

## Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- Coloured covers /  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged /  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated /  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing /  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps /  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations /  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material /  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available /  
Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion  
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut  
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la  
marge intérieure.
- Blank leaves added during restorations may  
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these  
have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que  
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une  
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,  
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas  
été filmées.
- Additional comments /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated /  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies /  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary materials  
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips,  
tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the  
best possible image / Les pages totalement ou  
partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata,  
une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de  
façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.
- Opposing pages with varying colouration or  
discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best  
possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des  
colorations variables ou des décolorations sont  
filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image  
possible.

Various pagings.

Pages 28 & 186 are incorrectly numbered page 8 & 86.

OFFICIAL REPORT  
OF THE  
DEBATES  
OF THE  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
OF THE  
DOMINION OF CANADA.

---

SECOND SESSION — FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

---

47 VICTORIÆ, 1884.

---

VOL. XV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY TO  
THE ELEVENTH DAY OF MARCH, 1884.

*Edited and Indexed by JNO. CHAS. BOYCE, Assistant to Chief Reporter.*

---



OTTAWA:  
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & CO., WELLINGTON STREET.  
1884.

858116 9

# MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

## RT. HON. SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, K.C.B.

AT THE OPENING OF THE 2nd SESSION OF THE 5th PARLIAMENT.

---

President of the Council (Premier). ....	Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, K.C.B., P.C.
Minister of Finance.....	Sir S. L. TILLEY, K.C.M.G., C.B.
Minister of Railways and Canals.....	Sir CHARLES TUPPER, K.C.M.G., C.B.
Postmaster-General.....	HON. JOHN CARLING.
Minister of Justice.....	Sir ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Public Works .....	Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G., C.B.
Minister of Interior.....	HON. D. L. MACPHERSON.
Minister of Agriculture .....	HON. JOHN HENRY POPE.
Minister of Customs.....	HON. MACKENZIE BOWELL.
Minister of Militia and Defence .....	HON. J. P. R. ADOLPHE CARON.
Secretary of State .....	HON. JOSEPH A. CHAPLEAU.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries.....	HON. ARCHIBALD W. McLELAN.
Minister of Inland Revenue.....	HON. JOHN COSTIGAN.
Speaker of the Senate.....	HON. WILLIAM MILLAR.

---

### OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HON. GEORGE AIREY KIRKPATRICK.....	Speaker.
JOHN G. BOURINOT, Esq .....	Clerk of the House.
DONALD W. MACDONELL, Esq... ..	Sergeant-at-Arms.
FRANÇOIS FORTUNAT ROULLEAU, Esq.....	Clerk Assistant.

---

### OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

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

# ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

## CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION OF THE FIFTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

**ADDINGTON**—John W. Bell.  
**ALBERT**—John Wallace.  
**ALGOMA**—Simon J. Dawson.  
**ANNAPOLIS**—William Hallett Ray.  
**ANTIGONISH**—Angus McIsaac.  
**ARGENTEUIL**—Hon. J. J. C. Abbott.  
**BAGOT**—Flavien Dupont.  
**BEAUCE**—Joseph Bolduc.  
**BEAUHARNOIS**—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.  
**BELLECHASSE**—Guillaume Amyot.  
**BERTHIER**—E. Octavian Cuthbert.  
**BONAVENTURE**—L. J. Riopel.  
**BOTHWELL**— { John Joseph Hawkins.\*  
                   { Hon. David Mills.  
**BRANT, N. Riding**—James Somerville.  
**BRANT, S. Riding**—William Paterson.  
**BROOKVILLE**—John Fisher Wood.  
**BROME**—Sydney Arthur Fisher.  
**BRUCE, E. Riding**—Rupert Mearse Wells.  
**BRUCE, N. Riding**—Alexander McNeill.  
**BRUCE, W. Riding**—James Somerville.  
**CAPE BRETON**— { William McDonald.  
                   { Murray Dodd.  
**CARDWELL**—Thomas White.  
**CARLETON (N.B.)**—David Irvine.  
**CARLETON (O.)**—Rt. Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald, K.C.B.  
**CARIBOO**—James Reid.  
**CHAMBLY**—Pierre Basile Benoit.  
**CHAMPLAIN**—Hippolyte Montplaisir.  
**CHARLEVOIX**—Simon Xavier Cimon.  
**CHARLOTTE**—Arthur Hill Gillmor.  
**CHATEAUGUAY**—Edward Holton.  
**CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY**—Jean Alfred Gagné.  
**COLCHESTER**—Hon. Archibald Woodbury McLelan.  
**COMPTON**—Hon. John Henry Pope.  
**CORNWALL AND STORMONT**—Darby Bergin.  
**CUMBERLAND**—Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, K.C.M.G.

**DIGBY**—Hon. William B. Vail.  
**DORCHESTER**—Charles Alexander Lesage.  
**DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA**—Désiré Olivier Bourbeau.  
**DUNDAS**—Charles Erastus Hickey.  
**DURHAM, E. Riding**—Arthur T. H. Williams.  
**DURHAM, W. Riding**—Hon. Edward Blake.  
**ELGIN, E. Riding**—John H. Wilson.  
**ELGIN, W. Riding**—George Elliott Casey.  
**ESSEX, N. Riding**—James Colebrooke Patterson.  
**ESSEX, S. Riding**—Lewis Wigle.  
**FRONTENAC**—Hon. George Airey Kirkpatrick.  
**GASPÉ**—Pierre Fortin.  
**GLENGARRY**—Donald Macmaster.  
**GLOUCESTER**—Kennedy F. Burns.  
**GRENVILLE, S. Riding**—William Thomas Benson.  
**GREY, E. Riding**—Thomas S. Sproule.  
**GREY, N. Riding**—Benjamin Allen.  
**GREY, S. Riding**—George Landerkin.  
**GUYSBOROUGH**—John A. Kirk.  
**HALDIMAND**—David Thompson.  
**HALIFAX**— { Malachy Bowes Daly.  
                   { John F. Stairs.  
**HALTON**—William McCraney.  
**HAMILTON**— { Francis Edwin Kilvert.  
                   { Thomas Robertson.  
**HANTS**—W. Henry Allison.  
**HASTINGS, E. Riding**—John White.  
**HASTINGS, N. Riding**—Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.  
**HASTINGS, W. Riding**—Alexander Robertson.  
**HOUELAGA**—Alphonse Desjardins.  
**HUNTINGDON**—Julius Scriver.  
**HURON, E. Riding**—Thomas Farrow.  
**HURON, S. Riding**—Hon. Sir R. J. Cartwright, K.C.M.G.  
**HURON, W. Riding**—Malcolm Colin Cameron.

\* Sat for 28 days; unseated on Judgment of Supreme Court; Hon. Mr. Mills sitting for balance of Session.





# House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.—47 VIC.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th January, 1884.

THE PARLIAMENT, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 17th day of January, 1884, for the despatch of business.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at fifteen minutes before Three o'clock.

### PRAYERS.

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

“ Mr. SPEAKER,—

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned,

### CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice King, one of the judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, a judgment relating to the election of the Electoral District of Albert, declaring the election of the respondent, John Wallace, null and void.

Also, from the Hon. Mr. Justice Rigby, a judgment relating to the election of the Electoral District of Lunenburg, declaring the election of the respondent, Thomas Twining Keefer, null and void.

Also, from the Hon. Mr. Justice Galt, a judgment relating to the Electoral District of Kent, declaring the election of the respondent, Henry Smyth, null and void.

Also, from the Hon. Mr. Justice Armour, a judgment relating to the election of the Electoral District of Lennox, declaring the election of the respondent, the Hon. Sir John Alexander Macdonald, null and void.

Also, from the Hon. Mr. Justice Armour, a judgment relating to the election for the Electoral District of West Middlesex, declaring the election of the respondent, George W. Ross, null and void.

Also, from the Hon. Mr. Justice Armour, a judgment relating to the election for the Electoral District of West Huron, declaring that the respondent, Malcolm Colin Cameron, was duly elected.

Also, from the Hon. Mr. Justice Armour, a judgment relating to the election for the Electoral District of South Simcoe, declaring that the respondent, Richard Tyrwhitt, was duly elected.

### VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that he had received the following notifications of vacancies which had occurred in the representation :—

Of MATTHEW H. RICHY, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the City and County of Halifax, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit, the office of Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Nova Scotia;

Of GILBERT ANSELME GIBOUARD, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Kent, New Brunswick, by resignation;

Of JOHN McMILLAN, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Huron, by resignation;

Of RAOUL S. DEBRAUJEU, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Soulanges, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown; and

Of JOHN PICKARD, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of York, New Brunswick, by decease.

He also informed the House that he had issued his several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to make out new writs of election for the said Electoral Districts, respectively.

He also informed the House, that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a copy of a Warrant, showing a vacancy which had taken place in the representation of the Electoral District of Lévis, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Hon. Joseph Godéric Blanchet, and that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery had, by virtue of the Act 41 Victoria, Chapter 5, Section 14, sub-section 2, issued a new Writ of Election for the said Electoral District.

### NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER further informed the House that, during the Recess, the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the election and return of the following Members :—

Of JOHN WALLACE, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Albert;

Of JOHN FITZ-WILLIAM STAIRS, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the City and County of Halifax;

Of CHARLES EDWIN KAULBACH, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Lunenburg;

Of PIERRE AMAND LANDREY, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Kent, New Brunswick;

Of ISIDORE NOEL BELLEAU, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Lévis;

Of DAVID WRIGHT ALLISON, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Lennox;

Of DONALD MACKENZIE CAMERON, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Middlesex;

Of the Hon. Sir RICHARD JOHN CARTWRIGHT, K.O.M.G., for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Huron; and

Of JAMES W. BAIN, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Soulanges.

### MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

The following Members, having previously taken the Oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took their seats in the House :—

JOHN WALLACE, Member for the Electoral District of Albert, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Leonard Tilley.

ISIDORE NOEL BELLEAU, Member for the Electoral District of Lévis, introduced by Sir Hector Langevin and Hon. Mr. Caron.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, Member for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Huron, introduced by Mr. Blake and Mr. Cameron (Huron).

PIERRE A. LANDREY, Member for the Electoral District of Kent, New Brunswick, introduced by Sir Leonard Tilley and Sir Hector Langevin.

DAVID WRIGHT ALLISON, Member for the Electoral District of the County of Lennox, introduced by Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Paterson (Brant).

JAMES W. BAIN, Member for the Electoral District of Soulanges, introduced by Sir Hector Langevin and Hon. Mr. Chapleau.

JOHN FITZ-WILLIAM STAIRS, Member for the Electoral District of the City and County of Halifax, introduced by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir John Macdonald.

CHARLES E. KAULBACH, Member for the Electoral District of Lunenburg, introduced by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir John Macdonald.

## ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OF OFFICE.

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

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

In fulfilment of the important trust committed to me by Her Majesty, I have recourse for the first time to your advice and assistance. It is a source of the deepest personal satisfaction to me, that I should have been called by Her Majesty to an office in which, as Her Representative I am enabled to take a part in the public affairs of the Dominion, and to associate myself with you in the performance of the honorable duties which you are about to approach.

I rejoice to learn that although the last harvest has been less productive than its predecessors, and although there are indications that the rapid expansion of your commerce has, to some extent, been followed by over-trading, the general condition of the Dominion is such as to justify me in congratulating you upon its prosperity.

The marked success attained by Canada at the International Fishery Exhibition in London, must be very gratifying to you, and has, I doubt not, been of great service in showing to the world the wealth of our Fisheries and the extent of our marine industries and resources.

The Commissioners appointed by my predecessor for the purpose of consolidating the Statutes affecting the Dominion, have pursued their task with diligence, and I am enabled to lay before you for examination about sixty chapters of the proposed consolidation. The remainder of the work will be prepared, and the whole of it revised during the present year, so that the final report will be ready at your next Session for your approval.

The number of immigrants to Canada during the past season has, I am glad to say, been greater than in any previous year, and is a proof that the better Canada is known the more it is valued by those seeking a home in the new world.

Arrangements are in progress to diminish the cost of inland transport, and I have reason to believe that the result will be a steady increase of valuable settlers, in the future.

During the recess, negotiations were resumed with British Columbia in regard to several matters upon which differences had for some time existed between the two Governments. One of my Ministers visited the Province last summer on a special mission with a view to the adjustment of all questions in controversy, and his efforts have happily been successful. Should your sanction be given to the arrangements then made, all occasions of dispute will have been removed, and the most cordial relations established between the Dominion and Provincial Governments. The papers will be laid before you and your consideration invited to measures enabling me to give effect to the agreement.

The rapid increase of population in the North-West renders some amendments in the North-West Territories Act expedient, and your attention will be called to this important matter.

The progress of the Indians in Manitoba and the North-West during last year has been, on the whole, satisfactory. The Bands included in the several Indian Treaties have for the most part betaken themselves to their reserves. A Bill for the further promotion of their interests will be submitted to you, as well as a measure applicable to the whole Dominion, for the purpose of encouraging the more advanced Indian communities to assume the responsibilities of self-government.

Mr. SPEAKER.

The Bill laid before you last Session for the representation of the people in Parliament and the assimilation of the electoral franchises existing in the several Provinces, has now been before the country for a year. The measure will be re-introduced and I commend it to your attention.

I would also urge upon you the expediency of providing for the regulation of factory labour and the protection of the workingman and his family. The measure submitted last Session, with some amendments, will be laid before you.

The rapid progress of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been maintained throughout the past year. Of the 2,833 miles of the main line between Pembroke and Port Moody, 1,738 miles are now constructed, rendering practicable the completion of that great work within the next two years. Although the time within which the Railway Company is bound to finish the road will not expire until 1891, my Government has thought it of the greatest importance for the settlement of the North-West and the development of our trade, that its completion from sea to sea should be hastened and the Company enabled to open the line throughout by the spring of 1886. With this view, and in order to aid the Company in procuring sufficient capital for the purpose by the disposal of its unsold shares, the Government agreed to receive a deposit of money and securities sufficient to pay a minimum three per cent. dividend for ten years on sixty-five millions of the stock. That arrangement was made on the belief that it would give steadiness and increased value to the shares on the market. A combination of unfavorable circumstances has prevented the fulfilment of these expectations, and the Company has not been able to obtain the required capital by a sale of its stock. The best means of preventing any delay in the great object of the early completion of the railway, demands your earnest consideration.

I am pleased to be able to state that the operation of that portion of the railway already opened, affords the most gratifying evidence of its soundness as a commercial enterprise and of its great value to Canada.

The large increase of the volume of traffic on the Intercolonial Railway over that of any previous year, without involving any burden upon the country, is a satisfactory proof of the continued development of trade between the eastern and western portions of the Dominion.

A provisional arrangement made with the Government of Nova Scotia for the retention of the Pictou Branch and the acquisition of the Eastern Extension Railway to the Strait of Canso, will be submitted for your approval.

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

The accounts for the past year will be laid before you. You will find that the expenditure has been considerably less and the receipts larger than the estimates, the surplus exceeding that of any previous year. The revenue of the first half of the current year, notwithstanding the large importations of last season, have been such that we may reasonably expect that the estimates for the year will be fairly maintained.

The estimates for the ensuing year will also be submitted to you. They will, I trust, be found to have been prepared with due regard to economy.

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

I feel assured that you will devote yourselves with earnestness and assiduity to the consideration of the subjects I have mentioned, and to all matters affecting the public interests that may be brought before you.

On motion of Sir John A. Macdonald, His Excellency's Speech was ordered to be taken into consideration, to-morrow.

## SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That Select Standing Committees of the House for the present Session be appointed for the following purposes:—1. On Privileges and Elec-

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

Motion agreed to.

#### REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House the Report of the Librarian on the state of the Library of Parliament.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

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

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY PAPERS.

Mr. BLAKE. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he proposes to lay on the Table, without motion, the papers connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway arrangements referred to in the Speech?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will be sent down as soon as the Speech is answered, by Messages from the Crown.

Motion agreed to; and (at 3:50 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 18th January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three O'clock.

#### PRAYERS.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. MACMASTER. Mr. Speaker, the first clause of the Speech from the Throne is one to which hon. members will give their very ready assent, and I am sure that not only this House, but the country generally, will endorse the wise choice made by Her Majesty of Her representative in this country. We know that the noble lord who has been appointed Governor-General of Canada, though yet comparatively a young man, has achieved a high position in the public life of the Mother Country, and that he has been a member of Mr. Gladstone's Administration. We further know that he belongs to a distinguished family which has contributed to Great Britain not only a Chancellor of the Exchequer, but also a Prime Minister. I am sure the Canadian people will extend to the Governor-General a hearty welcome, and I have no doubt his administration in this country will be as successful as those of his immediate predecessors. We have had the advantage of late years, not merely of having the selection of Governors-General wisely made, and the benefit of the eminent services rendered by these Imperial officers in the colony, but also the unofficial services of many of those gentlemen after their term of office and their connection with this country proper have ceased. In this respect Lord Dufferin and the Marquis of Lorne, though acting un-

officially, have been our most valued ambassadors in Great Britain, and have not ceased to take an interest in our country's affairs long after their terms of office expired. I may say, with respect to Lord Lorne and his royal wife that by their devotion to duty, they became endeared to the Canadian people, and will long be remembered with grateful affection by the inhabitants of this Dominion. In the case of Lord Dufferin, he equally won the affection of the people of Canada, and the contributions made to the Dominion's welfare, not only while he held office here but since his return to the Mother Country, will be gratefully recorded and remembered by our people. I am sure that in the great diplomatic triumphs achieved by Lord Dufferin since his departure from amongst us, no one has taken a greater interest than the people of Canada, no matter whether those efforts were directed to the pacification of the Egyptian, to the over-awing of the Czar, or the outwitting of the Turk—in all his endeavors he has had the sympathy and interest of the Canadian people. And I am sure that after the term of office of the present Governor-General, though it is rather premature to refer to that now, he, by his efforts here and work hereafter, will have equally succeeded in winning the best opinions of the Canadian people. The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, is of an eminently practical character. It may be divided into two main headings: first relating to administration, and second relating to proposed legislation. In this country the people and the representatives of the people are occupied with practical questions—questions intimately connected with the development of the country, with the building up of provinces, with the pacific work of civilization. In older countries, like the Mother Country, great interest may be excited over the mere discussion as to whether there should be an extra penny imposed on a quart of malt, but here our questions for discussion are broader, and I would fain believe, are more important, because I think it is more important to have a part in the moulding of a new and great nation than in discussing what are in many respects the petty affairs of older nations. I do not mean to disparage the important concerns of the Mother Country, but I do say that many of the warmest debates in her Parliament are upon subjects which, in this country, would appear of comparatively trifling moment. Among the subjects of administration upon which the country may fairly be congratulated are, first, the success which Canada had at the International Fisheries Exhibition, in London. It certainly should be a subject of congratulation for the Canadian people that by the indefatigable exertions of the Government, and more especially of the Minister who had charge of the Canadian exhibits, Canada obtained the second highest number of medals in that important competition—the United States obtaining first place—our country thereby acquiring an advertisement before the world of her great wealth and the great extent of her fisheries. The work of the consolidation of the Statutes affecting Canada has steadily progressed. This is a work which will greatly facilitate the labours of those who have occasion to refer to these Statutes, and I am sure that the assurance that it will be completed by the next Session of Parliament is one which will be received with feelings of gratification by all who take an interest in this subject. During the year, provisional arrangements have been made by the Government with the Governments of Nova Scotia and British Columbia, respectively; the first relating to the retention of the Pictou Branch of the Intercolonial Railway and the acquisition of the Eastern Extension Railway to the Strait of Canso. It is believed that this section of the road may be more efficiently managed in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and that by this arrangement, which is favourable not only to the Province of Nova Scotia, but also to the Dominion, a more efficient train service will be secured to the people

of Nova Scotia, and cheaper rates both for fares and freights. Of the arrangements with the Province of British Columbia, I have little personal knowledge; but we are well aware that for some time differences have existed between that Province and the Dominion of Canada. These it would appear, are now happily adjusted, and a measure will be submitted to Parliament by which they will be finally terminated. It is to be borne in mind that that outlying Province has not yet fully reaped the benefits which were anticipated from Confederation. The full benefits of union with the older Provinces will only be realized when our great Interprovincial Railway is finally constructed. Then British Columbia will fully realize the advantages of its union with the older Provinces; and, in the meantime, to that distant Province we must give our sympathy and our generous support; and I trust that the anticipations which the people of British Columbia reasonably entertain may, by the action of the Canadian Parliament, be fully and speedily realized. It is also a matter for congratulation that the Intercolonial Railway, as evidenced by the returns for the last year, is no longer a burden on the public exchequer, but that there is a surplus of receipts over expenditures. Among the subjects which are a fair matter for congratulation, there is none more important than that of immigration. In 1878 the number of immigrants who came into Canada and settled was 30,000; in 1881, 47,000; in 1882, 112,000, and in 1883, 133,000, showing a steady and unprecedented influx of people to settle in this country. With regard to the immigrants who arrived last year, 34,000 were from the United States, and 11,000 of those were returned Canadians. A very important trade, connected with cattle and sheep, has been developed in the last five years. The statistics of 1878 show no returns of the importation of pure bred cattle into this country; the year before last the importation of thorough-bred cattle amounted to 12,000, and last year to 21,000. This fact is one which will contribute to the improvement of our stock, and the increase of our agricultural resources, while it will also tend to stimulate the important trade which has sprung up in connection with cattle and sheep. Within the last five years this cattle trade has assumed almost enormous dimensions. In 1878 there were exported from Canada 19,000 cattle and 46,000 sheep, almost entirely of American product. During 1883 there were exported from Canada 56,000 cattle and 114,000 sheep, entirely of Canadian product. This industry will contribute greatly to the increase of the agricultural wealth of the country, and will afford the farmers and all who take an interest in the progress of agriculture, a new field for investment and increased opportunities for enterprise. I may say in this connection, that the Canadian cattle trade with England enjoys advantages over the trade of any other country. The United States are put upon what is called the scheduled list, and cattle exported from the United States to Great Britain must be slaughtered at the port of entry immediately after landing. But by a wise provision of the present Government, arrangements have been entered into by which Canadian cattle are not placed on the schedule list; they need not be slaughtered at the port of entry, but may be driven or carried to any of the British markets and treated in the same way as British cattle. This is a great advantage to the exporter of Canadian cattle, an advantage which, in money, is equivalent to one or two pence per pound of beef. During last year an incident occurred which demonstrated the patriotism and ability of the Minister of Railways, I am sure, not merely to the great satisfaction of his own political party, but to all people who prize the progress of this country, and who are interested in the prompt and efficient discharge of public duty. On one occasion three ship loads of cattle were condemned by the veterinary surgeons at home, but the Canadian High Commissioner seeing that the Canadian

Mr. MACMASTER.

trade might be injured by these cattle being condemned, and Canada put on the scheduled list, repaired immediately to the scene of action, with an order for the re-examination of these three cargoes. The skill which that hon. gentleman possessed in his knowledge of the physique of that other great animal, man, enabled him to have a supervising eye over the acts of the veterinary surgeons and by his prompt and vigorous action, by devoting his personal attention to the matter, he succeeded in getting a re-examination, which resulted in showing that these cattle had been improperly condemned, and procured the removal of an order which would not only have damaged the cattle trade but the shipping trade as well, and impaired the success of this great Canadian industry. I think the thanks of the Canadian people, irrespective of politics, are due to the hon. Minister of Railways for the promptness and the efficiency with which he performed this duty. I do not desire to trouble the House with much detail, but I may say that the receipts for the year have been in excess of the estimates, and the expenditure has been less than the estimates. The result is, that on the transactions of the year there is a surplus of \$7,060,000; and this is apart from the sum of about \$1,000,000 realized from the sale of lands in the North-West. These two make a total surplus of upwards of \$8,000,000, the largest sums united since Confederation. Now, Sir, a large portion of this surplus has been derived from importations—and with reference to that, I may say that there has perhaps been over-importation. Perhaps it would have been better for the prosperity of the country if our importations had not been so large; but that is a matter which will, in time, correct itself. However, a large surplus is not at all a bad thing to struggle with; and when we take into account the various circumstances to which I have referred—the large amount in our Treasury and the prosperous state of our finances—we may fairly congratulate the country on the substantial degree of prosperity it enjoys, notwithstanding the fact that the last harvest has not been so productive as its predecessors, and notwithstanding the over-trading which prevailed to some extent during the past year. Now, Mr. Speaker, referring to the legislation which is proposed, I would say that our experience in the North-West has demonstrated that changes can be made in the laws relating to that country with advantage, and a Bill is proposed to give effect to those changes. The growth of manufacturing establishments in the country will necessitate the introduction of legislation with the view of making better provision for the well-being of artisans and their families, not only in their own interest, but in the interest of the community generally. I am sure that the measure which it is proposed to introduce, in order to assimilate the laws relating to Dominion elections, will be favourably received. A measure of that nature was introduced last year, and was left over until the present Session for fuller consideration. It is an anomaly that the standard of qualification for voting at Dominion elections should be the diverging standards prevailing in the different Provinces. An effort should be made at the earliest day to render as nearly uniform as possible, the standard of qualification for voting at Dominion elections in the several Provinces of the Dominion. Then, Sir, it is proposed to legislate with regard to the Indians who are our heritage, and whom, by good faith, by fair dealing, and by keeping our treaty obligations, we have succeeded in retaining as our friends and allies, instead of making our vigorous enemies, as has been the case in the United States. The disappearance of the buffalo in the North-West, owing to his rapid slaughter, has induced the Indian to give up, to a great extent, his nomadic habits, and to betake himself to the more ordinary avocations of life. The Indians have, to a large extent, settled themselves on their reserves, and provision should be made for them in their new mode of life. Then, with regard

to the Indians who are most advanced in civilization, and who have lived for a long time in close proximity to the whites, it is proposed to concede to them some measure of self-government, somewhat similar to the municipal system that prevails among the whites. I am sure that an enlightened Canadian Parliament will welcome a species of Home Rule for the aborigines of this country. There is no question, Sir, in which the people of this country have greater interest at this time, or indeed, have had a greater interest for a considerable time, than the construction of the Pacific Railway. That work is a national work; it is a Canadian work in which the whole people of this country are deeply interested. The construction of the road, as we are all aware, has been relegated by the Government and by Parliament to a company. That company has, with an energy unprecedented in this country, set itself diligently to work to fulfil the great contract it has undertaken, and I think there is united testimony from both sides of this House, and from all sections of the country, that the company entrusted with the construction of that great work has been honourable in its dealings and has faithfully and energetically endeavoured to carry out its agreement. The progress made with the road has been unprecedented. Of the total length from Pembroke to Port Moody, 2,833 miles, 1,738 miles have been constructed, leaving 1,095 miles yet to be constructed; and it must be a gratifying circumstance that the portion of the road constructed and put into operation has proved not only a commercial success to the contractors, but also of very great advantage to the country. I will not weary the House with lengthy details or many figures, but I may state that, in addition to the portions of the road constructed in the older Provinces, in addition to the portions taken over from the Government, in addition to the sections separated by a gap to the north of Lake Superior, the road to-day extends west of Winnipeg to the summits of the Rocky Mountains, in full operation a distance of nearly 1,000 miles. At the present time, what is literally a small army of workmen, numbering 9,000, with all the appliances for the construction of the railway, in the shape of machinery and horses, are engaged in the work of lessening the gap that separates the two portions of the road north of Lake Superior. Now, it will be perfectly obvious, not only to hon. members in this House but to the whole country, that the prompt construction of that road is of the first importance to the Canadian people. We know that the Northern Pacific road has been just completed. That road will become a vigorous competitor for the trans-continental trade. And there is another road, the Union Pacific, in active operation. The rapid development of the North-West and the settlement of the country, the expansion of our trade, and a variety of other circumstances, will make it necessary that the Canadian Pacific road should be completed, both in the interest of the country and the company, at a period long antecedent to the date originally fixed, 1891. It was the recent expectation that the road would be completed in 1886, and I am sure that if that expectation should be realized, it would result in the greatest advantage to this country. Let us not overlook the advantage which that road, when completed, will confer upon this country. When we recollect that the two American Pacific roads are not through lines, that they are only partially through lines, that they have to connect with other lines in order to reach the seaboard, and that ours will be the only trans-continental road extending from sea to sea under one management, and that it will be hundreds of miles shorter than either of the other Pacific roads with any connections they can possibly make, I think it will be perfectly self-evident to every hon. member of this House and to the country, that great advantages will accrue to this country and to the Canadian Pacific road when it is completed. That road will possess other incidental advantages which are not to be ignored. In the

first place, it will pass through a larger area of cultivable land than either of the American Pacific roads. The agricultural lands on the western portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway extend from longitude 96 to longitude 114, equal to 18 degrees; on the Northern Pacific Railway from longitude 94 to 105 degrees, equal to 11 degrees; on the Union Pacific Railway, from longitude 96 to 105, equal to 9 degrees—showing the vastly greater extent of cultivable land that will be placed under tribute in close proximity to the Canadian Pacific Railway when it will be completed, than is traversed by the other roads. Furthermore, the mountain section of the Canadian Pacific Railway is vastly shorter than that of either of the American Pacific roads. For instance the Canadian Pacific Railway is embraced within a mountain section of 600 miles; the Northern Pacific Railway, within a mountain section of 900 miles; and the Union Pacific Railway, within a mountain section of 1,225 miles. From these facts, it is perfectly evident that our road will have a decided advantage in the competition for the trans-continental freight and passenger traffic, and that the sooner it can be put into operation the sooner will these advantages which I have foreshadowed result in great benefit, not merely to the company but also to the country. It was not to be expected that a road destined to become so formidable a rival to its competitors would be permitted to be built without vigorous opposition. Combinations have consequently been formed against the Canadian Pacific Railway by these interested roads. In self protection, its American rivals endeavoured to obstruct its progress, and the result of their combinations and machinations has been to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from disposing of its stock at a fair market value—at such value as they had fair reason to expect to so realize in order to apply the proceeds to the completion of their great work. Unfortunately a great depreciation took place in the value of American Railway securities, not merely in the New York market, but also in the other great money markets of the world—in Amsterdam, Paris and London—and this depreciation occurred at the very time when the Canadian Pacific Railway needed the proceeds which they expected to obtain from the sale of their stock. To meet this difficulty, the company approached the Canadian Government and deposited with it a sum of money and securities sufficient to provide for the payment of three per cent. of the five per cent. promised by the railway company on a capital stock of \$65,000,000. It was supposed that this provision for a limited amount of the interest promised by the Canadian Pacific Railway would have the effect, not merely of steadying the stock in the American, English and French markets, but also of giving increased value to the stock, and that thereby money would be realized from the sale applicable to the prosecution of the work. Through a combination of circumstances this result has not been achieved, and the company has not been able to realize from the sale of their stock the amount they might fairly have contemplated. Under these circumstances, it is evident that it will be the duty of Parliament to apply its best wisdom and give its most patriotic consideration to any measure that in the interest of the country the Government may find it necessary to submit with the view of preventing any delay in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway that may result from the causes I have indicated. Parliament will, no doubt, give its best wisdom and consideration to this subject. That the Canadian Pacific Railway should be built well built, and wisely built and built it must be. The Roman Senate once said, and the voice of the Roman people re-echoed the fiat of the Senate, *delenda est Carthago*, "Carthage must be destroyed"—and Carthage was destroyed. I see the leader of the Opposition smiling at the Latin, and I hope it will give him the proper inspiration under the circumstances to which I am alluding. The Canadian people have announced to the world that the Canadian Pacific Railway must be con-

structed and that no unreasonable delay should be allowed to hinder the completion of this great national work, which will tend to stimulate trade, encourage settlement, promote the development of the North-West, unite the several Provinces of the Dominion more closely together, and advance the prosperity of the whole country. I do not know that it would be wise for me to enter into any particulars. As Cicero once remarked in his address on the Manilian law, I am embarrassed with the variety of argument that might be presented on this subject. I think it is sufficient to state the proposition substantially, in order to commend it not only to this House but also to the Canadian people. I wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen on both sides, for the kind indulgence extended to me while I have made these remarks. I suppose I would not be acting according to tradition if I did not apologize for the imperfection of my utterances, and I have neither reason nor desire to depart from tradition in this respect. I know that none more readily than hon. members who belong to my own profession will extend their sympathy to one who speaks without instructions on his brief, or the inspiration of a fee. I thank hon. gentlemen for the kind courtesy they have extended to me and I wish to thank the Prime Minister, and through him, the Government, for the compliment implied in asking me to move the Address in reply—a compliment I highly appreciate and which, on behalf of the constituency I have the honour to represent, I accepted. I have much pleasure in moving the following Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne:—

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech at the opening of the present Session, and further to assure His Excellency:—

That we receive with great pleasure His Excellency's kind assurance that in having recourse for the first time to our advice and assistance, in fulfilment of the important trust committed to him by Her Majesty, it is a source of the deepest personal satisfaction to him that he should have been called by Her Majesty to an office in which, as Her Representative, he is enabled to take a part in the public affairs of the Dominion, and to associate himself with us in the performance of the honourable duties which we are about to approach.

That we rejoice to know that although the last harvest has been less productive than its predecessors, and although there are indications that the rapid expansion of our commerce has to some extent been followed by over-trading, His Excellency feels that the general condition of the Dominion is such as to justify him in congratulating us upon its prosperity.

That the marked success attained by Canada at the International Fishery Exhibition in London is very gratifying to us, and has, we doubt not, been of great service in showing to the world the wealth of our fisheries and the extent of our marine industries and resources.

That we are glad to learn that the Commissioners appointed by His Excellency's predecessor for the purposes of consolidating the Statutes affecting the Dominion, have pursued their task with diligence; that His Excellency is enabled to lay before us for examination about sixty chapters of the proposed consolidation, and that the remainder of the work will be prepared and the whole of it revised during the present year, so that the final report will be ready at our next Session for our approval.

That it affords us much satisfaction to be informed that the number of immigrants to Canada during the past season has been greater than in any previous year; that we agree with His Excellency that this is a proof that the better Canada is known the more it is valued by those seeking a home in the new world; and that we trust the result of the arrangements which he informs us are in progress to diminish the cost of inland transport, will be a steady increase of valuable settlers in the future.

That we thank His Excellency for informing us that, during the recess, negotiations were resumed with British Columbia in regard to several matters upon which differences had for some time existed between the two Governments; that one of His Excellency's Ministers visited that Province last summer on a special mission, with a view to the adjustment of all questions in controversy, and that his efforts have happily been successful; that we trust that we shall be able to sanction the arrangements then made, and that by our so doing, all occasions of dispute will have been removed, and the most cordial relations established between the Dominion and Provincial Governments; and that any papers laid before us and any measures for enabling His Excellency to give effect to the agreement, will receive our earnest consideration.

Mr. MACMASTER.

That we feel that the rapid increase of population in the North-West may render some amendments in the North-West Territories Act expedient, and that our attention shall be willingly given to this important matter.

That we learn with pleasure that the progress of the Indians in Manitoba and the North-West during last year has been on the whole satisfactory, and that the Bands included in the several Indian Treaties have for the most part betaken themselves to their reserves; and that any Bill for the further promotion of their interests which may be submitted to us, as well as any measure applicable to the whole Dominion for the purpose of encouraging the more advanced Indian communities to assume the responsibilities of self-government, will be willingly considered.

That the Bill laid before us last Session for the representation of the people in Parliament and the assimilation of the electoral franchises existing in the several Provinces, which has now been before the country for a year, will, when re-introduced, receive the attention to which His Excellency commends it.

That we are fully aware of the expediency of providing for the regulation of factory labour and the protection of the workman and his family, and that we are glad to know that the measure submitted last Session, with some amendments, will be laid before us.

That we learn with great interest, that the rapid progress of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been maintained throughout the past year, that of the 2,833 miles of the main line between Pembroke and Port Moody, 1,738 miles are now constructed, rendering practicable the completion of that great work within the next two years, and that although the time within which the Railway Company is bound to finish the road will not expire until 1891, His Excellency's Government has thought it of the greatest importance for the settlement of the North-West and the development of our trade, that its completion from sea to sea should be hastened and the company enabled to open the line throughout by the spring of 1886.

That we thank His Excellency for informing us, that with this view, and in order to aid the Company in procuring sufficient capital for the purpose, by the disposal of its unsold shares, the Government agreed to receive a deposit of money and securities sufficient to pay a minimum three per cent. dividend for ten years on \$65,000,000 of the stock, that arrangement being made on the belief that it would give steadiness and increased value to the shares on the market, although a combination of unfavourable circumstances has prevented the fulfilment of these expectations, and the Company has not been able to obtain the required capital by a sale of its stock; and that we feel that the best means of preventing any delay in the great object of the early completion of the railway, demands our earnest consideration.

That we share the pleasure expressed by His Excellency in being able to state, that the operation of that portion of the railway already opened, affords the most gratifying evidence of its soundness as a commercial enterprise and of its great value to Canada.

That we think, with His Excellency, that the large increase of the volume of traffic on the Intercolonial railway over that of any previous year, without involving any burden upon the country, is a satisfactory proof of the continued development of trade between the eastern and western portions of the Dominion.

That we shall willingly consider the provisional arrangement made with the Government of Nova Scotia for the retention of the Pictou Branch and the acquisition of the Eastern Extension Railway to the Strait of Canso, which, His Excellency is pleased to say, will be submitted for our approval.

That we thank His Excellency, for informing us that the accounts for the past year will be laid before us. That we shall be glad to find that the expenditure has been considerably less and the receipts larger than the estimates, the surplus exceeding that of any previous year, and that the revenues of the first half of the current year, notwithstanding the large importations of last season, have been such that we may reasonably expect that the Estimates for the year will be fairly maintained.

That we shall respectfully consider the estimates for the ensuing year to be submitted to us, and which will, we trust, be found to have been prepared with due regard to economy.

That His Excellency may rest assured that we will devote ourselves with earnestness and assiduity to the consideration of the subjects he mentioned, and to all matters affecting the public interest that may be brought before us.

Mr. BELLEAU (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the task which devolves upon me of proposing for the consideration of the House the adoption of the Address, it seems to me is one which should have been, and which always ought to be, entrusted to some hon. member of this House, whose experience in past legislation would afford him every necessary qualification to treat in a proper manner, the subject matter now under consideration. It seems to me that in a new country like ours, where we have so recently laid the

foundations of a new political organization, that it should belong to one of our veteran politicians, to one of those who have traced the great lines of our Constitution, to come before you and explain how the legislation, now asked of this Parliament, is connected with past legislation; to explain to you its real meaning, and make you understand its character. It seems to me that this task should not have devolved on a young member, who, like myself, appears for the first time within these precincts. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I well understand that it is not for me at the *début* of my political career, on my entry within these precincts, to criticise an old custom which has always been adopted, and which must have some good reason for its existence. This is the reason why I accepted the difficult task which has been assigned to me. Convinced as I am that, if I cannot instruct you by my experience, I will have at least the advantage of edifying you by the good disposition which I have manifested in accepting my share of the duties which are imposed on me as one of the members of the national representation. The document which is submitted for our consideration, Mr. Speaker, embraces matters which may be classed in three categories of different subjects; first of all, it contains a retrospective review of past legislation, and makes known its result on the general condition of the country. Secondly, it details the subjects which are to be submitted for our consideration and which may be divided into two classes: firstly, subjects which refer principally to the material prosperity of the country, and secondly, subjects which refer to the moral and intellectual condition of the population. The first sentiment which I see expressed in His Excellency's Speech, is also one which this House should make it a duty to express in the name of the country, that is the satisfaction which we experience with the selection of the new Governor General called to preside over the destinies of the country for some years to come. In appointing His Excellency the Marquis of Lansdowne to this important trust, the Home Government has given us another proof of the interest which it takes in the material development of the country. The choice of the most distinguished men, who have attained eminent positions in the Mother Country, gives us an estimate of the interest which the Imperial Government takes in us, and of its desire to see the material progress of this country keep pace with that of the United Kingdom. Before passing from this subject I believe it is my duty, and in so doing, I but echo the voice of this Chamber and of the country, to thank the late Governor General, the Marquis of Lorne, for the special interest which he manifests in our behalf, in England, today. During his beneficent administration of the affairs of the country, the Marquis of Lorne took the means to identify himself with our interests, to familiarize himself with our resources and wants; and now that he has returned to the Mother Country, I see that he seems to consecrate all his efforts, and all his energy to make known, on the Continent, the progress of our country, and to induce the surplus European population to come and settle amongst us. I thank him in the name of this House and in the name of the country. The time is well chosen to commence this propaganda. There has just been held in London a Universal Fishery Exhibition, in which our country had a most favourable and special opportunity of making known its resources. This exhibition, which was opened in the middle of last July, lasted five months. Twenty-five nations took part in it. It was opened by the Prince of Wales in person, an evidence of the interest which the English Government takes, not only in the development of her colonies, but also in the development of the interests of the entire world. Nearly 40,000 persons were present at the opening, and nearly 4,000,000 visited it during its continuance. Mr. Speaker, in so important an exhibition, in the midst of so many competitors, it is a great pleasure and a great honour to know that Canada came out of this exhibition third in

rank. The gold and silver medals which we won were not, it is true, as numerous as those obtained by the United States; but this is explained by the fact that the Americans figured at the exhibition both as a nation and as individuals. For this reason the number of medals was greater in favour of the United States; but I believe there is an accord of public opinion that the Canadian exhibition, in its entirety, as in its details, was superior to that of our neighbours across the line. If we reflect, Mr. Speaker, that we have a capital of more than \$3,000,000 invested in this industry, that we have a population of about 30,000 persons engaged in our fisheries, and nearly 800 ships and 11,000 fishing smacks; if we reflect that this industry yields to the country a revenue of \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000, we will understand its importance and the great necessity to contribute to its development. And I venture to think that the result of our efforts will be to make known to the world the value of our fisheries, and, at the same time, ameliorate the moral, intellectual and material condition of our fishermen. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is my duty ere passing from this subject, to bestow my congratulations, my compliments on the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for the success which has attended his efforts at the exhibition. It is a worthy reward for the zeal and energy which he has displayed; and I think it is only just to associate with his name that of the hon. member from Gaspé, who is sometimes called the King of Gaspesia, a title which he justly deserves by reason of the devotion which he manifests in the interests of that section, and by the legitimate influence which he has there acquired. I observed a few moments ago that the times are favourable to push the work of emigration. In referring to statistics, and according to the information which I have been able to gather, I calculate, as the hon. member from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) has remarked, that the number of emigrants this year has been three times as great as it was two years ago, and this emigration has two special characteristics: firstly it embraces a considerable contingent coming from the continent of Europe, which is one of the best proofs of the interest taken in our country; and this will the more induce us to hope that this emigration directed to our continent, stimulated by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by the resources which will be found in our country, will go on increasing, and will eventually fill up the vast plains which we reserve for European emigration. Another characteristic of this emigration, is that of those 133,000 emigrants, nearly 40,000 came from the United States; and among these 40,000 there were 12,000 French Canadians who returned to the North-West, which means to our country. It is well understood Mr. Speaker, that not only in this House, but also in the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, a desire has been expressed that the Government should make some effort to repatriate our fellow subjects. I think that one of the most efficacious means which the Government could employ to attain this end, is to demonstrate to them that they have a better future in this country than in the United States; that here they can find the means to maintain themselves and their families, and that, at all events, if they cannot find these means in the Province of Quebec, that they can, at least, in the North-West. There, at least, they will have the consolation of being at home and of living under their own laws, and under the constitution of their native country. All this, Mr. Speaker, points to a very satisfactory state of things, and we are not surprised to see the Speech from the Throne announce that the financial state of the country is in a most prosperous state, and that the surplus for the past year amounts to over \$7,000,000. The Speech from the Throne alludes in a few words to the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and at this time I should desire to have, for this great question, the experience which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals possesses. I should

like at this moment to speak with his experience and attainments, but I believe that hon. gentlemen in this House who have sat here before me, have already been made familiar with the resources of this great enterprise as well as the means to accomplish this undertaking, and I will not afford them any new information in telling them that in the year just ended the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has made wonderful progress. In reality it has constructed not less than 693 miles of railway, of which 553 miles are on the main line and 140 miles of branch lines. On the Western Division they have laid rails on 377 miles, bringing the line to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, a distance of 960 miles from Winnipeg. The company now proposes, at the commencement of the coming summer, to construct and put in operation a line of steamboats from Lake Huron to Thunder Bay, on Lake Superior. This will enable them to distribute the tide of emigration for a distance of nearly 1,400 miles from Port Arthur. These results could not be more satisfactory for the country; and if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has not succeeded as well as it expected in floating its bonds in foreign markets, the energy which it has displayed, the devotion which it has manifested in the execution of this enterprise which has been entrusted to it by the country deserves from this House, that its efforts should be aided and seconded, and as my learned colleague from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), remarked that we make it apparent that we can assure the success of our national enterprises even against the hostile forces arraigned against them. We are also happy to learn, Mr. Speaker, that the Intercolonial Railway has been a source of revenue this year to the country. Constructed at first in a military and political point of view, the Intercolonial Railway becomes to-day a success as a commercial enterprise, and this is a subject for congratulation. Nevertheless I might remark, and I believe the Government will perfectly understand its duty in the matter, that this road, whilst a commercial success, must not cease to be a public enterprise, an enterprise for the benefit of the provinces which it traverses as for the whole Confederation. We must not forget that each Province has contributed alike to its construction, that each contributes to its maintenance, and that each Province ought to have the benefit of its natural advantages in the arrangement of its tariff. I will not further extend my remarks on what refers to the legislation relative to the material interests of the country, and I will briefly review the other subjects which are submitted for our consideration. The Speech from the Throne informs us that the Government has the intention of submitting to this House a measure, which has, for its object, the assimilation of the electoral laws in all the Provinces. It always seemed to me that it was an anomaly to leave the electoral franchise of the Dominion in the hands of the Local Legislatures, and if, so far, this state of affairs has not produced serious inconveniences, I think, nevertheless, that a measure of this kind is most opportune; if up to to-day this state of things has not caused serious embarrassments, one thing is certain, it is that our electoral franchise is in the hands of Provincial Legislatures which can change or modify them entirely, and determine that we the members of Federal representation in going forth from these precincts may find ourselves face to face with an election law altogether different from the one under which we were elected. I think it is the duty of this Legislature to take up the question of our electoral franchise, and all that I can say is that for my part whilst the legislation seems to me timely, I have only to express a hope that the Government in conceding to popular liberty, will at the same time bear in mind and make due allowance for the conservative character of our population. The development of manufactures in this country necessitates legislation for the protection of persons therein employed, we ought to profit by the experience of other countries; that experience

Mr. BELLEAU.

teaches us that the development of manufactures in a great number of States, especially in the great manufacturing centres, has had the effect of injuring the moral and intellectual progress of the people; this Legislature will act wisely in taking, at the earliest possible moment, the means to protect women and children, who are generally the persons employed in the factories. The consolidation of the Statutes is an important service which the Legislature is rendering to the country, and we learn with a great deal of pleasure that this work is so far advanced, the report which will be submitted to the House will be received with a great deal of pleasure and we hope that it will be soon accomplished. Mr. Speaker, we also learn with a great deal of pleasure that certain administrative difficulties which might have arisen between the Central Government and one of the Provinces are on the way to an advantageous settlement. There is one feature of English statesmen which I have always admired: it is to find a solution for all difficulties, and settlement of all political differences by the means of diplomacy. There is an old adage "that for every evil there is a remedy." I think that this adage applies to politics as well as to other things; and I see with pleasure that our Canadian statesmen follow the noble example of English diplomatists. It is of the first importance that our rulers adopt, from the start, this manner of overcoming difficulties which may arise between the Provinces or between the Central and Provincial Governments. These, Mr. Speaker, in a few words, are the important subjects which are submitted for our consideration, and to which His Excellency the Governor General invites our attention. The appeal which is made is addressed to all hon. members of this House, no matter to what party they belong. We come from different parts of this great Confederation. We represent different interests, counties in Provinces whose resources and whose wants are different; but there is a common ground on which we can all meet. This ground is the general interest of this Confederation. We, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Province of Quebec, occupy a special position, a somewhat unique position, in this House and in the country. We are the minority; we have interests different from yours; we have our own language; we profess a different religion from you; our institutions, our usages, our customs, differ from yours; but I think you will bear us testimony that so far we have resolutely, loyally and generously embraced the idea which predominates in the organization of the new political constitution under which we live. Indeed, from our youth, from our infancy, we have learned from our public men to imbibe this idea; we have learned to defend and protect our own rights; but we have also learned to respect those of others. I need not mention any names, but there is one man whose memory is still fresh in this House; it is that of Sir George Etienne Cartier. That man would not for the whole world have abandoned one iota of the inheritance which his predecessors left him; but, Mr. Speaker, you can, at the same time, pay this testimony to him, that never, no never, was he backward when it was a question of defending, of protecting, of respecting the rights of those who were not his fellow-citizens. This House and the country has just rendered him a worthy tribute in decreeing that a statue shall be erected to him in front of these precincts. Well, Mr. Speaker, we, the members from Quebec, we have no other ambition than to follow this model—to follow the example set us by this man—example which is so well followed by those who represent him at the head of the political institutions of the country. We embrace these ideas, and we are here, within these precincts, with the sincere desire of loyally co-operating, of faithfully working for the material, moral and intellectual development of this beautiful country. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the indulgence which you have extended to me. I thank, also, this honorable House for the attention

they have bestowed on me, notwithstanding the fact that I speak a language which is not understood by a great number of the members of this House. Before taking my seat I humbly ask permission to second the motion now placed before the House by the hon. member from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster).

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, although the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) closed his address to the House by declining to tender the traditional apology, I will not so far follow his example as to decline to tender the traditional compliment, and I will assure you, that so far as I could judge, he has not merely, on this occasion, been provided with that which he seemed to think essential to a gentleman of his profession—a brief—but he stuck to it with very commendable accuracy of thought and attention, and he paid, it seems to me, a poor compliment to those who entrusted him with the honor of moving the Address when he declared himself to be in want of that essential preliminary to an advocate's speech. My hon. friend, if he will allow me to call him so, who seconded the motion, opened his observations by complaining of the task imposed upon him as a young member, and he said that he thought from his point of view, as I understood him, it ought to be some of the older hon. members, who were more accustomed to these matters, who had had more to do with them, who were more responsible for them, who should be called upon to explain, in a fuller and more authoritative manner than he could hope to do, the topics which were under discussion. But the hon. gentleman, after having made that apology, which the hon. gentleman from Glengarry disdained to make, proceeded to discuss those matters in a manner which indicated, I think, that he was also fully equal to the task imposed upon him. There was, it is true, on one occasion at any rate, some slight discrepancy in the statements of the hon. gentlemen, but, generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, I may say that both of them adhered tolerably well to the text of the document which they were asked to give their assent to, and to which they were inviting the assent of this Chamber. That document is long, but, though long, it is, perhaps, quite as remarkable for what it omits as for what it contains. I entirely agree with the paragraph, and with the expressions upon that paragraph, which have reference to the nobleman who has been lately appointed to preside over us. It is a fortunate circumstance that for many years we should have had a succession of distinguished gentlemen as Viceroys of Canada, and it is a fortunate circumstance also, I think, that they are men who, having already approved themselves to be fit for that position, by the place they have taken in public affairs of the Mother Country, were yet men in the prime and vigor of life, fully equal to an energetic and active discharge of those functions which devolve even upon a constitutional Governor here, and of whom we may fairly expect that they come here to improve and increase their credit and reputation; to approve themselves capable of still higher positions in that public service to which they have devoted themselves; and, therefore, there is every inducement to their discharging, as those in the past have discharged, to the full their duty to the country. We do not expect, as I once before observed here, from those who come to rule over us, indiscriminate praise and eulogy, but we are entitled to expect, and I am glad to say we do receive, marks of an abiding attachment on the part of those who have remained among us for five or six years, towards this country, and a public exhibition of that abiding attachment and interest in the country, which certainly must be, as the hon. gentlemen have observed, of great advantage to us in the country to which we look for so much, in reference to our development, and our relations with which are so important. I feel, Mr. Speaker, very glad indeed to learn that some arrangements have been made, which the

Government think they may with confidence submit to Parliament, for closing all questions at issue between the Province of British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada. It would be entirely premature to discuss, in any detail, the particular arrangements with respect to which the papers are not before us, but which, we are informed, we shall certainly receive full information about within a very short time. I was a little amused to observe, however, the principles upon which this settlement, in its main feature, was based, as publicly announced by the envoy of the Administration in the Province of British Columbia. I should have supposed that the settlement was based upon a fair and liberal consideration of what the claims were of British Columbia upon Canada, but I find that it was not so—that it was upon other considerations—upon the considerations of the claims of the city of Victoria upon the First Minister. I quote from the report of the speech of the Minister of Justice at Victoria, in which he announced that result:

“With reference to the Settlement Bill, as it is called by the Local Administration, Sir Alexander Campbell assured the deputation, reiterating the language of his colleague, Sir John Macdonald, that the Government of the Dominion has every intention to see that the line between Esquimalt and Nanaimo is constructed. This, Sir John A. considers a debt which he owes to Victoria, for the confidence placed in him by the electors, when they returned him as their representative.”

Mr. Speaker, an honest man pays his debts, but he pays them with his own money. But the hon. gentleman proposes to pay his debts, incurred in the constituencies which honor him with their confidence, at our expense, and this is formally announced in the course of the discussion which results in the settlement which is to be brought before us. I was a little amused, also, to observe that the arrangement involves a surrender to the Americans. I find that a large company is incorporated for the construction of the Island Railway, and that it is composed of sundry magnates who are very well known to fame, and who are interested, the hon. member for Glengarry may be surprised to hear, in the hostile railway—the Union Pacific Railway. I find the name of C. B. Huntington; I find the name of Mr. Gregory; I find the name of Mr. Stanford. I find names familiar to most of us, as magnates of the Pacific coast—kings of that country virtually by reason of their connection with the Pacific Railway—with whom hon. gentlemen opposite are contracting, and to whom they propose to surrender the coal lands and various privileges connected with the construction of the railway. They are useful persons to deal with, I have no doubt, as the publication of the recent correspondence in connection with the Pacific Railway proves, and I hope the hon. gentleman was extremely careful to caution his colleague when he dealt with these gentlemen—whose letters are before me in part, and I would read them if I had no other matters of importance to discuss—to caution him that such things should not happen in Canada as happened in railway negotiations with the same parties in the neighboring country. Now, the Speech alludes to the North-West, and the only reference that is made to the general condition of that country is a reference to the rapid increase of population which has taken place, and which is said to necessitate some further amendment of some of the laws affecting the territory. But the hon. gentlemen who were supplied with the brief on this occasion had, I think, in this particular, some reason to complain, because upon former occasions the brief contained the figures for the immigration to the North-West. Upon former occasions we were told at an early day, by the authority of the Government conveyed to those hon. gentlemen, what the figures were for the year. We have not got them for this year. Total figures have been given us; figures have been given us with reference to immigration from the United States, but we are not told what the increase to the population of the North-West was. Is it uncharitable in me to conjecture that it is because the

figures given last year have not been verified by results? Is it because there would be an unpleasant contrast between the figures of 75,000, exclusive of the suggested Irish immigration *en masse*, which we were told would enter the North-West last year, and the results? I think we might know, even to-day, whether those steps were taken which for two or three years have been pressed on the hon. gentleman, and which last year he promised me very faithfully he would see fulfilled, for the admeasurement of the actual settlement in that country. Up to this time my opinion is, as I have said before, that the principle of calculation upon which he has proceeded is one which is purely conjectural, and which does not actually measure what the settlement in the country was. Well, we have not, as I have said, the figures, and so, although the Speech has told us that there is a rapid increase of population; although the hon. gentlemen were instructed as to the figures in other parts, we were not told how rapid that increase has been which interests this legislation. Now, there is nothing more, as I have said, on the North-West, but much more ought to have been said, and here it is that I complain a little of the silence of those who have proposed to assent to this Speech, as well as of the absence of a statement in the Address itself. We know that there is more to be said about the North-West; we know that there is disappointment; we know that there is discontent; we know that there is agitation and difficulty there; we know that many things which a year ago we pointed out, which for several years we have been pointing out, would tend to create discontent in that country, are creating trouble and discontent, and that no word is said as to the task which is to devolve upon this Parliament of considering these great questions, and of taking care that so far as they may be remediable the causes of that discontent may be remedied. Hon. gentlemen may say, no; it is nothing, it is merely a tempest in a teapot; it is something that is not serious. But I observe the Prime Minister of that Province, a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, only the other day, at one of the banquets that are given to Members of Parliament in Winnipeg, and of one of which I believe the hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) was the fortunate recipient, followed immediately afterwards by a banquet, participated in by the hon. member for Wellington—I observed so late as the 9th of January the Prime Minister of the Province is reported to have said:

"At present we are on the verge of a crisis from which we must emerge in a better or worse condition. Not, however, until the masses were made aware of the situation would they stand up and maintain their rights. The time had arrived when Manitoba must be placed on a level with the other Provinces of the Dominion."

He referred to the cry that Manitoba was petted and pampered, and said:

"Not one new arrival had been in the Province three months before he who before was loud in its denunciations was equally loud in demanding its rights. The eyes of the farmers had been opened, and they were alarmed at the prospect. These matters would shortly engross the attention, not only of the Provincial but of the Dominion Parliament."

That is the statement which the First Minister made at a recent period in reference to the condition of that country, but of it we have heard no word, either in the Speech delivered to us or in the observations of the hon. gentlemen who have indicated the general run of the discussion for this Session. Now, we know that the policy of the administration in that country—one particular part of their administrative policy—could not be effectively criticised during last Session for the reason that the papers which were demanded were not brought down. I refer to the papers connected with the closing of land in southern Manitoba. They were asked for, and the order was promised, but they have not yet reached the House, and by consequence, it was impossible to engage in a discussion upon that subject. It is impossible to say that that order has been

Mr. BLAKE.

reversed, and that at a very late period the policy which had dictated, most improperly and wrongly, the closing of southern Manitoba to settlement, has been changed. I have observed that the ordinary sources of information on the part of newspapers which support the Government have praised each of these transactions. When southern Manitoba and the mile belt were closed, it was a wise and statesmanlike thing. When it was attempted to sell, by public auction, these lands, that also was a wise, statesmanlike and a proper thing. But when the policy for closing was reversed, when the policy of selling was reversed, and when once again they were opened, that was the wisest and most patriotic, the most sensible thing of all. Well, I believe it was. But it seems to me hon. gentlemen are easily satisfied if, with all these various policies in the course of a short few months, they are equally pleased as each one is presented. Sir, the policy did not last a long time, but it lasted long enough to do a great deal of harm. There were numerous persons who had settled upon homesteads in southern Manitoba who had a right to expect that the keeping of that country open would be continuous; who had a right to expect that the neighbouring lands would be opened for homesteading; who did expect, and who went there on the faith of it; who communicated with friends to go on and join them, and who were disappointed in their expectations, as were many of those who did go and attempt to join them, by the closing of the reserves. Of that step no explanation has been given. I think an explanation is due to the country, because I believe it is to be one of the not unimportant causes of the difficulties in the North-West, and to have created a set-back which will last much longer than the policy itself has lasted. Well, then, there were other difficulties which were attracting the attention of the people of that country, and have attracted the attention of the constituted authorities of that portion of it which extends beyond the bounds of Manitoba. We complained of the policy of locking up lands by the lavish arrangements which were made as to the acreage to be granted to various colonization companies. We pointed out the hon. gentleman was repeatedly informed that the practical results of the arrangements was that the companies asserted in some shape or other, and effected in some shape or other—whether by law or without law was immaterial to the purpose—some sort of control or check over those lands which were said to continue open to homesteading, and the general settlement was interfered with to a much larger extent than hon. gentlemen indicate. It was not very long after this policy was adopted that it, too, was reversed by the Government itself. It is not many months ago since, I believe, an Order in Council was passed suspending a further grant of lands for colonization purposes, and we know that the very great bulk of the companies which were organized have utterly failed. But there, too, their policy and the consequent opening of these lands for settlement or sale has not prevented a mischief from being done, because at a time when the eyes and expectations of numerous people were upon that country, and when there was a strong desire to settle, difficulties were thrown in the way of settlers and the progress of the country was seriously checked. I have said that the constituted authorities of the North-West have protested against the companies which were in active operation, and I believe amongst the remonstrances which were forwarded to the Government, is one which is from the North-West Council, in reference to the operation of the policy and the operations of a particular company. Well, there were other causes of discontent, to which also we have referred. We pointed out that the settler in that country, although when he first came there he would treat as part of his capital expenditure, as part of his investment, the expenses of transport and the necessary incidentals to the first settlement, yet would he be found seriously inconvenienced, as a rule, by these necessary

expenses; that in that country, having the great advantage of the settler being able to plough without clearing, there were other initial expenses—expenses connected with buildings, fences, &c., which were to be set, to some extent, against that advantage, and that the remoteness of the country, the expenses of transport, and these initial expenses, certainly demanded the greatest consideration on the part of the authorities who believed, as I think this House at large believes, as I think the country believes, that what is really for the interest of the country is that the North-West should, at the earliest moment, be settled with a thriving, industrious, prosperous, and contented agricultural population. We pointed out that there would be financial difficulty in the way of the settler; and yet, in the face of that difficulty, great as it was, with the financial burdens imposed on him, the Government took the step of increasing those tariff burdens at the last Session. Then there was the further difficulty in connection with the disallowance of the Provincial railway charters within the bounds of the old Province of Manitoba; a course which, as I have pointed out more than once is, in my view, a derogation of the rights of the Province as a member of the Confederation, is not called for by the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and is opposed to the express declaration made on the subject when the contract was being passed through the House. And the result of this difficulty, of the check in looking elsewhere which the Government has interposed, has been that the people of that country have now their eyes turned towards the Hudson Bay, and they are anxious, even desirous, that their boundaries shall be extended and their large obligations increased by the Government and Parliament, on the faith and credit of the people of a new Province, already struggling under considerable difficulties necessarily incident to the settlement of a new country, in order that a railway may be built to that Bay, and they may thus obtain some means of escape from the greivances which they feel to be so serious in regard to railway communication. I will not enlarge on the consequences of the scheme if it be successful. I am sure that after what has been said in regard to the Pacific Railway contract and the means of outlet and inlet to that country, the hon. Minister of Railways will be found assisting to the utmost of his power the Hudson Bay Railway; and whatever the consequences may be to us in the east, it is impossible that we can refuse to those people any means of ingress or egress open to them in that direction. It is quite true with respect to this very question of the monopoly and consequent high rates, that some redress has lately been accorded. Within a few days a very important reduction has been made in the tariff on grain carried over the Canadian Pacific Railway. And I am glad to know it; it is a fortunate omen. It indicates that the company is accessible to the remonstrances of the people, when sufficiently loudly expressed; but it indicates also that those complaints which were made as to the tariff were sound complaints. It indicates that the Tariff was too high; or else why was the reduction made? It indicates, therefore, that the grievance which we said would arise has arisen, and at any moment may recur. On the whole, this subject, to which the hon. gentleman has thought fit not to give any attention in the Speech from the Throne, and which the hon. members who moved and seconded the Address in reply, thought unworthy of notice, seems to be a very serious one, one of the most serious which we have before us. It seems to me that history is repeating itself, and that the same Government, presided over by the same hon. First Minister, which a number of years ago, in the early history of our connection with the North-West, imperilled that connection by its course of administration, has done much to thwart the progress and check the feelings of cordiality and kindness which ought to exist

between other people of that district and the people of the rest of the Dominion. With respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the hon. gentlemen who have spoken have indicated that the Speech contains matter in truth on which we ought to congratulate ourselves. We have heard much of the immense exertions which the company have made, of the great work which they have done, and we are told it is of the last consequence that the railway should be completed within two years from the present time. Mr. Speaker, I consider the statement made in the Speech to be one of a grave and alarming character. It informs us that during the recess of Parliament the Government took the responsibility of arranging for the guarantee of the interest at a certain rate upon \$65,000,000 of the stock of the railway, on receiving cash and securities. That was a transaction which, as I understand it, was not authorized by the law. The Government, no doubt, has power to sell terminable annuities, but their power to sell them is contained in legislation, which enables them to do that for the purpose of obtaining cash to pay our debts; and I do not understand that they have power to issue terminable annuities in exchange for anything else but that; and, therefore, in so far as this was a transaction in which what the Government received was securities and not cash, I am not familiar with any clause of any Act of Parliament which justifies that step. But if it were justified, it was a very grave step to take. It involved a very large transaction, and we have not yet before us any indication whatever as to what the securities were; what the *quid pro quo* was, what the consideration was, in respect of which the Government undertook this particular obligation. The transaction is said to have been justified, accomplished as it was within a comparatively brief date of the meeting of Parliament, by the importance to the country of steadying and increasing the value of the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. And I have no doubt, as has happened before with other Governments—and it is the ordinary recourse under such circumstances—had it succeeded, its justification would have been said to have been its success; but it has not got that poor justification for a step of this description; for, instead of having succeeded it is said to have failed. And, indeed, I am unable to perceive how, if it were true that for every dollar guaranteed a dollar of tangible and available securities was handed over by the company, which might otherwise have been used, the transaction, although it might enhance the price of existing stock for the purpose of buying and selling, could not be said to have the elements of permanent success. If, on the other hand, we are to give without getting, that is a different transaction. But no new plan is indicated. We are told the particular plan which the Government adopted has failed, and we are told that we are to expect something or other in substitution for it. The reason that is given for this is a single reason: It is said that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are about to anticipate the period at which it was to complete the work, and that in order to anticipate that period the company require, at an earlier date, I suppose, and perhaps to a larger extent, cash than it would otherwise require. We all recollect the boasts that have been indulged in for the past two years, as to this anticipation of the work. We recollect the glorifications in which hon. gentlemen opposite indulged as to the standing and financial strength and connections of the corporators of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We recollect the sense of relief which they expressed themselves to feel and in which they asked the House to participate, and the country to indulge, as to the burden lifted off our shoulders and placed on the shoulders of men who were able, willing, and ready to bear it; and then when they came to be, as hon. gentlemen said, "better than their word"—when it was alleged that the company were going to anticipate the

termination of the contract—we were told that while this would be good for the country, it was done in the interest of the company, because it would be good also for them; because they believed it was a wise policy to anticipate the period fixed for the completion of the Railway. They said, we rejoice at it and call upon you all to rejoice and fall down and worship the great Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government which has created it and which is overshadowed by the glory of its doings. For two years it has been dinned into our ears that this corporation was about to complete the road. Now it turns out that the Parliament of Canada is to be called on to enable them to do it; that it is to the Parliament and the people of Canada they are to look for further assistance of an indefinite character to enable them to execute their contract in the form and manner which they deem to be most advantageous for themselves. Now, I have, on former occasions, standing here, pointed out from time to time what the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway was from the statements of the Government themselves, and from the statements of the company themselves. I have pointed out what the cost of their road would be, according to their own calculations; what the value of their subsidies of various descriptions was, according to their own calculations; what the balance would be, according to their own calculations. And hon. gentlemen opposite have said, well, it is very important, it is extremely valuable—we hope these speeches will receive a wide circulation; they are extremely favourable to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I, however, have been obliged to point out, and I did so last Session on more than one occasion, that it was not the magnitude of their subsidies or the excellence of the position accorded to the company under the contract which would relieve the enterprise from risk if prudent management did not attend its execution, and amongst the points of difficulty was this very one of a too rapid prosecution of the work. Speed means cost, and you cannot press a work beyond a certain point, as was proved in former discussions on this very subject, and as shown very clearly by the report of the former Chief Engineer of the road, without the cost being very largely enhanced. We are told that the speed has not only been great but that it has been unprecedented in the history of railway building; and if speed means cost what does unprecedented speed mean? It is clear that the work has cost more than it would have cost had it been prosecuted more slowly. You cannot suddenly obtain the supply of labour required for such a purpose to an extent double or treble what would be required for slower progress, without raising the cost of labour, and in that regard, as in other regards, as I have said, I repeat, speed means cost. The early completion of the work, its completion at so early a date as is talked of, of course accelerates the period of less profitable working. We have not all of us yet forgotten the statements by which the price to be paid the company was justified. It was said, there is to be a long period after the completion of the road before you can get any settlement and develop the traffic, during which the working will be unremunerative, and for which we have to compensate, in advance, by paying a larger price, and that is included in the sum of the price we paid. But accelerated construction, accelerated completion, means, of course, the acceleration of the point of that very unprofitable working to which hon. gentlemen allude. It means more. It does not merely accelerate the point of commencement, but it intensifies the character of the unprofitableness of the working, because the faster you build, the fewer years you allow for the development of the country, the development of the trade, the introduction of a population to sustain the railway when it is built, obviously the greater are the difficulties of working when you complete. Nor am I able to agree that the extreme rapidity which has been used and which is in-

Mr. BLAKE.

tended to be used, has done real good to the country. I am not able to agree in that view, and I think if the hon. gentleman would enquire in the North-West he would find that that sentiment is largely entertained. Amongst the difficulties of settling that country, is the difficulty of isolation, the sparseness of the settlements; and what has been done by the extreme rapidity of construction has been to increase that difficulty as well. People have been scattered over a wide expanse of country in which their difficulties have been made greater by this cause; and they have been induced to look rather to the chance of some fortunate location turning out to be a town site, or a mine, than to the steady development of the agricultural resources of the country, upon which its future must, after all, depend; which steady development will be greatly favoured by comparative density of settlement, and as seriously hindered by sparseness of settlement. Now there is a defence of course, and that defence is the boom; but I do not know that the boom has done the North-West much good either. I do not know that the great balloon which the hon. gentlemen set floating in the air, which looked so splendid and to which they directed all eyes, presents the same flourishing appearance to-day; and I believe the future of that country has, upon the whole, not merely not been helped, but has been seriously retarded by the course of inflation and speculation which their policy in this and other respects invited and encouraged; and that, therefore, it cannot be said in respect to the boom any more than in other respects that this rapidity of construction which induced the boom, and which we now learn is to be had at our cost instead of the cost of the company, was an advantage to the North-West. Hon. gentlemen say in the Speech that the reason of the guarantee is the need to sell the unissued stock. Without entering, on this occasion, into details, I must say that I do not find that statement very much in accord with the statements which are officially made by the president and by the vice-president of the company, from which it appears that their other resources, irrespective of the unissued stock, would be adequate to the construction of the road. It is said that the stock is not saleable at its fair market price. Now, I moved for, and the House ordered, papers on this subject, but the information which was ordered has not been brought before us. It should be brought before us. We know that the stock nominally is \$100,000,000. We know that the original issue was said first to be sixty, but I believe that later information is more accurate, which places as the price at which the syndicate, to whom it was entrusted, received it at fifty, and therefore the stock is issued at somewhere about one half its nominal value. We know from the newspapers, if the market reports are to be trusted, that it has been selling at a premium which has varied from fifty to sixty, occasionally going up above sixty, meaning a premium of from ten to twenty or twenty-five. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that is not enough, that it should sell at the highest premium on its issue price, and as it will not, let us make up the difference. Now, I maintain that amongst the information which is essential in order to Parliament's intelligent consideration of any plan or scheme for the relief of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is the full-est information of all transactions in connection with this stock. We have discussed the subject before, and I have pointed out the inferences which are to be drawn from such meagre information as we have. We have called for further papers, and I ask that these papers should be speedily brought down, and that, as part of the *cause justificative* of this proposed transaction, we should know how it is that \$45,000,000 or \$55,000,000 is the actual sum of what has been received for them. But that is not the only difficulty which, as it seemed to me, was brought on the company by the policy of that corporation, aided and encouraged and backed by the Government of the day, in taking that

course. I have pointed out before, and I repeat, that this contract, large and liberal as were the subsidies that were granted, and extensive as were the privileges which were allotted to the corporators, was one of great magnitude—one which required the undivided energy and devotion of those engaged in it, to the completion of the contracted line; and I have pointed out that the time, the energy, the capital, the credit and the resources of the company have been largely devoted to objects not embraced within the limits of the contracted line. Some of these are more justifiable than others; but of all of them it is to be said that they are transactions in respect of which, if the company entered into them at all, it was to be expected that they would not be entered into to the detriment of any one of the elements of success to which I have referred, in the contracted line. Take the Canada Central; the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental; the Laurentian; the St. Lawrence and Ottawa; the Atlantic and North-Western; the Ontario and Quebec; the Credit Valley; the Toronto, Grey and Bruce; the Hamilton and North Western; the London Junction; the South Eastern; irrespective of the Algoma Mills Branch, the North-West branches, and North-West lines—in most of these it is established that the company have meddled in one way or other; and in others it is asserted, and I believe rightly, that they have also meddled, in some to a greater, in some to a less extent. The capital involved in the acquisition of these various lines runs into the tens of millions, amounting to probably as much as \$30,000,000; and I attribute a great portion of the difficulties in which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are now confessedly involved, to the circumstance that they have engaged in matters not contracted for in their contract, and that with the capital which was directly due to the performance of the contract, they have done much more than the contract demanded, and have done that more in their own interest. I pointed out also that the course which was pursued in proposing to construct another railway in competition with the other great railway of the country, through Ontario, would almost inevitably have the result it has had, and would invite the hostility of that other railway, to the detriment of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I regretted, and I repeat the regret, that that hostile attitude should have existed. I know not whether it now exists; but I maintain that it was hardly expected that it could be avoided when this competition, which was not necessary to the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, was engaged in. In all these things, and for all these things, the Government have had a large part and have assumed a large responsibility; they have promoted, encouraged, and aided them; they have supported them by granting all the assistance, all the legislation that was desired to give these additional powers; they encouraged them by the method of distributing the subsidies in the original contract—by granting an inordinate amount towards the prairie section instead of reserving it for those difficult ends of the work which are yet to be completed, and in respect to which we are to be asked to deal still more lavishly. We contended that the subsidies should be distributed in accordance with the cost of the respective portions of the work. Hon. gentlemen opposite said: no, we want to put the company into a first-class position, and we will give them what is admitted to be a disproportionate part of the subsidy at the beginning. That is what they did, and the results have been just as we predicted. And, Sir, while this is so, while at this early period, after making the contract, the Government are obliged to make the melancholy statement contained in the Speech, we did not hear one word in connection with that statement in reference to the invitation to be given to us to modify the terms of the contract, or any proposal to annex any condition for the relief of the country by the removal or mitigation of those obnoxious

portions of the contract which are more oppressive to the community than profitable to the corporation. Sir, I will not enter into other topics connected with the Railway. But as I take a view entirely opposite to that taken by the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the Address, as to the condition of things developed by the paragraph, I felt it necessary to say so much. The Speech refers to the condition of the country, and it tells us that the harvest has been less productive than some of its predecessors, and that there has been, owing to the rapid expansion of our commerce, some little over-trading; but it asserts that there is a general condition of prosperity. I congratulate the hon. member for Glengarry upon the dexterous manner—borrowed, I dare say, from his avocations in the other sphere to which he alluded—in which he slipped over this remark. He did it very well. He felt that the least said the soonest mended, and he got on the ice and off of it as fast as possible. I do not know that he got upset, but it appears to me he ran a considerable risk of it. We remember the admirable exhibitions made by speakers on former occasions, when they were developing this part of the usual Speech from the Throne. If we remember the beautiful exhibitions afforded to us, first by the mover, and then by the seconder, as late as last Session; if we remember the length of time they took in their performance; if we remember the ease and grace, and the apparent delight and joy with which they dwelt upon the condition of the country on that occasion, and contrast it with the hon. gentleman's dart-in and dart-out again, we must feel that in this particular he knew his business; but we must also feel that the contrast is a little more serious—a little more serious, in fact, than even the Speech from the Throne has told us. In truth, the high Tariff policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has proved itself largely a failure. The period of good times, to which we were naturally entitled, came to us a little later on account of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it has left us much sooner than it ought to have done. We had two or three years of it, during which there were good crops, good markets, a good lumber trade, large railway and other expenditures; during which the people grew more wealthy, the importations crept up and the circumstances were such as hon. gentlemen were pleased to dilate upon in the debate on the Address. Now the conditions are changed. They are sadly changed. Why are they changed? And why are they changed so soon? I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite as to the deficient harvest; I agree that they did not incorrectly express the degree of depression which is due to that cause. There has been a very good harvest in very many parts of the country. There has been an abundant harvest in many parts of the country. In one section of the Province from which I come—over a large region of it—one of its main staple crops has, no doubt, lamentably failed; but other crops have done well in that section, and in the eastern portion of Ontario even that crop, so far as it was grown, has done fairly well. In Manitoba, as we know, owing to an unfortunate circumstance which we must all deplore, a portion, although not a very large portion, of the cereal whose cultivation is to be the staple of that country, was frozen, and there difficulty ensued; but barring these two points, there is no doubt that although the crop is not to be described as equal to its predecessors, we have not been subjected to the calamity of a very bad crop all over the Dominion. The crop is inferior, but not a failure, and has followed a very brief period of prosperity, during which we had good crops and good prices, and a good lumber market. Surely then, the great policy which was to do so much for this country; which was to give us steadiness of prosperity, steadiness of employment to our working men; which was to ensure to us a permanent condition of prosperity, in so far as anything can ensure it, ought to have carried us over one partial failure of a crop. But what has happened

is very serious, and it is not to be accounted for by the crop. It is due to other circumstances more in the control of the Administration than is the crop. I have observed on former occasions, that while hon. gentlemen opposite, addressing the people in the country, would not absolutely tell a farmer that the crops were in their own hands, that they could cause the sun to shine, and the rain to fall, and the crop to grow, they had yet said—and the hon. gentleman who is now laughing has himself said:—after all, you had better vote for the Government that the sun shines on; Providence is kind to us: support us. “When the Grits come in,” said the hon. First Minister, “the weevil will come in with them.” Thus they have told the poor people of the country who have, some of them, confided in them, that there was some sort of high compact and alliance between them and the supernal powers under which, by means not to be disclosed to vulgar ears, yet none the less effective, good crops were coincident with the existence of a Tory Administration. I do not suppose they will take credit for that any longer. Even although they have failed so slightly, even although the crop has not been so very bad, I believe they are now much more disposed to attribute the alternations of prosperity and adversity to conditions beyond their control, and a crop beyond their control, than they were in former days. But I deny that the change in affairs is to be mainly, though to a considerable extent it is, to be attributed to such causes. It is to be attributed to the policy of the Administration—a policy, in the first place, of extravagant expenditure under which they took and spent; a policy, in the second place, of extravagant collection under which they took what even their extravagance could not enable them to expend, under which they determined to abstract from the people of the country, in these years that have lately passed and the current year, about \$20,000,000, which will cost the people of the country—the consumers—by the time they pay it, something approximating to \$30,000,000, and which they used in order to pay for this same Canadian Pacific Railway that once more dresses the Speech from the Throne; a policy, under which, instead of borrowing at four per cent. the \$20,000,000 they wanted, they have caused the people to pay \$30,000,000 at something like seven or eight per cent. They thus abstracted from the people, at the period they wanted it, something which made the difference between a good and a bad crop. In addition to a partial failure of one crop which we suffer from Providence, they have brought on us what is equivalent to the failure of another crop. They took what they did take unjustly and unequally. They did more. They invited and encouraged over-speculating and over-trading. They fomented the North-West speculations by the land arrangements which they made. The hon. Minister, instead of being a prudent pilot, told his crew that if he were only as young as they and in trade he would clap on full sail for a period of ten years of assured prosperity and then take in sail. How many of his crew have taken in sail since, although the ten years have not elapsed? How many of his crew have gone down under the sail which he told them to hoist and keep up for a ten years' voyage? They unduly stimulated every pet industry. What of the cotton industry? the sugar industry? the iron industry? and the glass industry? and a half a dozen other things I could mention which hon. gentlemen placed under their hot-bed system, and in respect of which they brought up numerous plants, and which have now largely withered. Their policy resulted in over-investment in manufactures, over-production, over-trading, over-importation; and had not others been wiser than the hon. Minister of Finance; had not others set that caution signal which he declined to set, the consequences would have been much more serious than they actually were. If they were not more serious it is due to this circumstance. I trust that the

Mr. BLAKE.

check which was administered by some leading men, who had a better knowledge of the signs of the times than the hon. gentleman, who were better able to judge the course of events than he—I say, the check they endeavoured to give the administration one and a half years ago, and have been repeating ever since, has mitigated the disaster which might otherwise have occurred. I trust it is limited to a period of stringency and dullness without being advanced as it would have been to a period of crisis and collapse. If it be so, it is due to others and not to the Finance Minister; and even as it is, it is bad enough. It was only last Session that the hon. gentleman who moved the reply to the Address adverted to the list of bankruptcies as an indication of the continued prosperity of the country. I pointed out to him that I thought he had not referred to the authorities or he would have followed, by anticipation, the prudent course which has been taken on this occasion and omitted reference to the subject. Although there was last year an increase instead of, as the hon. gentleman supposed, a diminution, still the amount was moderate. Though enough to warn people and cause them to be cautious, it was not enough to indicate a then existing condition of a very serious character. What is the roll call to day? You find that the number has enormously increased, about doubled, if I remember aright. You find that the amount of liabilities is between two and three times the amount of last year, according to one of the commercial reports, and between four or five times as much, according to the other; you find that, comparing our condition with that of the neighboring Republic, we have nearly twice as many, in proportion to those engaged in trade, who have succumbed under the excessive load which they were carrying under the hon. gentleman's advice, as they have on the other side. The hon. gentleman has adverted on former occasions to the bank stocks as an indication of the prosperity of the country. He said the other day, out in the country, that he did not do so during his Budget Speech last year, because he thought they were rather high. What does he think now? What does he think of the loss of some ten or twelve millions at least—I have not actually counted the figures, but that at least—in value since they touched that point? What does that indicate in relation to the condition of the country? What did a rise in stocks indicate? He said advancing prosperity. What does a fall so serious indicate? I leave it to him to answer. And then we might make an enquiry as to the condition of the pet industries. Pride and rejoicing were manifested in past years on the ground of their vigour and prosperity. The hon. gentleman spoke of them as things of which the country ought to be proud. It is true the people might be paying a little more, though they disputed that, but what was that when you found men engaged so vigorously in home production, and employing so many hands, and paying such liberal wages, and giving such constant employment, and making such large donations to charitable objects, and generally prospering so much? What is the condition of the pet industries to-day? Has that unhealthy stimulation which we said would take place under the hot-bed Tariff of high prices, done good or harm? Has it not had the result we predicted, and are we not reaping at an earlier day than even we predicted, and at a much earlier day than he expected, when he made his prophecies, the bitter harvest of his policy? What is the condition, under the National Policy to-day, of the great industry of flour-milling in Canada? How does it stand? How does the Tariff affect it? Has the hon. gentleman accommodated his little difference with the millers? Is he about to relieve them from the difficulties under which they say they labour and which prevent them, they say, from grinding American flour in Canada? Has the result of this Tariff proved itself to be a result sound and just as applied to this country in that regard? How is it with

reference to the balance of trade? Why, I remember when the hon. gentleman pointed out with pride and glory, I think only two years ago—

An hon. MEMBER. Three years.

Mr. BLAKE. Three years was it?—that for the first time in the history of Canada the balance of trade was in its favour, that we had exported more than we imported, and he told us what he had accomplished, and he told us how he had accomplished it. And before that he had pointed out what his duty was in that regard. He told us at an earlier period that we had to attain to a different condition of things from that which had existed before. It is true it was not very bad. It is true the amount of our importations was not very large. But the hon. gentleman, in 1879, said: "Regarding the matter as I do, I think it is to be regretted that the volume of imports has not been materially reduced." Reduced from its volume then, reduced from the small volume that then existed. "I look upon the large imports ever since the Dominion was organized, showing a large balance of trade against it, as one of the causes of trouble with which we have to contend, one of the difficulties that it is our duty to remedy. They have been decreasing to a certain extent, but are still very large"—how do they compare with those of last year?—"showing distinctly and clearly, in my judgment, that they ought to be still further diminished. I think then, without entering into a discussion of Free Trade and Protection, so far as they affect England and the United States, we may fairly conclude that the prosperity of the one country, at this moment, is caused in a great measure by the large surplus in its favour, and the depression in the other, by the large deficiency." He then gives the figures, and concludes: "Under these circumstances, it appears to me that we should turn our attention to the best means of reducing the volume of imports from all parts of the world." Having declared his duty, having proposed to perform it, having rejoiced three years ago in the success which had attended his efforts, I want to know, to-day, what has happened to the National Policy? Is it asleep? Has it gone upon a journey? How is the balance of trade now? How was it last year and the year before together? How does it compare with the balance of trade in the year when he complained so much?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Very well.

Mr. BLAKE. I know, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman will do. I know him of old, Sir. He will take a lot of averages. He is great on averages. He does not mind the story that the figures tell, if you look at their consecutive order, but he will take them back and forth, and will take the average of a number of years. But we are speaking of the year 1879, when he spoke of the then existing condition of things, and the subsequent years, when he spoke of what it was his duty to do and what he had accomplished, and we are comparing the year preceding 1879 and the condition of things to-day, as to the volume of imports and the balance of trade; we are comparing it in its progressive manner. He had obtained perfection three years ago, but now I suppose he will average the three years, and say, "What have you to do with the returns of last year? Look at the average."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; we will take both.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, besides the other progeny of the hon. gentleman, he brought forth a little domestic loan this year. He thought the people did not know what to do with the rest of their money. After he had taken \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000, as I have pointed out, from them more than was required, he said, "Gentlemen, there is something left in your pockets, and I believe that you had better let me have it at four per cent.," and the

hon. gentleman's organs pointed out with a great flourish of trumpets what a wonderful and prescient Government this was, that proposed a domestic loan at four per cent., and how wise a step it was. Well, the advertisement issued, and the time elapsed, and there was what they call "an awful pause," and the news came out that the loan had failed; and then the hon. gentleman's organs said, "What a wonderful Finance Minister this is; he knew it was better for the country that the loan should fail, and it is a most fortunate circumstance that the loan has failed." But the hon. gentleman was not content with that, he was determined to give a crowning proof of his titles to our confidence, and, as the people would not take the loan at par, he put up the rest at a premium of two and a half per cent., and the organs said, "This is the wisest thing of all." Well, Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to believe that the farmers of the country are beginning to perceive the hollowness of the hon. gentleman's plans for making them rich. I am inclined to believe that the working men are beginning to see that his Tariff is not a Tariff which protects labour or which gives continuity of employment, as was promised. Why, if the hon. gentleman would enquire as to those operatives who have been dismissed during the last few months from some of these various pet industries, I dare say they would tell him some plain truths which would do him a great deal of good. It is quite true that his organs, true to their duty to him, to prove that he is always mindful of the workingman above all, pointed out that the workingman had been working too hard for some years, that he actually had become overworked and run down and wanted a holiday, and that it was the best thing that could happen to him, just as it was the best thing for the country that the hon. gentleman's loan failed, to have a little slack time at the mill, so that he might go home and repose himself in the bosom of his family, and spend some of his surplus earnings; but I have not heard that the workingman has sympathized much with that view of the case. In Toronto city, from which I come, there is a very great deal of distress; there is more distress than I have known there for many years, due in part to special and exceptional circumstances, to which I will have to refer, and due also very largely to other circumstances to which I have alluded, and if hon. gentlemen would read the reports of those who interest themselves in the charity relief organizations of that city, they would find an account very different from that which they may be disposed to give us. So of Montreal, in which the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) I believe, resides. It was but the other day that I was reading a report of a St. George's Society, as to the condition of things there. As to London, I do not know what the hon. Postmaster General will say about it, but I find, positively, Mr. Speaker, I find that they are proposing to establish—what industry do you think, now? Why, Sir, a soup kitchen, and who do you think proposed it? Why, it is the hon. gentleman's organ, the leading Conservative paper in the western part of the Province, the *London Free Press*, which, on January 5th, remarked:

"The present cold weather must be severely felt by many. The poor, 'who are always with us,' have certain means of relief from the public. For many years past the fund provided for assisting the deserving poor has been ample and systematic in its administration."

Then they proceed to point out that there are immigrants who have come in, and then they say:

"The dead of winter is a period of peculiar hardship to the stranger without means. The case of these men suggested the establishment of a soup kitchen, and this is being done in Toronto. Why can't the same thing be done here. It is a simple, effectual and inexpensive way of feeding the hungry, and, we think, a natural and necessary part of the relief system for the winter months. The existence of a public soup kitchen would protect householders from the importunity of tramps, while it might greatly assist in the general relief work of the city. Once before a soup kitchen was established here with excellent results, its operation was regarded as a blessing, and large numbers took the bene-

fit of it. We throw out the suggestion at this time, because any such attempt at Christian charity on an organized scale, in view of the hard winter weather, and the presence of many strangers, as well as citizens to whom such aid might be welcome, would seem to be in order."

Why, haven't I been at meeting after meeting in which I was told "no soup kitchens now!" Haven't I often heard Ministers of the Crown pointing to the circumstance that there were no soup kitchens now? I am not at all certain that the hon. Postmaster General himself, in some of those orations with which he has enlightened the Western Peninsula, has not alluded to the paucity of soup kitchens and to the fact that that industry no longer existed. And now, in the very city which he represents, his own organ proposes, as a necessary thing, as a sort of pendant to the National Policy, the establishment of a soup kitchen. And I observe that one of the aldermen has stated that there are at this moment in that city between 1,300 and 1,400 immigrants out of employment. I am very glad to hear that, although the sum stated of immigration does not come up to the moderate expectations, as they were called, indulged in last Session, it reaches so large an amount. We were told that we would have at least 150,000, and that, we were told, was an extremely moderate estimate; we are told to-day that the sum is 133,000. This is a very satisfactory approximation to the estimated amount. I am not quite so certain how these figures will stand scrutiny. My difficulty is increased by the discrepancy of the statement to which I alluded awhile ago, because the hon. member for Glengarry told us, that there were 34,000 of these who had come in from the United States. The hon. member for Levis stated there were 40,000. Where the 6,000 are, I do not exactly know. But, Sir, I pointed out last Session—and I will not enter into the figures to-day at all, as I will have occasion to deal further with the subject later on—that there must be something radically wrong with these returns or with the result deducible, from what information we can obtain. Whether you draw it from the census, or whether from the municipal returns, there is, to a large extent, a displacement of the native by the immigrant population, and the immigrant population, instead of being stationary, is, to a large extent, transitory. I say it is impossible to draw any other conclusion from the statistics which are before us, than that with reference to the figures which have been given. I repeat, also, what I have said upon a former occasion, that the yearly returns from the Province of Ontario, which are the only yearly returns to which I believe we have access, indicate that the ratio of increase of the population, during the four years which preceded the last four years, was much greater than in the last four years. And it is an extraordinary circumstance, that that holds good, not merely with reference to the rural population of Ontario, but with reference to the urban population also; and that during these four years, in which it has been said the prosperity of that Province was so greatly increased by the operation of the Tariff policy of the Government, the ratio of increase of the urban population is markedly lower than it was in the preceding four years that were stated to be years of retrogression. Now, this subject is treated in the Speech in a rather perfunctory manner. We are told, there has been a large immigration, and we are told further that improvements in reference to the facilities for inland transportation, or the cheapness of inland transportation, will help us in the next year. But, Sir, I expected much more upon this subject in the Speech, and I am sure that the hon. member for Levis, who spoke so strongly on the importance of repatriation, must himself have felt—though he did not deem it loyal to express it—a sentiment of disappointment in the fact that so little has been said upon this subject in the Speech. Mr. Speaker, of late years it is not only in the Speech from the Throne that we learn of the

Mr. BLAKE.

intentions of Ministers as to the legislation of the Session. The hon. Minister of Public Works, at a banquet that was given to him in Montreal in October last, pointed out what was to be done in this particular regard. I propose to supplement the information conveyed to Parliament in the Speech from the Throne by a few passages from this ministerial pronouncement. The hon. member declared that there were three great questions upon which the Government claimed the confidence of the community, three great measures of policy—the Confederation itself, of which he claimed sole credit for the Conservative party; the Canadian Pacific Railway, which he did not then tell us required our further assistance, and the National Policy. Let me read. The hon. gentleman says:

"And, gentlemen, this demonstration is also an approbation of the great measures which have been adopted by the administration of which I am a member. First, there was the Confederation Act, and since we returned to power, we have adopted the National Policy, and the great Pacific Railway measure, and finally, we have adopted another measure scarcely less important in respect to the encouragement of immigration into this country."

Adverting then to the history, according to his version, of the other three measures, he recurs to the immigration measure, and he says:

"But, gentlemen, our mission would be but half accomplished if we forgot that we have on the other side of latitude 45 a great number of our fellow-countrymen who would like nothing better than to return home and sit down to the family table and eat with us, and to earn their living under the institutions now existing in Canada. (Loud cheers.) I need not say, gentlemen, that it is with the greatest satisfaction and pleasure that I am able to announce to you this evening that the Government of Canada intend to take measures, and energetic measures, to recal into the limits of our own territory all our fellow-countrymen in the United States who desire to return and live with us. You will understand, gentlemen, that in a banquet like this I must be excused if I do not give all the details of the ministerial measure that we propose to bring down next Session. But in any case it is well that you should know that our compatriots in the United States, whether they be of French origin or of any other origin, they are not forgotten, and all that can be done to bring them back to this country we shall do most heartily."

This was heralded in October last by the Minister of Public Works as the fourth great claim to the confidence of the country, and he placed it upon a par with those three other claims to which I have referred: Confederation, the National Policy, and the Canadian Pacific Railway. He announced the formation of a scheme, the decision of the Government, the determination to bring down some scheme this Session to produce this end. Is this little peddling paragraph about cheap inland transportation the hon. gentleman's great scheme? Is it, or is it something else? And if it be something else—if it be something at all commensurate with the grandeur, not to say the grandiloquence of the language with which the hon. gentleman announced the scheme to his friends at Montreal, why do we hear of cheap inland transportation and hear nothing at all of the hon. gentleman's great scheme of repatriation? Why is the less inserted, and the greater omitted? Why, to an assemblage of Conservatives in Montreal, is a measure equal in importance to the National Policy, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Confederation of the Provinces to be announced, and Parliament itself not to be told a word in regard to it in the Speech from the Throne? Mr. Speaker, I said that there was distress in the city in which I live, and that it was partly due to special circumstances, not due altogether to those circumstances to which I had alluded. It is due to immigration. I am not about to discuss at this moment who is responsible for those circumstances, but I say that it is lamentable that the number of people that are there should be there under the circumstances under which they are there; and I repeat what I have stated on former occasions, that while this country ought to devise and encourage a system of immigration, while we ought to see that those whom we want are summoned and welcomed

here, yet discretion is to be used; and the hon. gentleman's scheme of assisted passages, which he professes to us—though some of the documents I have seen do not appear to bear him out—is confined to agricultural labour, is, so far as I can make out, in its practical operation, extended to the bringing into the country, by virtue of Government funds, certain classes of people for whom we have not room, viz.: mechanics and artisans. I believe that a considerable number have been brought into the country under the auspices, and partly by means of the assistance given by the Government, who had been better in the country from which they were brought. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken, have referred to the proposed legislation of the Session. It is not very new to us, because we had those Bills before us last Session. I do not intend to say a word upon either of them that I said last year. At the opening of the Session I pointed out what I thought was the true view with regard to the Franchise Bill; I will not repeat those words to-day. The Bill has been before the House, it has been before the country, but it has not yet received the advantage of explanation and vindication at the hands of its proposer, and I will reserve, for the present, any remarks I may have to make, until we hear from him, his vindication of the various provisions. This only I will say, that when I spoke last Session I did not and could not know that the measure would contain a provision so objectionable, so arbitrary, so unheard of, as a provision which the hon. gentleman proposed then, and which I hope he does not propose to embody in the Bill he is about to introduce, namely, that with respect to the appointment of revising barristers. With regard to the Factory Bill, there is another reason for saying nothing just now, because the hon. gentleman states it is to be introduced with further amendments. I only express the hope that when introduced it will be found to give as efficient a measure of protection to artisans of whatever age or sex in this country as is given to artisans in England. There is an omission or two in the Speech to which I must refer. The Fishery Exhibition is mentioned, and the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the Reply have spoken with great and lively admiration on the success of that Exhibition, and of the triumphs which Canada there achieved. But we have some fishery interests which are to be promoted in other ways than by attending Exhibitions; there are some fishery clauses in a treaty, which clauses have been denounced, and which are to come to an end at no remote period; and I think some reference to that circumstance and to an intention to take the House into the confidence of the Government as to the course proposed by them, and to indicate what the Government have done in view of the approaching termination of the Fishery Clauses of the Washington Treaty, would have been at least of as much consequence as the paragraph which has been inserted in the Speech: It is very well known that within the last two or three years more particularly, the chief market for our fish has been the United States, and it has become of very pressing importance that we should know what the results are to be of the termination of these Fishery Clauses. It is of importance that the treaty should not terminate without an earnest effort in advance to make proper arrangements, so that there shall be no gap, if it can be avoided; and I will add that it is of great consequence also, and the times appear to be more propitious now than in former days, that in those negotiations due attention shall be paid to arriving at some mode of restoring freer trade relations between us and our neighbours than have for some time subsisted. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) last year adopted the plan of referring to the judgments of the Privy Council in the Speech from the Throne, and we had a Ministerial exposition of a judgment of the Privy Council. But I am sorry to observe that that good custom is not followed this year. Some years ago, the Government, of which I happened to

be a member, finding a decision of the Court of Queen's Bench of Lower Canada in favor of the Provincial right to escheats, decided to abide by that decision—which was in accordance with my own view of the respective rights of the Provinces and the Dominion—and acting accordingly we made no effort at that time to assert any right on the part of the Dominion. At a subsequent period that decision was concurred in and adopted by the Appellate Court of the Province of Ontario, and so strengthened, the case came before the consideration of hon. gentleman opposite. They decided to adopt another course. Centralizing, as I have often charged the hon. gentleman with doing—centralizing wherever he can, with his eye set always upon that one object of drawing to the general legislature and government, all the powers and functions which he can by any possibility draw to it, the hon. gentleman said, although the former Government adopted this view, although the highest court of Ontario adopted it, although the highest court of Quebec adopted it, we will fight them and endeavour to secure for the Dominion the right to escheat. He took up the case, he instructed the counsel, he paid the fees, the case went to the Privy Council, and the hon. gentleman was beaten. The result has been to establish the Provincial right in this regard contrary to the views he entertained, and in accordance with the views and judgment of the two Provincial Courts to which I referred. I congratulate those who are lovers of our Federal Constitution upon this vindication of one of its important elements—not that the question of escheats itself is of much consequence, but because it was, as I have said, the means of vindicating one of the most important elements of our Constitution. I congratulate them on the failure of the hon. gentleman in attempting to arrogate to this Administration and this Legislature, a power which was not its right. But when we have an important decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council settling a question of this kind finally and conclusively—not settling it in a manner susceptible of discussion, but settling it absolutely—why should not we be informed that our constitution has been definitively settled and expounded in one important matter?

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

#### After Recess.

MR. BLAKE. Another omission from the Speech, yet more inexcusable, having regard to the language of the Speech last year, is the failure to refer to the judgment of the Privy Council in the Hodge case, bearing upon the license question. And as the First Minister adverted to the speech in which he made the statement with reference to the effect of the decision in *Russell vs. The Queen*, I suppose I may without impropriety myself refer to it. The report of his speech which was delivered early in the month of June, 1882, from the *Mail* newspaper, is as follows:—

"The following question in writing was here handed to Sir John:—'What is your opinion of the constitutionality of the Ontario License Act?'"

"Sir John said that since Confederation his decisions had often been given as Minister of Justice on constitutional questions, and in no single case had his judgments been reverse. He believed that the Act was not worth the paper it was written on. The whole system of the Government appointing license inspectors to compel men to vote under penalty of losing their licenses was wrong and indefensible. Whenever the licensed victuallers brought the matter before the courts it would be decided that the Act was an usurpation, and had no force whatever, and he was surprised the question had not been pressed long before this. If he carried the country, as he would do, he would tell Mr. Mowat, that little tyrant who had attempted to control public opinion by getting hold of every little office, from that of a division court bailiff to a tavern keeper, that he would get a bill passed at Ottawa returning to the municipalities the power taken from them by the License Act."

Well, in the course of the debate on the Address, I took leave to point out that there were some serious questions to be settled before the views expressed in the Speech from

the Throne ought to be adopted by Parliament; and in answer to the position which I then took, not in detail, because I pointed out that the judgment had not then been circulated, the hon. gentleman made some remarks. I had charged the Government with a centralizing tendency. I had charged them then, as I charge them now, with a desire to draw in here whatever they can of power and jurisdiction, and of diminishing so far as in them lies, the power and jurisdiction awarded by the constitution to the Provinces. In answer to me the hon. gentleman said:

"That subject was not willingly undertaken by the present Government. They were quite satisfied that the law as it obtains in the different Provinces should be continued. They were quite satisfied that each Province should, so far as the law would allow it to enact such statutes, deal with the subject of shop, tavern and saloon licenses. Neither the Government nor the Parliament of Canada, I take it, wished to interfere; and it was only when the decision which was given in June last on the Scott Act, a Dominion Act, and the subject was forced upon them, that they thought it their duty to bring it before Parliament. I never had any doubt that when the question was brought before the courts, it would be decided that the different Provincial Legislatures had no right whatever to deal with that subject except for revenue purposes—for the purpose of imposing taxation for Provincial or municipal purposes. I expressed the opinion in Parliament years ago, and last year I expressed it at a public meeting in Toronto or its vicinity. But while that opinion was strongly impressed upon my mind I took no steps, nor did the Government of which I was a member take any steps, for the purpose of interfering with the legislation of the different Provinces, or forcing Dominion legislation on the country, or trying to centralize such powers in this Parliament. On the contrary, the only centralization on that subject—the only time in which that question was in any way dealt with by the Dominion Parliament—was when the late Government was in power, and when they introduced the Scott Act."

Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to say, with reference to *Russell vs. The Queen*:

"It is quite clear to every lawyer, and any man who is not a lawyer, who reads that judgment, will see that the very reasons on which the Privy Council decided that this Parliament had the right to deal with the Scott Act, are the reasons showing that the Provincial Legislature of Ontario had not a right to deal with that subject under the Crooks Act, except as a matter of revenue for municipal or Provincial purposes. The hon. gentleman says that we should have allowed the matter to stand over until it was finally decided. Sir, if there be any value in that decision, and there is every value in it, because it is the law of the land, there is no check at this moment in the Province of Ontario against the unlimited, unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors. This is not a matter we can play with. It is not a matter of policy; it is a matter of necessity. If we wish to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors we must legislate immediately; for I take it, that any man in this city or in any other part of Ontario can open his saloon and sell liquors, and there is not a court in the world can prevent his doing so."

In answer to these views, I took leave to say:

"He said that any lawyer, or any other man who is not a lawyer, who chose to read that judgment must see plainly from it, that the unavoidable result was no power was left with the Local Legislatures to restrict the number of licenses. Now, I do not draw that conclusion from the decision in *Russell vs. The Queen*. In the first place, that judgment does not deal in the slightest degree with, does not touch in any way upon, that very large part of Provincial rights which is comprised in the subject of municipal institutions. The decision is expressly stated to be upon the consideration of whether the power to pass the particular law which was before the Privy Council, viz.: the Scott Act, was vested in a Local Legislature in either of the then headings: the heading of property and civil rights, the heading of shop, tavern and saloon licenses, or the heading of local and private matters. The Judges expressly say that these were the points which were raised before them, and upon which they judged. They do not say a word about municipal institutions having been suggested or argued. Now, Sir, if hon. gentlemen sitting in this Parliament, if Ministers of the Crown, chosen from all the different Provinces, do not know what are the local laws touching the sale of liquor, what powers have been given to the different municipal bodies in that regard; if we require to-day to take the first step in order to inform our minds upon the mixed question of law and fact as to what are the laws and what mean the laws; can we suppose that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was inspired to know all about those municipal institutions and local laws which were not even alluded to in the argument and the judgment? Can it be seriously argued before a Canadian Parliament, that the single decision of four or five men—when the great question of municipal institutions was never even raised or discussed—has so finally concluded this question that it is no further arguable? It is absurd to say so. I maintain, that in the absence of a decision in which the whole question of municipal institutions shall have been brought up expressly, in which that mass of statutory learning which is required in order to know what the position of the municipal institutions of each Province was at the time of Confederation was not called for, in which the true construction of this phrase 'municipal institutions' was not fully debated and decided—no man, in the absence of such a decision,

Mr. BLAKE.

can say that this question, which, in the largest of the Provinces, in the next largest of the Provinces and in two or three more of them, was dealt with before Confederation, and for years after, as a subject of municipal institutions, is not to be found in the Confederation Act."

Once again I proceeded to point out what was done in the old Province of Upper Canada, under the heading of municipal institutions, and also in Lower Canada; and I said:

"I deny his construction of the decision in *Russell vs. The Queen*, and the argument in *Russell vs. The Queen*. I have read the stenographer's notes of the whole argument, and it seems to be unfortunate that in a constitutional case of this high consequence, the senior counsel, a man whose knowledge and power and eminence, everybody knows and respects—Mr. Benjamin—should have been absent, and that the brunt of the argument should have been borne by the junior counsel. Mr. Benjamin appears only at the close in delivering a short and a concise argument. I say the argument is not satisfactory; and the judgment is not satisfactory, even as far as it goes. But the question is, how far it goes? We are not to take it as far as the hon. gentleman says it is to be taken. The hon. gentleman says no lawyer reading that judgment will come to any other conclusion; he says no layman would come to any other conclusion. But lawyers have come to a different conclusion; judges have come to a different conclusion; courts have come to a different conclusion; and what the hon. gentleman declares no man would say, some of the highest and most respectable and esteemed judges of this land have already said."

And I pointed out in detail what the judgments were which bore out that proposition. After doing so, I said:

"For myself, I never will consent that one of the greatest powers given to the Provinces, shall be swept away by a court before whom this question of our municipal institutions was not argued or considered, before whom it was not contended that our powers in that respect were in question, and of which they knew no more than the messengers at the Table—I will not consent that the Parliament of this country shall, without my protest, arrogate to itself the power to take away from the Provinces that great right, until we find, on full argument and consideration, that such is the meaning of our Constitution."

Well, Mr. Speaker, making these observations upon the motion of the hon. gentleman to initiate this legislation, which I opposed on this and other grounds, I was answered from the Ministerial benches by an hon. member, who said, speaking for the Government:

"They do not ask this House to consider whether the license question may be dealt with by the Local Legislatures or by the Dominion Parliament. That is a foregone conclusion, and His Excellency says, he is advised upon that question that the Provinces have no right to deal with the question; and, therefore, this House being seized with the case, and being satisfied that the opinion of the hon. the First Minister is the true one, is asked only to assimilate the laws of the several Provinces and to see that an Act is placed on the Statute-book, which shall satisfy the several Provinces."

Again, he said, referring to my point, that the only excuse that the Government had for introducing the measure was the speech the hon. gentleman made in Yorkville:

"Well, what better evidence does this country want of the great constitutional knowledge of the right hon. gentleman than the fact that he predicted, three weeks before the decision was given, that the jurisdiction lay alone in this Legislature; that the Local Legislatures had no control over that question. That shows his great constitutional knowledge and his opinion of what the law really was, because, a few weeks afterwards, we find the Privy Council endorsing his view."

However, although we voted against the initiation of this legislation, and declared that it ought not to be commenced, at a later day, when the Bill was to be read the third time, we recorded another proposition, to which I desire to refer. That proposition was contained in a motion, moved by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) in amendment to the third reading of the Bill, to leave out the words for the third reading, and insert these:

"The Provincial Legislatures have since Confederation exercised Legislative powers in the regulation of the issue of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, and the hours and certain other incidents of the sale.

"That the Appeal Courts of Ontario and Quebec have each decided in favor of the exercise by the Provinces of the Dominion, of the jurisdiction, and this Appeal Court has further determined that the judgment of the Privy Council in *Russell and The Queen* does not decide that the Provincial Legislatures have not this jurisdiction.

"That the questions involved are now under the consideration of the Supreme Court of Canada, and will shortly be brought under the consideration of the Privy Council.

"That the Parliament of Canada should not assume jurisdiction as proposed by the said Bill, until the question has been settled by the Court of last resort."

That motion also was defeated. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us understand clearly what determination we were called upon to take, for what reason and upon what plea. We were called upon to interfere with the regulation of licensing in the various Provinces upon the plea—not that it was a politic thing for this Parliament to assume that jurisdiction, not that it was a measure of policy or expediency at all, but upon the plea of necessity—that in order to prevent the unrestrained sale by anybody who pleased of intoxicating liquors wherever he pleased, it was necessary for this Parliament to intervene; not upon argument, for argument was not resorted to in this House, to prove the necessity, but upon the plea that the necessity was proved and established by the judgment of the court of last resort, which the hon. gentleman said was the final law of the land—upon the plea that the local laws were not worth the paper they were written upon—that they were usurpations; and in order to prevent these dreadful evils over which the hon. gentleman wept, resulting from the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors all over the country, he said we must act at once and act decidedly, else the country would go to ruin over the quantity of liquor sold by everybody and drunk by everybody else. Well, Sir, we pointed out that the hon. gentleman's interpretation of the judgment in *Russell vs. The Queen*, was erroneous; that it did not establish the proposition he laid down; that it could not establish it, because an essential element to a conclusive decision upon that subject was that the question of Provincial powers in municipal institutions should have been brought under the consideration of the court, and adjudged upon by the court, whereas that question was not considered or adjudged upon at all. However, the hon. gentleman who answered for the Government said that they took the opinion of the First Minister, that they were willing to take his opinion on trust, and that as he wished it, not merely as an expounder of the law, but as a prophet, it was particularly unfortunate that I should have challenged his judgment. But time brings about its revenges. There were allusions in the course of the debate, and in this motion to cases then pending—to a case before the Supreme Court of Canada at that time standing for judgment, in which judgment has since been delivered, and in which three of the judges, those who expressed an opinion on the question of jurisdiction, expressed the opinion that the Local Legislatures have regulative jurisdiction. There was a case alluded to which was about to be heard in the Privy Council. It was pointed out in a late stage of the debate that it was entirely unnecessary for the hon. gentleman to proceed so hastily, for he himself proposed that his Act should not come into force until May next, at any rate so far as the licensing power was concerned, and that he might well wait until the decision of the Privy Council was rendered. But he had some purpose to serve, and he insisted on Parliament coming to a conclusion. Parliament came to the conclusion he desired, and since then judgment has been delivered; and this is the second complaint I make of omissions. Surely this judgment has more importance upon the question before us last Session than the judgment in *Russell vs. The Queen*. The question which was before us last Session was, What are the powers of the Local Legislatures with reference to the issue and regulation of licenses? That was the question. The hon. gentleman said they have no powers to regulate licenses—that they had no powers except with reference to the raising of revenue for municipal or Provincial purposes; and he said: I prove it by saying that a particular judgment goes to show it. Now, we have got a judgment which shows this precise point, which is on the point which touches it, which deals with it, and, in spite of the hon. gentleman's infallible nod, concludes the point. And as the hon. gentleman would not put this judgment, which does not go to show, but which does show, into the Speech, I do

not propose to move in amendment that it be inserted, because that would be contrary to the *bienséance* of parliamentary life, as we understand it to-day, but I will read it. After explaining, or attempting to explain, the decision in *Russell and The Queen*, and the principles on which that decision was founded, and coming down to the point in question:

"Their Lordships proceed now to consider the subject matter and Legislative character of Sections 4 and 5 of the revised Statutes of Ontario. That Act is so far confined in its operations to municipalities in the Province of Ontario, and is entirely local in its character and operation. It authorizes the appointment of License Commissioners to act in each municipality, and empowers them to pass, under the name of Resolutions, what we know as By-Laws, or rules to define the conditions and qualifications requisite for obtaining tavern or shop licenses for sale by retail of spirituous liquors within the municipality; for limiting the number of licenses; for declaring that a limited number of persons qualified to have tavern licenses may be exempted from having all the tavern accommodation required by law, and for regulating licensed taverns and shops, for defining the duties and powers of License Inspectors, and to impose penalties for infraction of their Resolutions. These seem to be all matters of merely a local nature in the Province, and to be similar to, though not identical in all respects with, the powers then belonging to municipal institutions under the previously existing laws passed by the Local Parliaments.

"Their Lordships consider that the powers intended to be conferred by the Act in question, when properly understood, are to make regulations in the nature of police or municipal regulations of a merely local character, for the good government of taverns, &c., licensed for the sale of liquors by retail, and such as are calculated to preserve in the municipality, peace and public decency, and repress drunkenness and disorderly and riotous conduct. As such they cannot be said to interfere with the general regulation of trade and commerce which belongs to the Dominion Parliament, and do not conflict with the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, which does not appear to have as yet been locally adopted.

"The subject of Legislation in the Ontario Act of 1877, Sections 4 and 5, seem to come within the heads Nos. 8, 15 and 16, of Section 92 of British North America Statute, 1867.

"Their Lordships are therefore of opinion that in relation to Sections 4 and 5 of the Act in question, the Legislature of Ontario acted within the powers conferred on it by the Imperial Act of 1867, and that in this respect there is no conflict with the powers of the Dominion Parliament."

Now, what the hon. gentleman averred was that it was the case according to his opinion, and that it was judged by *Russell and The Queen* that a Local Legislature could not regulate tavern licences at all, that they could not pass any law to decide who should have a license, or how many licenses should be issued, or with reference to hours, &c.—that all they could do, was to impose a license fee for Provincial and municipal purposes, and that any body who chose to pay that fee, so far as the Local Government was concerned, must be entitled to a license, and could not be restricted. That was the hon. gentleman's proposition. I say that proposition is condemned conclusively by the judgment I have just now read. As I have said before, the hon. gentleman is a centralizer. I dare say he may ask this Parliament—having passed this law under his misleading, as a question of necessity alleged by him to prevent a great calamity, which more than any one in the Dominion he is desirous should be averted; having asked Parliament to pass this law, on the plea of the absolute nullity of the local laws regulating the sale of licenses—he may now ask Parliament to say: Oh, well, after all, it is not necessary, but it is expedient; it is politic; and as a matter of policy it is better we should keep the power which, under another pretext, we took in our hands last Session. But I hope—it having been now established that that large measure of power which has been exercised by Local Governments since Confederation, is embraced in its intrinsic and essential principles, within the phrase "municipal institutions," and therefore devolves expressly, by virtue of the British North America Act, upon the Local Parliaments—the hon. gentleman will acknowledge that he did not lead Parliament correctly on a late occasion, that there was not that necessity arising from the nullity of the local legislation which he asserted, that there was not therefore any fact or cause which was alleged for that law, and that he will not seek now to draw us into conflict with the Local Legislatures on

some other pretence of concurrent, paramount, enhanced, or mystical power. It may be that he will. He always desires to centralize, but let those who are lovers of the Federal Constitution, who admire the Federal principle, who believe that the well-being of this Confederation depends upon the large measures of local liberties reserved to the different Provinces, in this widely extended, different circumstanced, and sparsely populated Dominion. Let those who entertain these sentiments resist the proposition which the hon. gentleman himself, last Session, disclaimed, the proposition that we ought to endeavour to intrude upon this question, to touch it at all, except from the necessity which he alleged, but which has now been proved not to exist. The hon. member for Glengarry made a quotation, and he said I smiled when he made it. I did smile. I think *delenda est Carthago* was not a very apt quotation on a proposition for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I will venture to say to the hon. gentleman what occurred to my mind when he made his quotation. Whether unwittingly, I have no doubt, for I am sure he desires with the rest of us, the good of his country—whether all unwittingly by his undeviating support of all these measures to which I have been referring, by the course he has insisted on being pursued with the results I have indicated—he may not have been unintentionally but none the less assuredly, accomplishing his motto with the slight change *delenda est Canada*. The hon. member for Levis called, in the course of his address, for a consideration of the peculiar condition of the Province of Quebec. He pointed out its special condition, its special relations to the rest of the Dominion, and called for a liberal consideration of its special rights. I would say to the hon. gentleman that when he has adorned this Parliament a little longer, he will find that if there is one thing this Parliament is disposed not to do, it is to meddle with Quebec; and he will find any danger which Quebec runs, is because it is not always the case that the hon. members from that Province—and I have one of them now in my eye—who are or make themselves the special guardians of its rights in this Parliament, are equally careful of the application of the same principles which they would desire to see applied to their own Province when the question concerns some other Province. I would desire him to remember that it is by a firm and careful adherence and a uniform and undeviating application to all the Provinces of the same hon. gentleman's principles of respect for the Federal principle of respect for the local rights, and by resisting, as endangering the whole fabric, any attempted infringement upon them in any one Province, that the views of my hon. friend will ultimately prevail; and that, so long as we find jealousy in respect of those rights when they affect a particular Province, and indifference, or even a disposition to assist in their impairment, when only other Provinces are concerned, so long it is impossible to say that what the hon. gentleman wishes, namely, the maintenance on a sound and immutable basis of the Federal principle, has yet been attained. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we met last year for the first time, I adverted to the many changes which had taken place in the constitution of the Parliament from the time we met before. Since that time several changes, even in this brief interval, have taken place—some of them expected, some of them unexpected. To one or two only I wish to allude. The hon. gentleman opposite has been relieved of the disagreeable and embarrassing necessity of making an election. He finds himself free from the necessity of choosing between the two devoted constituencies which claimed his hand, and both of which would have been delighted to stick to him if the law of this country had permitted. But that spouse of his, so faithful while she adhered to him, has been unfaithful since, and another man sits for Lennox. I regret exceedingly, and I am sure the hon. gentleman regrets, what his

Mr. BLAKE.

Toronto organ, with a fine appreciation of the fitness of things, calls "the temporary triumph of vice over virtue," which resulted in this election. Other faces we miss, and other faces reappear amongst us. I shall allude to one only. We have lost John Pickard, a man firm in his political opinions, but who possessed the rare good fortune, I believe, of not having a single person on unfriendly terms with him in this House, who was a friend to everybody and to whom everybody was a friend, who had the singular happiness of evoking during his life those universal expressions of affection and sympathy which are too often suppressed until the heart they would have gladdened is cold in death. I feel that I speak the sentiments of every man on both sides of the House when I say that we mourn his loss. As I have said before, and as I said last Session, this new Parliament, changed as it was greatly then, changed as it is now, had before it a future, a future which it had to make; and I ventured to express the hope which I forced myself then to entertain that that future would be a bright one. That future has since become, in considerable measure, a past, and those hopes are dim. But, though much be taken, much remains. There is yet time, and even now, after the experiences of last Session, I will repeat the expression of the hope that we shall take heed to the lessons of the year, that we shall endeavour to repair the errors of the past, and, if we cannot now achieve all that might have been achieved, we shall yet endeavour to do for our country what may, under present circumstances, be done for its best.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, if I cannot agree in all that my hon. friend, if he will allow me to call him so, has stated in his interesting speech, I can agree with him in the opening sentences in which he paid a just, graceful, I may say an eloquent compliment, to the mover and seconder of the resolutions which are now before the House. These are not merely ceremonial compliments, on the present occasion at all events, because, from the speeches of both gentlemen, we can perceive what valuable members they are of this body. I can also agree with the hon. gentleman in his remarks as to the illustrious individual who represents Her Majesty in Canada, and to his two predecessors. It is not, perhaps, the best taste, or would not be the best taste, for an adviser of the Crown to pay compliments to the Governor General who accords the Ministry his political confidence; but I may be permitted to say with the hon. gentleman, and to believe, as I do, that, when the term of office of the present representative of the Sovereign is ended, he will enjoy not only the affection but the confidence of the people in as great a degree as his predecessors. The hon. gentleman has spoken at greater length than is usual on the opening of a Parliament, and in answer to a Speech from the Throne. It has become in England, and is becoming in this country, the practice to consider the Speech a formality—a necessary constitutional formality, but still a formality—and to address ourselves with as little discussion as possible to the business for which we are called. The hon. gentleman has, however, much to the instruction, much to the amusement of the House, addressed us for some considerable period, and he commenced by stating that the Speech was remarkable for its omissions. Now, a Speech from the Throne is made for the purpose of conveying to Parliament an idea of the important measures that are expected to be submitted for their consideration. It is not expected to enter into all subjects that are not to be considered, that will not be considered, and that cannot be considered, that have been settled, or are so far aside from the business of the day as not to call for the attention of Parliament during the then Session. I can congratulate my hon. friend on the style in which he has addressed the House. It is a new departure, a new appearance of my

hon. friend. Why, in days of old, even in the last Session, he assumed the tone of a grave statesman, of a sedate politician, or rather a stern political economist. Now he has taken quite a new rôle, broken out in a new place, as the saying is, and instead of a speech on the various subjects of importance, he has treated us to a good deal of very pleasant *badinage*. I could not at first understand the reason for all this jocosity. I could not understand why the hon. gentleman had taken a new tone, had adopted a new rôle; but, as the speech went on, I began to understand it, when I heard him bring out, in the first place, the suggestion that there was a short crop; then that the Speech showed that there was overtrading; then that there was discontent in the North-West; then that the Premier of the Province of Manitoba had expressed his discontent; then, still further, that the speech showed some indications that there might possibly be a failure in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and, Sir, more than all, when the hon. gentleman alluded with such gusto to the fact that there perhaps might be a series of bankruptcies in the country. He revelled in the idea, Mr. Speaker. Oh! with what unction he brought out the fact that there was a proposal in the *Mail* to establish a soup kitchen to help the starving poor. The hon. gentleman got what he has been wishing for, he got what his party has been praying for, the hon. gentleman got the country at last to the only position in which by any possibility he or his party can get into power. He thinks the country will get into a wretched position and then, when it is in such a position—and he revels in the misfortunes which his press had predicted, which his press had desired, and which it exults in—then he thinks there will be some chance for the hon. gentleman opposite. The jocosity, the smiles, the *badinage*, the little pleasantries of the hon. gentleman are quite understood, and I have no doubt will be appreciated by this House, and by the country. The hon. gentleman was a little erratic in his taking up the various topics of the Speech. He did not follow them paragraph by paragraph, and I must to some extent follow him. I had not the opportunity that the hon. gentleman had of preparing these elaborate sarcasms, of making quotations of one hon. member from this side in November, another in October, and another in August. I have not an opportunity of preparing any impromptues like the hon. gentleman, so that I have to follow him in the way that he has taken. He alludes to British Columbia. He does not say that he objects to all that he has heard, or that he knows of the settlement made by the Government, the provisional settlement made with that Province. He is glad of course—he professes gladness—that all sorts of causes of quarrel, or discussion between the Province of British Columbia, and the Dominion have ended. I do not know that I am able to answer my hon. friend. We have lost a good many, as the hon. gentleman says, in this House. We have lost the only man that could answer him—my friend Mr. Bunster. He took care of British Columbia in his day, and he threw back the taunts and sarcasms of the hon. member when he chose to attack British Columbia. I, in my feeble way, must assume the position of Mr. Bunster. The hon. gentleman does not object, as I understand it, to any of the terms of settlement, so far as they have appeared in the public press; and he quoted a speech of the Minister of Justice, my colleague, stating that the particular arrangement of building the Island Railway was the payment of a debt due to Victoria because they elected me. Well, the hon. gentleman says very truly, that honest men pay their debts, but they pay their debts with their own money. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of British Columbia, at all events, think that the Dominion owes them a great debt for returning me to be head of the Government instead of handing it over to the hon. gentleman; and I have no doubt that not only British Columbia, but the whole

Dominion will accept, also, by a large majority, the belief that really Victoria did confer a benefit upon the Dominion by enabling me to appear here in my present condition as Minister of the Crown. The hon. gentleman took occasion—it was quite proper for him to do so, there is no reason why he should not—to allude to the parties who are, it is said, going to build the Island Railway, and he spoke about Mr. Huntington, and other American magnates who are coming in to build that road. Well, I believe I have the same sources of information as the hon. gentleman, and perhaps a little more. I believe that there are some American magnates coming in, and that Mr. Dansmuir, who is a Canadian millionaire, a British subject by birth, and one of the most enterprising men of the whole Dominion, is going to join them. I am very glad that such is the credit of Canada all over, and such is the credit of that particular portion of Canada which is called British Columbia, that we can at last, under the present Government, get American magnates to come in and invest their money. But, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that those same American magnates, during the reign of the hon. gentleman opposite, would not have come in; not a shilling, not a cent, not a nickle would they put into any Canadian fund of any kind so long as the Government, its revenues, its future, and its present, were under the paternal guidance of hon. gentlemen opposite. An hon. friend near me says I must remember that the debt was created by hon. gentlemen opposite. It was an obligation created by hon. gentlemen opposite; a promise made by them, an engagement made by hon. gentlemen opposite, which we are now carrying out. I do not choose to dwell upon that, because if we cannot put everything into the Queen's Speech, neither can we put everything into the debate on the Address, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's eloquent exertions to do so. But, Sir, that is the fact: that this same Island Railway, this same obligation, was created by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. The hon. gentleman then alluded to the paragraph relating to the North-West; that some legislation would be required in consequence of the rapid development of that portion of Her Majesty's Dominions; and he took occasion to say that there was a great omission in the Speech when there was no notice taken of the discontent that, he says, exists there. He specially quoted with the greatest pleasure—he had it carefully in his drawer, there it was pasted, with the industry, with the care that would do honor to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert)—there he had it, Mr. Norquay's speech, and he says, Here is the evidence of discontent; here is the evidence of the want of policy; here is the evidence of the misgovernment of that country. Why, Mr. Norquay is coming down—I believe he has come down—to ask for better terms. I remember the time when Nova Scotia came to ask for better terms, when it was represented to this House, and to the Parliament at that time, that Nova Scotia was discontented, that Nova Scotia was recalcitrant, that she was about to secede. There was an imminent danger of that, we were told. Yet, I think the hon. gentleman excelled himself in Opposition—and the hon. gentleman is powerful in Opposition—when, notwithstanding that discontent, notwithstanding the dissatisfaction that existed in Nova Scotia, notwithstanding the great danger there was from the beginning that she would secede, that hon. gentleman opposed strongly, ably and vigorously, the granting of better terms. Why, of course, Mr. Norquay comes down here. He is not coming, to use a very celebrated expression, to cry "stinking fish." He exaggerates, if possible, or, rather, he presses as strongly as he can, all the various reasons why better terms should be granted. I have no doubt that we will consider them. We will not treat the application for better terms in the same manner the hon. gentleman did that of Nova Scotia. We will give it every consideration—not frightened by threats,

nor yet prevented from doing justice, if we think justice demands any action, by being told that we are conceding improperly the demands of the Province, as we were told in the case of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman says there are various causes of discontent, and these should all have appeared in the Speech. Among other things he says it was very improper to reserve the lands lying in the mile belt; and yet the hon. gentleman, forgetting that portion of his speech, attacked the Government afterwards for making too rapid progress in railway construction and for building the road so quickly that the population became scattered. The hon. gentleman urges that the people should not be allowed to scatter all over the North-West, but should be kept in one place, all of which would have been accomplished if his railway policy had been carried out. If we had only had the water-stretches system and the vigorous action of the Sir W. P. Howland Syndicate, then the hon. gentleman would have had what he wanted, not the scattering of a vigorous population all over the country, but the concentration of people in one place. They would have been compelled to have hung round Winnipeg, to have bought the land held by Winnipeg speculators at speculators' prices; they would not have been allowed to isolate themselves, for there would have been no railway to have carried them out to Brandon, Regina, Moose Jaw, or Calgary. The few people who would have gone to the country would have been obliged, I say, to have remained near Winnipeg for want of railway communication. The hon. gentleman would then have been satisfied; all his anticipations would have been realized. Instead of a population rushing in, 25,000, 50,000 and 100,000, they would have gone in in few numbers under the wonderful management, great foresight and vigorous administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says he objected, and objects now, to the policy of locking up the mile belt. In the first place, both his Government and our Government were pledged that the North-West should pay the cost of its own railway. We saw and felt that there was no reason why the taxpayers of the Maritime Provinces, or of the old Province of Canada should, out of their own pockets, pay for railway construction in the North-West. Those hon. gentlemen felt, as we felt, that in order to develop that great country, we should make an advance, borrow money and loan it to the North-West, which was rich enough when its resources were developed to repay principal and interest for the advance which they wished Parliament to make. We did ask Parliament to make the grant. Parliament made the grant, but under a solemn pledge given by myself and my colleagues, that we believed and knew that by a proper and vigorous administration of the affairs of that country, not one farthing would be taken out of the pockets of the rest of Canada, and that the North-West should pay for and build its own railway. In pursuance of that policy, Parliament, in its wisdom, not aside 100,000,000 acres of land for the purpose of repaying to the rest of Canada the temporary advance of \$:5,000,000 to build that great road. In carrying out that policy we were obliged, of course, to take care that while opening up the country and providing amply sufficient areas of land for all settlers, the plan should be carried out so that old Canada should not be obliged to be out of pocket ultimately. With respect to the mile belt, being then Minister of the Interior, adopted, to a very great extent, the advice and suggestions of my hon. friend who has just spoken. My hon. friend said—it will be found in *Hansard*, but I have not *Hansard* before me, for I am not a collector of speeches like the hon. gentleman or like my hon. friend behind me—but I remember his remark well, and I am quite sure he will not deny it—that while every settler should have the right to get his homestead, there was no reason why he should become a millionaire, and Government should take great care that

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

town sites and valuable spots along the line should be sold at their value for the purpose of forming a fund to build the railway. The hon. gentleman pressed strongly upon the House the propriety, expediency and justice of selling the land along the line, so far as town sites were concerned, certainly, for the purpose of building the road. Everybody who has gone through the country—I have not had that experience—knows that from Red River to Calgary there are few points which nature indicates as being certainly the site of a town. The country is one vast prairie and there are only one or two points marked out by nature, I say, as future town sites, and as a general rule it is mere accident as to whether a place becomes a town or remains a mere rural section. It would therefore be quite impossible for the Government to find out where the town sites would most likely be. But there was another reason, which I had occasion to elaborate to some extent last Session. When the boom to which the hon. gentleman has referred prevailed in the North-West, there was a rush of speculators all along the line, and there was great danger of the honest and *bond fide* settler, who wanted to obtain a homestead in the vicinity of the railway, being crowded out by paid agents of speculators who sent out hired myrmidons by the dozen and even by the hundred to put up false, fictitious and fraudulent evidence of settlement. While the boom existed it was quite impossible to decide between the honest settler and the pretended settler in the pay of a speculator. These paid agents were scattered all over the country, as was admitted by the hon. member from Manitoba who spoke last year. Then men, under the pretence of being honest settlers, went upon land and put up a fence or threw up a few rods of soil in a perfunctory manner; these were the paid servants of speculators who were receiving a commission in addition to monthly wages, and there was danger that land would remain in the same state as the land in the immediate vicinity of Winnipeg remains, namely, held by speculators for advanced prices, greatly to the loss of that section of the country, and to the disadvantage of the city itself as well as to the honest settler. With respect to the land between the railway and the boundary line, not one single honest settler, not one single *bond fide* immigrant who has settled on any one lot, has been dispossessed, not one man has been disturbed. There must have been some little uncertainty in men's minds while a reserve existed; but that must, and will exist until the whole country is settled. That section was the most profitable and valuable portion of the whole of the North-West; that was the portion we had desired and intended to commence selling for the purpose of recouping the loan made by the people of Canada to the people of the North-West. Sir, that boom is over, the inflation was excessive; the reaction was correspondingly great for a time. I am happy to believe that is over now. I am happy to believe that prices have resumed their normal condition, that land is now held at fair prices, not at fictitious or speculative values. The moment the time came when the Government were satisfied, when the Department of the Interior had the evidence before it that the time had passed for speculators to rush in and put on the land agents, and thus procure a fraudulent settlement, and that those speculators had enough to do at home to meet their engagements without seizing on new lands and dispossessing *bond fide* settlers, that moment the Government, not a moment too soon and I do not think too late, withdrew their reservation. And what is the consequence? The consequence is that the real settler now goes in, not the agent or the speculator, not the land jobber or the land shark, but the real, *bond fide* settler, and whether he comes from the Mother Country or from older Canada he is certain to find his homestead, to choose his homestead, to enjoy his homestead. That, Sir, is my answer to the attack made on the policy

of the Government. I consider that I am responsible personally for that policy; I am responsible also for the opening up of the lands; I am responsible in every way, and I am quite satisfied that the Government acted wisely in keeping out the land shark at the time it did, and equally wisely in opening up these lands for the settler at the proper time. Then the hon. gentleman attacked the colonization companies, as I believe he did on former occasions. Well, Sir, the colonization system was not initiated by the present Government. The colonization system, the granting of lands to capitalists for the purpose of inducing settlement, was inaugurated and carried out by our predecessors—carried out not to a very large extent, because they had not the opportunity, they had not the country, but they began the system and we have carried it on, and we have no reason to regret our having done so. In the first place, if we compare the Northern and Western States with the position of our own North-West, at the time we undertook the administration of affairs, we will find that the chief lands of the American North-West were granted to the American railways; that these railways have had agents all over the world, the best agents in the world, for the purpose of selling their lands. We had no large railway companies heavily subsidized at that time. The Government were using all the machinery they could possibly use, in the way of an Immigration Department, for the purpose of encouraging immigration. They could not do what private individuals or railway companies, or colonization companies could do. The Government carried out, to a very considerable extent, the policy of their predecessors, and that policy has, on the whole, been successful. There has been many and many an immigrant and settler who has gone in there through the agency of the colonization companies, who would not have gone in there but for these companies. Besides that, we had the commencement of the fund, and a very large and satisfactory commencement of the fund, out of which we have to repay to the Dominion Treasury the \$25,000,000 pledged to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. The assertion that in any way settlers were kept out of the country included in the colonization grants, is mistaken. Everybody knows who has looked at the regulations and the Government system, that the even-numbered sections in every colonization grant, are open to the homesteader just as much as if the land had not been included in the grant. Any homesteader can go on the land of any colonization company, and say this is No. 8 or No. 4 or No. 6, or any even-numbered section, and despite the company he can sit down on his land and can claim his patent and obtain his patent for it. The plan of the Government is simply this: that so far as the odd-numbered sections are concerned, they should get a price for them; that the money should be put in the Public Treasury to pay for the subsidy, and that the colonization companies, in order to make it a matter of interest to them to act as immigration agents and find settlers, should get the odd-numbered sections at half price if they found settlers to settle on the even-numbered sections. The consequence is, that some of the companies have failed. Some of them were, I am afraid, merely speculative companies, had not a *bona fide* intention of looking for settlers, but merely went in for the purpose of making something out of it. Some of them, on the other hand, have gone to great expense, have laid out large sums of money, and have agents traversing England, Ireland and Scotland for the purpose of bringing out immigrants to settle these lands. That is the policy of the Government, and I believe it has been successful, and I have no doubt that within three or four years more—because these companies have scarcely had time to work out this system or generate the capital in order to do so—but in a few years the country will acknowledge that the system was a good one, and that such of the companies as were *bona fide*—

as many of them were—became active, earnest, zealous, and successful agents in settling the North-West. The hon. gentleman alluded as one cause of discontent to the disallowance of certain local railway Bills. I would only ask the hon. gentleman to go to the people of Winnipeg and ask them whether they want any local railways running from the Canadian Pacific Railway west of them down to the Province line. Let him ask the people of Winnipeg, the place where the excitement has arisen, and he will find that any man who would venture to state that he was in favour of that system of allowing local railways to run wherever they pleased from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the frontier, would have very little chance of representing Winnipeg or the electoral district of which it is the centre. The hon. gentleman has said that one great cause of discontent is the high Tariff. Well, that is the old question of Protection against Free Trade. The people there are taxed no more by the high Tariff than the people in the other parts of the Dominion. The people of the other parts of the Dominion—I am sorry for the hon. gentleman's sake to say it, because I know it is a disappointment to him—are submitting to the National Policy in a spirit of Christian resignation and a spirit of Christian hope and expectation. Besides, when we talk to the people of the North-West we can say to them, Would you rather have Free Trade and a deficit and no railway, or Protection and a high Tariff, with the Canadian Pacific Railway and a surplus? and I think the people, *en masse*, if the question were put to them, would decide in favour of Protection and the surplus and the Canadian Pacific Railway instead of a deficit, no railway, and Free Trade. There would be the glorious privilege of buying American manufactures at their border, if American manufactures could be carried or transported by toboggans or waggons across the plains, in the absence of a railway. The hon. gentleman said that he did not wish to commit himself in any way with respect to the cry for a Hudson Bay Railway. There is a natural impatience in the North-West for want of transport, of course, and hence the cry for the Hudson Bay Railway. That Parliament is anxious to assist such an enterprise is shown by its chartering two companies. These two companies, I am glad to believe, are about to amalgamate, so that they will unite their strength to build a railway from the Pacific Railway—I suppose in the vicinity of Winnipeg—to Hudson Bay. That is the action of Parliament. The action of the Government has been this: in order to encourage that railway, if it has any vitality—and I do not mean to say that it has not vitality and a great future before it—I am not competent to speak as to that; but the Government, in order to encourage it, have agreed to give a larger land grant to that railway and at a lower price than to any other railway that has been subsidized in the North-West, except the Canadian Pacific Railway itself. They have agreed to give twice the quantity of land, and at half the price, that they have given to the Manitoba and South-Western, and the other railways which are projected through that country. Well, there is a natural feeling of impatience in the country, because the people cannot get their crops out; hence the great agitation for the immediate construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. They are now obliged to send their grain by foreign railways to eastern Canada. They are obliged to send it to the boundary line and there take the American railways. The American railways, of course, consider only their own interest. They have no interest in common with those people, and do not care whether they suffer or not. They put on just what tariff they please for their own purposes. But, Mr. Speaker, in two years the scene will be changed. There will be two routes through Canada. There will be the all-rail route running from Calgary through the whole of the wheat district and to the north of Lake Superior, direct to Montreal and the sea; and

there will be, besides, the subsidiary line running from Winnipeg to Prince Arthur's Landing, and thence by steamers put on for the purpose, to eastern Canada;—two lines to carry off the agricultural wealth of the North-West. If these two lines are found to be insufficient, I have no doubt other lines will be established, and the Hudson Bay route, if it be the route, will have its turn. That is all I have to say with respect to the remark made by the hon. gentleman as to the Hudson Bay Railway. Now, Sir, I do not know why it is that the hon. gentleman is always against the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not understand why, from the beginning of the proposition until now, he has been its steady opponent. He was opposed to building the line to the north of Lake Superior at all. At all events, he was strongly in favor of postponing it for years and years—it was to be built in the distant future, in the days of our grandchildren; whereas, Mr. Speaker, if you now ask the men most interested in the building of that road—if you ask a man like Mr. Van Horne, the chief manager of the company, a man who has had as large a railway experience, both in the United States and Canada, as any man on this continent, he will tell you that of all the portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from one end to the other, there is no portion so important in the view of the company as the line that runs to the north of Lake Superior—no portion so absolutely necessary to make this line what we wish to make it, a great arterial line, carrying the produce of Canada from one end to the other, from sea to sea; no portion more important than that part of the line which the hon. gentleman opposed with all his might and main, and with all his eloquence. And, Sir, as he failed in that, he has never forgotten his opposition. His opposition is consistent, steady. His *amour-propre* seems to be interested in fighting this railway. He cannot allow himself not to be infallible; he cannot allow himself to have ever made a mistake; he cannot allow himself to have been mistaken in the two great positions he used to take—first, that there should be no railway, in our time, north of Lake Superior, and second, that there should be no line through British Columbia to the Pacific Ocean. He cannot forget that he took these two positions; and, as they are both carried against him, as both of these portions of the railway are going to be built and are going to be the most profitable portions—

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear. He says the road has been built too rapidly. He did not want the road built rapidly. He wanted it to go on slowly, easily, with the old, honest jog-trot of a hundred years ago. He says it is going to cost a great lot of money. So it is. He says that immigrants are going to be scattered. They are going to settle in little quiet communities. They are going to be scattered over half that immense continent. They will be sitting around their fires, enjoying their domestic happiness, within easy range of the municipal institutions of Winnipeg, and listening to the church-going bell that rings along the Red River. Sir, supposing the hon. gentleman's plan had been carried out—and if the second syndicate had got the contract, it would have been carried out—what would have been the price of coal in Winnipeg at this moment? Why, Sir, by building that railway, by forcing it through to Calgary, by pushing it across the continent, the coal requisite for comfort, almost for life, which formerly cost \$23 a ton in Winnipeg, is now sold at \$7. The wealth of that western country is now shown to be so great that it has been the most favoured portion for the immigration of the past year, and will be still more the favoured country for settlement and enterprise in the year 1884. It is a country for cattle, for horses, for sheep; a country for gold, for silver, and more important, it is a country for coal; and that

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

country would not have been opened, not a ton of coal, not a nugget of gold would have been taken out, not a horse or cow or flock of sheep would have been herded on those plains and those declivities, if it had not been for the rapid progress of that railway—that wonderful combination of wealth and skill and disinterestedness which is called the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the hon. gentleman says that the company have not only built the main line too fast, but have gone into other enterprises which they should not have undertaken. They should have confined themselves to building from Callendar to Calgary. So far as the Government are concerned, and Government aid is concerned, I can tell hon. gentlemen in this House that not a dollar of money, not an acre of land, has been given to the Canadian Pacific Railway except on the certificate of the Chief Engineer that the money has been expended on the main line. Not one farthing has been expended, or one acre of land granted, except for that purpose. I cannot go over all the particulars the hon. gentleman has mentioned, because I do not know them all, when he quoted half a dozen of railways. What the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway may be in those, I am not able to specify. The time will come when this subject will be before the House and then full particulars will be entered into, but I say that the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been a failure, would have failed in its great purpose of connecting the Atlantic with the Pacific, if the road had stopped at Calgary. Of what use would have been the road unless it extended from Calgary to Ottawa and from Ottawa to Montreal. Of what value would it have been to the people of the North-West, if they did not know that their produce would be carried across this line without breaking bulk, without intermission, without delay, at the cheapest possible rate, and in the shortest possible period, from the place of growth to the ships that are to take it to England from Montreal or Quebec. The hon. gentleman has been unable to grasp the magnitude of this question. He has been unable, even with his mighty mind, to seize the importance of building this railway in one straight line from the Pacific Ocean to Montreal and Quebec. The hon. gentleman has cavilled at every step that has been taken by the Government in building this great road. He objected to building it north of Lake Superior; he objected to extending it from Calgary to the Pacific Ocean; he now sneers at this company for their enterprise, for the grand idea they are carrying out, in a grand way, in order to make this country a grand country, instead of giving them his sympathy; instead of forgetting party; instead of forgetting his old and mistaken policy; instead of remembering that he was a Canadian first, before a Leader of the Opposition, and granting his support, and his voice, and his great and deserved influence, in making this great Canadian line a success—the greatest line belonging to any one country in the world. If you consider the straightness of the line, the healthfulness of the country it goes through, the fertility of the land it traverses, and the energetic people who are settling on both sides of it, I do not know that on either continent there is any railway with the present magnificent position or with a future equal to that of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman then backed back as to the bad harvest and the over-trading. We did not, in the Speech, desire to say—it would be untrue if we did—that this country was not prosperous. This country in the present year is prosperous. If you look at the amount of money deposited in the savings banks in 1883, you will find it is greater than in any previous year. If you will consult the wholesale merchants in the great centres of commerce, Montreal, Toronto, St. John, or Halifax, you will find, by their unanimous voice, that payments have been promptly made by the country merchant who supplies the agriculturist, and that they have been made with greater regularity than in previous years.

We have all the indications of prosperity. The mere chance—the misfortune it is, certainly—of having an unsatisfactory crop, for the hon. gentleman says it is no worse, together with the fact that, in some instances, in our early experience, the manufacturers have made an over-production in some certain branches, has furnished the occasion of a cry; and there has also been ten or fifteen per cent. of frosted wheat in the North-West. It is a very strange thing that while that same frost cut down the crops in Minnesota and Dakota, and destroyed the whole of the corn crop through a large region in the Western States, you do not find the American press, the American statesmen, or American politicians, publishing to the world, and gloating over on the stump, the fact that their country has suffered in its production, and is not so prosperous as it has been in past years. It has been left to the Grits and the Grit press to defile our own nest. Much good may it do them. If they can persuade the farmer or the workman who, from over-production in a given mill or manufactory, has been obliged to work short time, that the National Policy is wrong, what care they—what care they about ruining the character of the country, depreciating its credit in the markets of the world, if they can only displace the National Policy Government and take its place? Hon. gentlemen opposite, like the individual depicted by Milton, who says it is better to rule in hell than to serve in heaven, would rather rule over a ruined country than sit quietly on the benches of the Opposition, seeing much against their will a people prosperous and a developing trade. But there are some wonderful omissions in this celebrated speech delivered by Lord Lansdowne the other day. Among other things he says the Washington Treaty ends in two years. It is of the very greatest importance to Canada that that subject should be dealt with by us now. Why, Mr. Speaker, I remember the time when every man in the Opposition called me Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold; I remember the time when I was hounded down; when I was called a traitor to the country, a traitor to its best interests, because I was in some degree, as one of the Commissioners, responsible for the Washington Treaty. It was called the "Washington Surrender,"—why, the surrender of Cornwallis was nothing to it. I was told I was a traitor. Benedict Arnold was a seraph to me. For the whole time from May, when the Treaty was signed, to the following winter, when we asked Parliament to confirm it, I was the victim of continuous attack. The language used was as plain and as honest Saxon as ever was used. There was no mincing; there was no circumlocution in the phrases applied to me. Of all the scoundrels who ever betrayed a country, I was the worst. And now I find the Leader of the Opposition, one of those gentlemen, who, no doubt to some extent, though always in a gentlemanly way, joined in these attacks upon me, says it is of great importance that that Treaty should not be allowed to drop. We must take it up, because there are great interests concerned, and he actually charges me and the Government of which I am the First Minister, with being guilty of a criminal omission, an omission he thinks he ought to bring up in the House in his place as a member of Parliament defending the interests of Canada, because we have not announced that we are going to take steps to continue that opprobrious Treaty. I remember the time when the then leader of the Opposition said, "And you have sold the territorial rights of Canada; you have given up the territorial rights of Canada for money, for money." Said he, "I loathe the idea of the money we get or will get under that Treaty." Yet we got \$4,500,000. *Non olet*, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to quote Latin, though he objected to my hon. friend doing it, the money did not smell badly. They not only took the money which they loathed as a bribe to sell our best inter-

ests, our national honour, but they applied to Her Majesty the Queen to grant the title of Knight Commander of St. Michael and St. George to the Minister who was at the head of the Department that got the money. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my hon. friend to one particular omission, which he dwelt on with great unction, which he dwelt on with special unction, and that is that, in my desire to centralize everything in this Government and the Parliament of Canada, I expended the money of the people of Canada in fighting out in England the claim of the Dominion Parliament to the escheats—estates forfeited by individuals leaving no heirs or representatives. That is the statement of the hon. gentleman. He said I was so anxious to centralize everything that I insisted upon that doctrine being carried out. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not design, I am quite sure, intentionally to misrepresent me, but there is a most unfortunate lapse in his memory. They say Mr. Gladstone has the same failing. He always believes anything he states at the time is true. Sometimes it is proved that it is not true, but at the same time everybody knows that Mr. Gladstone is a great statesman, and a saint, and a good man; and he is, no doubt. He is just as often as not wrong in his statements of facts, but he believes he is right when he makes a statement of any kind. The hon. gentleman says it is the Government of which I am a member that took up that question of escheats. Sir, from 1867 to 1873, when we went out, the Government took not one single step with regard to escheats. They never expressed an opinion in regard to that question where the escheats would go, and, although the hon. gentleman has got a lot of extracts, I challenge him or any man to state that anywhere from 1867 to now, at any time, he ever heard me express an opinion as to that contested question, whether the escheats went to the Provincial Government or the Dominion Government. I say I challenge the hon. gentleman or anybody to prove that, on any occasion, in Parliament or out of Parliament, I ever expressed any opinion on that question. It is a matter of little importance, as the hon. gentleman truly says. It did not give the Treasury anything, because everybody knows it is the practice, whenever there has been an escheat, if any relative, legitimate or illegitimate, if any friend, if any creditor of a person leaving an estate behind, can be found, the money is given up readily and willingly; it never has been considered a portion of the revenue of the country. It never has formed a portion of the revenue of the country. I do not believe that \$5,000, I do not know that even \$1,000, has ever found its way since Confederation into the Public Treasury from any escheat; therefore the charge that in any way whatever I desired in that instance to centralize the matter here is altogether erroneous; but, Mr. Speaker, I will go a little further. While no opinion was given by me as Minister of Justice, which I was from 1867 to 1873, strange to say, that the whole question arose on the decision of Mr. Mackenzie's Government; that the case arose on an opinion given by Mr. Lafamme, as the Minister of Justice of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, declaring that the escheats belonged to the Dominion Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Fournier.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, Mr. Fournier; not Mr. Lafamme. It was Mr. Fournier, now a judge, made by the hon. gentleman, a Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada; and a very good judge, I believe, Mr. Fournier is—a man who does honour to the Bench; but he gave his opinion, as Minister of Justice, that all the escheated moneys went into the Dominion Treasury, and not into the Provincial Treasury. And, Mr. Speaker, when we came in, and this celebrated Mercer case arose, Mr. Mowat wrote here to know what we would do about it, and we came to an agree-

ment that he might dispose of the money subject to the final decision of the question. Now, the question was raised by the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite. We had come to an arrangement carrying out the decision of the previous Government, and paying respect to that decision. We said: very well, you can keep the money and dispose of it in this Mercer institution or in any public way you like, subject, of course, to the final decision. It was absolutely necessary—we had not raised the question, it was sent home, not by the Government, we did not want to raise it, we never had raised it, but one of the persons supposing himself to be interested in the Mercer estate carried it to England—it was of great importance that the question should be settled, and our only intervention in the matter was that, in order that it might be finally settled and well argued, we agreed to support and stand by the decision of the previous Government, of which the hon. gentleman was a member—I do not think he was a member then—but of the previous Government, the Liberal Government; we agreed to stand by their decision. We could not, as a Government, I think, set aside the solemn decision of our predecessors, and we agreed to pay a fee to competent counsel, in order that the case might be fully argued. That will show the justice of the line of argument taken by the hon. gentleman against the Government. Then there was the great Hodge case. The hon. gentleman has quoted my speech and he has quoted his own speech. Well, Mr. Speaker, in my speech I went a little too far, there is no doubt. I am not like the hon. gentleman, infallible. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has never ventured to say that the McCarthy Act is *ultra vires*. The hon. gentleman has never ventured to say we had no right to pass that Act; he has never ventured to say that Act, when brought into full operation, will not have the force of law. His friend, political and personal friend, I have no doubt, Mr Bethune, has given a very strong opinion on that matter, and I think my hon. friend—not in his political capacity, but in his professional capacity—especially if he has got a hint of the fee that my hon. friend, the mover of the Address spoke of, would keep to his opinion that at all events the McCarthy Act was constitutional, and was not *ultra vires*. I am quite satisfied the hon. gentleman will not get up without a fee, and say that it is not the law of the land. Well, the Hodge case, I have no hesitation in saying, is not the last word of the question. I have no hesitation in saying that the Privy Council, for some reasons known to those behind the scenes, from the absence of those hon. members of it who usually take up questions under the British North America Act, avoided a decision, and the decision was this: that the Ontario Government, first, could make by-laws and regulations for the regulation of licenses; and, second, if they could do that themselves they could give that power over to the municipalities. That is simply the decision, but it in no way affects the decision in Woodward and Russell; in no way affects the decision in the Scott Act; in no way affects the language used by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was sometimes a member and sometimes not a member; sometimes a supporter and sometimes not a supporter. In 1878, when they put this language into the mouth of the Governor General—"It is very desirable," those hon. gentlemen said: they wanted to get up some new cry, not to say it is expedient, or it is right, or it is just, but something new, and they said: "It is very desirable that there should be uniform legislation in all the Provinces respecting spirituous liquors." Hitherto that trade had been regulated by Provincial laws or laws existing before the Confederation of the Provinces, although there had been lately a conflict of authority as to the jurisdiction of the local authorities. That was the announcement made in 1878, in the Speech from the Throne, by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the same language

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

may be applied to the McCarthy Act, that it is expedient that there should be one general law for the traffic of liquors over the whole of the Dominion instead of its being as heretofore regulated by different Provincial laws. We are going to carry out exactly what the hon. gentleman in 1878 gave his support to. But the hon. gentleman says we ought to have put this in the Speech. Mr. Speaker, if it were proposed to put a clause in that we were going to repeal the McCarthy Act, then there would be some sense in it, but the Government has no such intention. The Government know, as far as infallible man can know, that it is the law of the land, that it is expedient there should be one general law, that it is of great importance for the well-being of the community that there should be one general law, and they will, *sub judice*, take the chance of the courts disagreeing with us. I do not think the hon. gentleman will say that the courts ought to disagree with us, and that we had not every right and competency to pass that Act; and as to the expediency I only quote their language against themselves, that it is expedient. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I have tired you, at all events, I have tired myself. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, had better not have said much about the county of Lennox. That is *sub judice*, and, perhaps the hon. gentleman will find that neither he nor those who would like to have the support of the hon. gentleman who sits for that county now, will be so proud of it if the courts have a chance to get to a trial of the question. As for the gentleman who now holds the seat in this House, all I can say is that I wish him no harm. I know him, I know his friends, and I believe he is a very kindly gentleman, a gentleman liked by his neighbours, popular, and justly popular, as shown by the strong vote he has got. But whether he is going to hold the seat from which I was obliged to unwillingly to vamoise, is a question for the courts. I think the hon. gentleman had better have avoided an allusion to that matter. It brings up other questions. I will venture to say this, that if we had a sworn commission to try the validity of the seats of every man in this House, small in number, though strong in ability as the present Opposition is, their number would be decreased and ours on this side would be increased. I have no doubt of that, and if it was seriously challenged I would not fear the test.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Try it over again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not want to lose my hon. friend. What would be the opposition from Lower Canada without my hon. friend? Why, the *rouge* flag would be paled, and those unfortunate degenerate *bleus* would be coming back here like a flock of sheep, not regulated, not controlled, not over-mastered by the great intellect, and the great *morale* of my hon. friend who wishes to have a new election. Now, my hon. friend in his speech wound up with an effective appeal to the hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada, saying, Take care if you desire Protection for your own institutions to see that the institutions of other Provinces are not attacked. Mr. Speaker, I went into Parliament in 1844, I became a Minister in 1854, and I have been supported by a French majority ever since that time. They have never failed me, and they have always had confidence in me, and I have, I believe, proved myself worthy of their confidence. Sir, I have suffered obloquy on their behalf; I have been attacked by those hon. gentlemen opposite in days gone by, when it was convenient for them to ride the Protestant horse, when they called me a slave to French influences, a slave to Romish influences, a slave to Lower Canada influences. It won't do, Mr. Speaker. All the blandishments of the hon. gentleman, if he put on twice the smiling countenance, and if he used twice the eloquent language that he has done and that he is able to do, will not make the people of the Province of Quebec believe that they are

safer in his hands than in the hands of John A. Macdonald.

Resolutions agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That the said resolutions be referred to a Select Committee composed of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Charles Tupper, and Messrs. Macmaster and Belleau.

Motion agreed to.

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

#### SUPPLY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

#### WAYS AND MEANS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved :

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

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 21st January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

The following Member, having previously taken the Oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took his seat in the House:—

Donald M. Cameron, Member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Middlesex, introduced by Mr. Blake and Mr. Fairbank.

#### REPORTS.

The following Reports were laid upon the Table:—

Annual Report of the hon. Minister of Public Works for the fiscal year 1882-83.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

The Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1883.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Report of the Auditor-General of Canada for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1883.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Report, Returns, and Statistics of the Inland Revenue of the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1883.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ending 30th June, 1883.—(Mr. Bowell.)

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

#### LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an agreement made at Victoria, on the 20th day of August, 1883, relative to various points remaining unsettled between the Government of the Dominion, and that of the Province, together with the contract for the

construction of a Railway on the Island of Vancouver, and accompanying papers, and recommends the same to the favourable consideration of your Honourable House.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
OTTAWA, 17th January, 1884.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 2) to amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting Offences against the Person.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Bill (No. 3) to further amend the Law of Evidence in criminal cases.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Bill (No. 4) respecting Carriers by Land.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

#### LAND AGENT FOR CALGARY SECTION.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) enquired, Whether a Dominion Land Agent has been appointed for the Calgary section of the North-West? If so, when? His name, former residence and occupation; amount of salary; when did salary commence; where is his head office located; has he entered on the discharge of his duties? If so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. William H. Hillyard, of Brandon, Manitoba, was appointed by Order in Council on the 23rd June, 1883, at a salary of \$1,200 per annum. His head office will be at Calgary according to present arrangements; he has not entered upon the discharge of his duties because the surveys were not sufficiently completed to enable him to do so. Since the beginning of September he has been at work at the Brandon Land Office, and from that period his salary commenced to be paid.

#### LAND AGENT FOR ASSINIBOIA.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) enquired, Whether a Dominion Land Agent has been appointed, with his head office at Troy, or at any other point in Assiniboia? If such an appointment has been made, when was it made; what is the name of the appointee; his former residence and occupation; where is the office now located; what is the Agent's salary; when did it commence; has the Agent entered on the discharge of his duties? If so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Dominion Land Agent has not been appointed with his head office at Troy. An Agent has been appointed for the Regina district with his head office at Regina city. The Agent's name is J. Macdonald Gordon. He was appointed in March, 1882, at which time he was residing in Ottawa, and occupying the position of a clerk in the Department of the Interior. He opened an office in a tent for a time at Troy, but since a building was prepared he removed to his present quarters. His salary is \$1,200 per annum, and dates from the 1st of May, 1882. He entered on the discharge of his duties in the early part of June, 1882.

#### SALE OF SUPPLY FARM No. 20.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) enquired, Whether Supply Farm No. 20, on Fish Creek, near Calgary, has been sold; when, to whom, and for what price, and whether by private sale or public competition?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Supply Farm No. 20 has been sold to the Hon. Dr. Robitaille at a price of \$3 per acre, by private sale, and not by public competition.

## STATEMENT OF IMPORTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the absence of Mr. Burpee, of St. John, I wish to move for a return similar to that which has been moved for by that hon. gentleman on two or three occasions,—a summary statement, similar to No. 2 in the Trade and Navigation Returns, of the goods imported for consumption, dutiable and free, in the Dominion of Canada, the amount of duty collected, and the rates of duty levied thereon, during the six months ending 31st December, 1883; also, a similar statement to No. 5, in the Trade and Navigation Returns, of the goods the produce and manufacture of Canada, exported from the Dominion of Canada for the six months ending 31st December, 1883. This, I think, has been regularly moved for and obtained during the last year or two.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the motion is carried, I would say to the hon. gentleman that some little time, as he well knows, must elapse before it will be possible to make out the desired return. We have to wait for all the papers from the different Provinces, and as the hon. gentleman very properly remarked in introducing the motion, the same resolution has been passed almost every Session for the last four or five years. But we have never been able to prepare the return and bring it down before the end of the Session, so that really it has been of very little use for the purposes to which it could be applied during the Session. I will, however, if possible, have the return brought down this Session at an earlier period, and see that it is made out with all possible despatch, but the hon. gentleman must not expect it for some weeks.

Motion agreed to.

## STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That a Special Committee of seven Members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday, the 17th instant, and that Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Hector Langevin, Messrs. Blake, do compose the said Committee.

Mr. BLAKE asked that Messrs. Cartwright and Vail's names be substituted for Messrs Mackenzie and Laurier.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

## OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. BOWELL moved:

That a Select Committee, comprising Messrs. Béchard, Bergin, Charlton, Colby, Desjardins, McDonald (Cape Breton), Scriver, Somerville and White (Gardwell), be a Committee to supervise the Official Report of the Debates during the present Session.

Motion agreed to.

## RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

A duly certified copy of the complaint or petition of Eugène Gosselin, of St. Charles de Bellechasse, farmer, presented to the Dominion Arbitrators; also of all the record of proceedings before the said Arbitrators, including all evidence, accounts, protests and judgment in the said case and forming part of the said record.—(Mr. Amyot.)

A duly certified copy of the complaint or petition of Louis Chabot, of St. Charles de Bellechasse, farmer, presented to the Dominion Arbitrators; also of all the record of proceedings before the said Arbitrators, including the evidence, accounts, protests and judgment in the said case and forming part of the said record.—(Mr. Amyot.)

A duly certified copy of the complaint or petition of Charles Chabot, of St. Charles de Bellechasse, farmer, presented to the Dominion Arbitrators; also of all the record of proceedings before the said Arbitrators, including all evidence, accounts, protests and judgment in the said case and forming part of the said record.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

presented to the Dominion Arbitrators; also of all the record of proceedings before the said Arbitrators, including the evidence, accounts, protests and judgment in the said case and forming part of the said record.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Return of the Receipts and Expenditure in detail, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, from the first day of July, 1882, to the 20th day of January, 1883, and from the 1st day of July, 1883, to the 20th day of January, 1884.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return in the form used in the statements usually published in the *Gazette*, of the exports and imports from the 1st day of July, 1882, to the 1st day of January, 1883, and from the 1st day of July, 1883, to the 1st day of January, 1884, distinguishing the products of Canada and those of other countries.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Statement showing the amount of Government money on deposit on the 1st day of January, 1884, whether in Canada or elsewhere, together with the names of the Banks where in the said moneys are deposited, with the amount in each Bank respectively; also the amount at interest and the rate of interest, if any, allowed on the said deposits in each case.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return showing (approximately) the number of immigrants who are supposed to have settled in the Province of Ontario in the years 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882 and 1883, respectively.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 3:45 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 22nd January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 5) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the elections of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Bill (No. 6) to provide for the punishment of seduction and like offences.—(Mr. Charlton.)

## MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman opposite has asked me to give an explanation of the Ministerial changes which have taken place since last Session. The only change which has taken place is this: The Hon. Mr. Macpherson, who was Speaker of the Upper House and a member of the Government, resigned his Speakership and was appointed Minister of the Interior in my place, I taking the office of President of the Council. There is a change in the administration of the Department of the Interior in this regard: that the Indian Department, instead of being under the charge of the Minister, is now under the charge of the President of the Council, myself. The Mounted Police Branch which is connected with the Indian Department, is also transferred to the Department of the President of the Council under the Statute. The Hon. Mr. Macpherson is now Minister of the Interior, and I am President of the Council and Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has thought fit to disassociate himself from the very heavy office, adequately filled, of Minister of the Interior. I think that all of us who have been for some years in Parliament must have felt convinced that the office of First Minister is quite sufficiently exacting in itself without the addition to it of extremely onerous departmental duties, and that the necessary result of such addition is that one or other of the functions of the person filling that position must be more or less neglected. I hope that in the comparatively smaller sphere of departmental duties to which the hon. gentleman is now devoting himself, he will find it possible to administer with more successful result; in point of economy, at any rate, the Indian Department. We all know the mode in which our expenses have swelled for some years in that Department, and I look with some degree of hope to the exercise of greater economy in that branch now that the hon. gentleman is no longer embarrassed with the nominal, if not actual, control of the Ministry of Interior. But, while I say so much in approval of the course the hon. gentleman has wisely taken, I must renew the suggestion I have made once or twice with reference to Ministerial changes that have taken place under this Administration. The work of the Department of the Interior has very much to do with the revenue of the country, and is very largely of an executive and administrative character, in respect of which there ought to be the most immediate and active responsibility as between the Minister and the Commons. It is a description of work in which, particularly as the hon. gentleman has moulded and executed the Statutes, we have mainly but the privilege of obtaining information and of criticising the administration; but it is also important that should be done with the Minister in this House. It seems, therefore, unfortunate, that this important Department should have been transferred from this House to the other Chamber. The hon. gentleman has said that this is the only Ministerial change, and therefore, I presume, he thinks—and I do not intend to object to his mode of viewing the subject in that regard—that it is not fitting, under an enquiry as to Ministerial changes, to make any explanation with reference to the anomalous conjunction of offices witnessed since last Session in respect of his colleague sitting beside him; and I suppose it is in some other form we must ask explanations that are due this House and the country in that respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the Indian Department I can only say I will give it the same attention I have given it hitherto. The House knows perfectly well, or they did not listen to the remarks and lucid explanations I have made on many occasions in other circumstances, that the expenses of the Indian Department were necessarily very great. The Indians were thrown on the Treasury in a destitute condition, and we could not allow them to starve; but I am glad to say, in the language of the Speech, that the reports this year are most satisfactory. The Indians have confined themselves to the reserve, and if they have not been as energetic as white men, they have made and are making rapid progress towards self-maintenance, which means a very considerable reduction in the annual expenditure. With respect to the Department of the Interior I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the office of First Minister, extending over all the Departments, involves so many miscellaneous duties, it is important that he should be free from heavy departmental work. In 1878, when I took the two offices of First Minister and Minister of the Interior, the reason I did so was that the country was going to be the scene of large operations, and that some system had to be laid down for immigration, settlement of the new population, and opening up of the North-West generally; and this involved large principles and a vast policy for which the First

Minister must be held primarily responsible. For that reason I accepted the double duty. Subsequently, when the work became more distinctly departmental, I obtained the able assistance of the Speaker of the Upper House, who relieved me in a most disinterested way of the excessive pressure of work, and he, with his usual thoroughness, has become thoroughly acquainted with the business of the North-West and the Department. It is true it would be well if arrangements could be made for the Minister to be here, but the next best thing has been done; all my present colleagues being actively employed in their Departments. Having initiated in a considerable degree the policy of the North-West, being acquainted with it, I shall be here as First Minister, taking the responsibility of meeting the House on all matters connected with the Department of the Interior, and I hope I shall receive—I do not ask the confidence—but the support on all proper occasions of my hon. friend opposite. With respect to the fact that the hon. Minister of Railways is acting just now as High Commissioner, I have no occasion to allude to that. That is not a Ministerial change. If any discussion is to arise on that point, both he and I had better wait until the subject is brought properly before the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I was going to congratulate my hon. friend on the promptness he has shown in calling us together early in the Session so that we might be able to adjourn by Easter; but if we begin at this rate of despatch I will have to withdraw my compliment. There are numerous subjects to which the attention of the Government might be directed at once, for instance the Bothwell or the Megantic elections, or the Government might show the same interest towards the other Provinces that they displayed last Session towards Ontario, when they devoted six weeks to the Ontario elections, by giving their attention to the state of affairs existing in Quebec. There are many other subjects, in fact, which we might discuss. Take, for instance, the Shields matter, and many other subjects which I could suggest. I will furnish any number to my hon. friend opposite, in order that he may set us to work. For my own part I am ready to work. I speak on my own account only, and, rather than adjourn now, I propose that we should do something on any kind of subject that the hon. gentleman might bring forward, and I would take in preference the Shields matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman should move that we do something.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I was taken by surprise; I never anticipated this.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be a new step in the hon. gentleman's career, that we should do something. He has not yet succeeded in doing anything, and, if he wants to do something now, let him move. I shall move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to; and (at 3:45 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 23rd January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, from the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees, ordered by the House on the 17th instant, reported lists as follows:—

## No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

## Messieurs

Abbott,	Daly,	McIsaac,
Amyot,	Davies,	Ouimet,
Belleau,	Desjardins,	Patterson (Essex),
Blake,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bossé,	Laurier,	Royal,
Cameron (Huron),	Lister,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Victoria),	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper (Pictou),
Casgrain,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
Colby,	Macmaster,	Wells,
Costigan,	McCarthy,	White (Cardwell) and
Curran,	McIntyre,	Woodworth.—3.

## No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

## Messieurs

Allison (Lennox),	Coughlin,	Labrosse,
Armstrong,	Daoust,	McIntyre,
Bain (Soulanges),	De St. Georges,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Benson,	Desaulniers,	Paint,
Billy,	Dodd,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Inverness),	Fréchette,	Robertson (Hastings),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Guillet,	Tyrwhitt,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hackett,	Valin,
Casey,	Harley,	Wheler and
Cochrane,	Hesson,	Yeo.—30.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

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

## Messieurs

Abbott,	Ferguson (Welland),	Orton,
Allen,	Fisher,	Ouimet,
Amyot,	Fortin,	Paint,
Bain (Soulanges),	Fortin,	Patterson (Essex),
Bain (Wentworth),	Foster,	Pope,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gault,	Ray,
Barnard,	Geoffrion,	Riopel,
Beaty,	Girouard,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Béchar, d,	Glen,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bell,	Gordon,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Belleau,	Haggart,	Ross,
Benoit,	Hall,	Royal,
Bergeron,	Hawkins,	Rykert,
Bergin,	Hay,	Scott,
Bernier,	Hickey,	Scriver,
Blake,	Hilliard,	Small,
Blondeau,	Holton,	Sproule,
Bolduc,	Irvine,	Stairs,
Bossé,	Ives,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Bourassa,	Kilvert,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Bryson,	King,	Tassé,
Burns,	Kinney,	Thompson,
Burpee (St. John),	Landry (Kent),	Tilley (Sir Leonard),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Landry (Montmagny),	Trow,
Cameron (Huron),	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tupper (Pictou),
Cameron (Inverness),	Laurier,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Cameron (Victoria),	Livingstone,	Vail,
Carling,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Valin,
Caron,	Macdonald (Cape Breton),	Vanasse,
Casey,	Mackenzie,	Wallace (Albert),
Casgrain,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Chapleau,	Macmaster,	Watson,
Charlton,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Weldon,
Cockburn,	McCallum,	Wells,
Colby,	McCarthy,	Wheler,
Cook,	McCraney,	White (Cardwell),
Costigan,	McDougald,	White (Hastings),
Coursol,	McGreavy,	White (Renfrew),
Curran,	McIntyre,	Wigle,
Davies,	McIsaac,	Williams,
Dawson,	McLelan,	Wilson,
De St. Georges,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville),
Desjardins,	McMullen,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	Méthot,	Woodworth and
Dundas,	Mitchell,	Wright.—137.
Fairbank,	Mulock,	

## No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

## Messieurs

Allen,	Geoffrion,	Méthot,
Allison (Hants),	Gillmor,	Montplaisir,
Amyot,	Girouard,	Mulock,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Glen,	Ouimet,
Bell,	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Benson,	Hawkins,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Hay,	Reid,
Brechen,	Hickey,	Robertson (Shelburne),

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Burns,	Holton,	Scriver,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Homer,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Ives,	Springer,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Casey,	Kinney,	Stairs,
Catdral,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Cockburn,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Cuthbert,	Landry (Kent),	Thompson,
Daoust,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper (Pictou),
Desaulniers,	Laurier,	Vanasse,
Dodd,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Farrow,	Lister,	Weldon,
Fleming,	Macmaster,	Wells,
Foster,	Massue,	Wheler and
Fréchette,	McIsaac,	Wright.—71.
Gagné,	McMullen,	

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

## No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

## Messieurs

Auger,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Welland),	Livingstone,
Baker (Victoria),	Gault,	Macdonald (King's),
Beaty,	Gigault,	McDonald (Cape Breton),
Bergeron,	Gillmor,	Macmillan (Middlesex),
Bourbeau,	Gordon,	Massue,
Burnham,	Grandbois,	Méthot,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Gunn,	Moffat,
Casgrain,	Hackett,	O'Brien,
Coughlin,	Houde,	Paterson (Brant),
Dawson,	Hurteau,	Paterson (Essex),
De St. Georges,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Dodd,	Irvine,	Sutherland (Oxford) and
Dundas,	Jackson,	Wood (Brockville).—14.
Dupont,	Kaubach,	

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

## No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

## Messieurs

Baker (Missisquoi),	Foster,	Somerville (Brant),
Bergin,	Houde,	Tassé,
Bourassa,	Innes,	Thompson,
Bowell,	Landry (Montmagny),	Trow and
Desjardins,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Cardwell)—15.

## No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

## Messieurs

Baker (Victoria),	Farrow,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Béchar, d,	Ferguson (Welland),	Rykert,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Scriver,
Bergin,	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Blake,	Ives,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Bolduc,	Kilvert,	Tilley (Sir Leonard),
Bowell,	King,	Tupper (Pictou),
Brechen,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Burpee (St. John),	Mackenzie,	Vail,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Massue,	White (Cardwell),
Charlton,	McDougald,	White (Hastings),
Colby,	McLelan,	White (Renfrew),
Costigan,	Mulock,	Wood (Brockville) and
Coursol,	Pope,	Wood (Westmoreland)
Davies,	Rinfret,	—46.
Desaulniers,	Riopel,	

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Nine Members.

## No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

## Messieurs

Abbott,	Dundas,	McCallum,
Allison (Hants),	Dupont,	McCarthy,
Allison (Lennox),	Fairbank,	McDougald,
Béchar, d,	Fleming,	McGreavy,
Bernier,	Forbes,	McMullen,
Blake,	Fortin,	McNeill,
Bossé,	Gault,	Mitchell,
Bourbeau,	Gigault,	Moffat,
Bowell,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Bryson,	Guillet,	Orton,
Burnham,	Gunn,	Ouimet,
Burpee (St. John),	Hackett,	Paterson (Brant),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Haggart,	Platt,
Cameron (Huron),	Hall,	Reid,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hesson,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Cameron (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Rykert,
Campbell (Victoria),	Houde,	Scott,
Carling,	Innes,	Scriver,

Cartwright (Sir Richard)	Jives,	Shakespeare,
Casgrain,	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Catudal,	Jamieson,	Sutherland (Orford),
Charlton,	Kaulbach,	Tilley (Sir Leonard),
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Vail,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Vanasse,
Cook,	Kirk,	Wallace (York),
Coursol,	Kranz,	Weldon,
Curran,	Landerkin,	White (Cardwell),
Outhbert,	Lesage,	White (Renfrew),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Williams,
Davies,	Macdonald (King's),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dawson,	Mackenzie,	Wright and
Desjardins,	Mackintosh,	Yeo—100.
Dickinson,	Macmaster,	
Dugas,	Massue,	

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Nine Members.

#### No. 9.—ON IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Allen,	Dawson,	McNeill,
Allison (Hants),	Dickinson,	Montplaisir,
Allison (Lennox),	Dugas,	Orton,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Farrow,	Pinsonneault,
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Platt,
Baker (Victoria),	Fisher,	Pope,
Barnard,	Fortin,	Ray,
Béchar, d,	Gagné,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bell,	Grandbois,	Ross,
Benoit,	Guilbault,	Royal,
Billy,	Harley,	Scott,
Blondeau,	Hawkins,	Somerville (Bruce),
Bolduc,	Hay,	Springer,
Bourassa,	Hesson,	Sproule,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Burnham,	Homer,	Taylor,
Burns,	Houde,	Trow,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hurteau,	Tyrwhitt,
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Watson,
Catudal,	Kirk,	White (Hastings),
Chapleau,	Kranz,	White (Renfrew),
Cimon,	Labrosse,	Wigle,
Cochrane,	Landry (Kent),	Wilson,
Cockburn,	Mackintosh,	Woodworth,
Coughlin,	McCraney,	Wright and
Daly,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Yeo.—81.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Nine Members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the said report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

#### RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to lay before the House a statement of the receipts and disbursements of the Accountant of the House of Commons, for the year ending 30th June, 1883.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Blake, Bracken, Cameron (Huron), Colby, Daly, Davies, Desjardins, Fortin, Houde, Laurier, Ouimet, Scriver, Tassé, Weldon, Wells, and Wright, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this the same as last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate, requesting that their Honours will unite with this House in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, namely, Messrs. Baker (Missisquoi), Bergin, Bourassa, Bowell, Desjardins, Foster, Houde, Innes, Landry (Montmagny), McDonald (Cape Breton), Somerville (Brant), Tassé, Thompson, Trow, and White (Cardwell), will act as members, on the part of this House, of the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is passed, I would like to make a suggestion to the hon. the First Minister. I think that Committee, if I remember aright, regulates the number of copies of our Sessional Papers that are issued in the year; at least, that is my recollection. The matter is one which, I think, would commend itself to him, and probably to most of us. I would suggest that, in future, we adopt the rule which I understand is adopted in England, that all gentlemen who happen to have been members of this House, and who choose to apply after leaving this House, or being unable to regain seats in this House, should have the various Sessional Papers sent to them,—should have that privilege on application. My attention was called to the matter during the last year. I had no cause to complain in my own instance, as my friends kept me admirably supplied with the Sessional Papers; but I know that many gentlemen who have been members of this House have made collections of these papers, and would like, without troubling their friends, to have them sent to them from year to year; and it would not add much to our expenditure in this direction if this were done only on application, as some gentlemen do not care to have them. I think it would be a very proper courtesy to extend to gentlemen who have had the honour of being members of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a suggestion worthy of all consideration, and I would commend it to the best attention of the Committee on Printing, when they meet.

Motion agreed to.

#### ELECTORAL FRANCHISE BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, by the consent of the House, in order to expedite business, I will move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) respecting the Electoral Franchise. The Bill is substantially the same as that of last Session, and will be distributed as soon as possible.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the amendments are too trivial to deserve detailed mention on this occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are not so important as to warrant me in taking up the time of the House in a long discussion.

Bill read the first time.

#### BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced—and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 8) for constituting a Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

#### INDIAN AGENT AT PENETANGUISHENE.

Mr. COOK enquired, Whether any Indian Agent has been appointed at Penetanguishene? If so, when, his name in full, amount of salary, when did salary commence, and what is the extent of his district?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; an Agent was appointed by Order in Council of the 31st of January, 1883; his name is Henry Horace Thompson; the salary is \$500 per annum; payment of the salary commenced on the 21st March, 1883, when Mr. Thompson commenced his duties; the Agency embraces the Christian Islands in the Georgian Bay.

#### INSPECTION OF NEWFOUNDLAND HERBING.

Mr. FORTIN, moved for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of

Newfoundland, and between the former and some fish merchants or others on the subject of the inspection in Canada of Newfoundland pickled herring, imported into Canada; statements showing the quantity of Newfoundland herring imported in different ports of Canada, in 1883, the number of barrels and half-barrels of the said fish that have been submitted to our official inspection, and the result of such inspection. He said: Before putting the motion, I would like to address a few remarks to the House. I put this motion on the paper a few days ago and as it happened to stand alone on the Order paper it was remarked outside the House that it was a very small affair. Well, from one point of view it is a very small affair. I dare say, if I had spoken of salmon, trout, or of fly fishing, or of something relating to sport, many people perhaps would have been pleased. But, Sir, the herring fishery, from a commercial point of view, and from an economical point of view, if not from a political point of view, is of very great importance. History is a great mentor and tutor, and I will recall some facts of history. Some centuries ago, the famous Dutch Admiral Van Tromp swept the British channel, and dictated peace to the English; and Ruyter and other Dutch Admirals, for a century, had command of the sea. And who had they on board their vessels as seamen? Herring fishermen, and no one else, and they were recognized to be the best seamen in the world. It is well known that the herring fisheries of Holland gave to that country the mastery of the sea for centuries—not because of that particular branch of trade, but because the famous Dutchman, Beukels, had discovered a means of preserving herring by pickling them. At first sight this would not seem to be of much account. But, Sir, let me remind you that it created a revolution in the herring trade; let me remind this House that the great Charles V, the great King of Spain, and great Emperor of Germany, when he visited Holland, expressed his opinion that Beukels, who discovered this process of pickling herring, was one of the greatest benefactors of humanity; and he did not consider it beneath him to go and pay his respects at his tomb. Now these poor, humble, herring fishermen on our coasts and bays are well worthy of our attention. When we look at the statistics we find that in Norway no less than 750,000 barrels of herring are taken annually. In Scotland there are about as much more, that is to say 1,500,000 barrels of herring for the two countries, being equal to 300,000,000 lbs. of food. If we look at Canadian statistics we find there were taken last year on our coasts, 193,361 barrels of herring, that were pickled; 159,505 boxes of smoked herring, and 2,800 boxes of frozen herring, worth altogether over \$800,000. These figures prove that herring is a very important factor in the fisheries of this country, and the Government, having introduced the National Policy, is bound to protect and develop that industry as much as possible—as much as any other industry or branch of manufacture. Well, I had the honour to speak in this House several times in regard to the inspection of herring. The inspection of herring not only enables the buyer to know what he is buying, but it obliges the fishermen to do their very best to have good fish, and, as a consequence, to get a better price for their fish. When I spoke in this House on a former occasion it was to ask the Government to repeal a law passed by the Free Trade Government, in 1874, which permitted Newfoundland herring to come into this country, not only free of duty, but free of inspection, whilst our herring was obliged to be inspected. We know that the inspection of herring in Canada costs from 20 to 40 cents a barrel. Now we know that inspected herring cannot be all classed as No. 1; sometimes it is classed as No. 2, or 3, or even less than that—and it is not always because the fishermen did not do their duty by the fish, but because the fish was small, not fat enough, or fresh enough. Sometimes the captain of the vessel which carried these bar-

Mr. FORTIN.

rels did not take proper care of them, and the pickle was lost, and the fish damaged. That law not only allowed these Newfoundland herring to come in free of the Canadian inspection, but it obliged our own inspectors to give it a certain character. They were obliged to stamp it Newfoundland, so that Newfoundland herring which came to this country to the extent of from 15,000 to 30,000 barrels every year, and bearing the mark of the Newfoundland inspection and all stamped No. 1, were sold as No. 1. The buyers in the western Provinces not only bought it as No. 1, but paid for it as such, while our own herring had to be inspected; and as a great many barrels could not rank higher than No. 2, our fishermen lost that way \$1 a barrel, the difference of price between No. 1 and No. 2 herring, while the Newfoundland herring all sold as No. 1. Well, this state of things constituted a grievance, and the matter was brought before the House. It was sometime before our fishermen got redress, but they did get it. A law was passed which went into effect last spring, by which Newfoundland herring were submitted to the same inspection as our own—there was not the slightest difference. The Newfoundland fishermen and merchants pretended that their herring was inspected in Newfoundland; but our fishermen said their inspection was a fraud, and we proved that it was a fraud. During five or six years the Newfoundland merchants and fishermen were able to take advantage of that fraud, and to do great injury to our herring trade; and I know for a fact that several vessels, and a great many fishermen, went out of the trade. Formerly the Montreal market was supplied by Labrador herring, and by herring taken by people on the Magdalen Islands, or on the north shore, which state of things continued until they were driven out of the market by the Newfoundland herring. I will now give the House figures to prove that the Canadian herring trade has been protected to our fishermen by the recent Act. As I stated before, Newfoundland fish was inspected by the official inspectors of that colony; but as I mentioned in the speech last year, and also two years ago, any man could get a commission as inspector in Newfoundland—the captain of a vessel, the fisherman himself, and, of course, when he inspected his own fish, he marked them all No. 1. The fish came into Canada and were passed by the law of 1874. The new law was proclaimed in the month of June, 1883, and about 35,000 barrels of herring from Newfoundland came into Quebec and Montreal last fall. Some were inspected, not all, and I will give the House a statement of the result. I will begin with Quebec, to which only one cargo came. Here is the statement given by the inspector himself:

“Statement relating to the inspection of Newfoundland herring imported at Quebec, in 1883, by H. Grenier, Inspector of Fish and Oil, at Quebec.”

Only one lot was imported in that port by Mr. G. Patterson. All the barrels and half barrels were officially inspected in Newfoundland and were all stamped as No. 1 herring. The lot was composed of 1,226 barrels and 75 half barrels, and the result of the inspection was the following:—

“No No. 1 herring were found.”

No. 2.		No. 3.		Rusty.		Sour.		Total.
Brls.	½ Brls.	Brls.	½ Brls.	Brls.	½ Brls.	Brls.	½ Brls.	
840	45	163	17	218	13	5	0	1,301

The inspector examined the barrels in the same way as he inspected Canadian herring, with the result I have described. A large lot came to Montreal. The following is the statement:—

"34,283 barrels and 2,617 half barrels of herring were imported into the Port of Montreal in 1883, all bearing the official inspection of Newfoundland, and all stamped No. 1 herring. Of these 18,435 barrels and 2,061 half barrels were inspected, and the following is the result :

No. 1.		No. 2.		No. 3.		Rusty.		Rotten.		Empty.		Small.	
B.	½ B.	B.	½ B.	B.	½ B.	B.	½ B.						
557	117	14912	1695	1,572	137	456	40	26	3	165	18	717	51.

These facts, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the fishermen, prove that justice at last has been obtained at last for our fishermen. Look at the state of affairs before this Act came into operation this spring. Our fishermen supported the National Policy, and they think many things are very high. On the other hand, the Government must give to all industries the protection they require. I do not hide my opinion; I never did. I would not have gone for protection alone, but I supported the National Policy. Our fishermen, I say, have supported the National Policy. The fishermen of Newfoundland have no National Policy. The fiscal laws there are only to collect a revenue sufficient for the Government needs, and consequently the people can live cheaper than we do. The Liberal Government, in 1874,—and it was a Free Trade Government acting according to their ideas—allowed Newfoundland fish to come into the Dominion, not only without paying duty, but without inspection; and, of course, plenty of herring came in, but it was Newfoundland herring. Our fishermen were thereby placed in an unfair position, because the market was glutted with Newfoundland fish. But this year buyers found the Newfoundland fish so bad, that they gave large orders for Canadian herring, and several cargoes of Canso herring, which is properly inspected, were imported into Montreal. If a merchant wants No. 1. or No. 2, he can order it, and he is sure of getting it now. This is the result of the Government measure. I approve of it, and the fishermen also approve of it, and I, and they, hope the Government will stick to their policy. I know there are merchants, especially commission merchants, who would like to see that law revoked, because a commission merchant is essentially a Free Trader. The more barrels of fish that pass through his hands, the more money he makes; he does not care much about our fishermen. I emphatically say that all those who have studied this matter—and all the fishermen—endorse the Government's measure, and hope they will stick to it. In making this request we do not ask much. At the present time Newfoundland levies a pretty heavy duty on flour and other products sent from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and other parts of the Dominion. The only product they can send here is fish. They say: "We allow Canadian fish to come in Newfoundland duty free." But to send fish there would be like sending coals to Newcastle. So I hope the Government will maintain the attitude they have taken, and do something in other directions—to aid the fishermen and give them means to live and properly support their families in this country. Let me add these few words. There is in no other part of the world a fishing population so hardy and patriotic as is the Maritime population of Canada, and it is matter for regret that at the present day many of them have to resort to the neighbouring country to get their living. I regret to have to state that such is the case, although so many do not go as is represented. Let the Government not only protect the herring trade, but promote, in every possible way, the fishing industry, so as to furnish employment to our people.

Mr. KAULBACH. The position in which we in this Dominion have been placed in respect to the article of pickled fish in packages coming from Newfoundland, has

been a source of serious dissatisfaction for some time to our fishing industry, fishermen, and fish traders; and it is very desirable, in the interest of the Maritime Provinces, that all Newfoundland pickled fish, imported into this Dominion, should be subjected to the same laws and regulations as respects our own catch—whether they had been inspected previously in Newfoundland or otherwise; or, in other words, that they should undergo inspection. This is necessary, otherwise the imperfect inspection of the imported article would interfere materially with our own prices at home, and when re-shipped and competing in a foreign market with our own, would naturally tend to very injuriously affect the price of our fish, notwithstanding our own being a genuine and better article. Apart from the reasons thus advanced, one would naturally ask what reasonable right have we to admit their fish into our ports free of inspection, when they tax us in the shape of duty upon every article of produce we transmit to them from our shores. It will be remembered that, under the Mackenzie Government, pickled fish was imported free of inspection and free of duty as well. Whilst speaking of the inconveniences from the importation of uninspected pickled fish from Newfoundland, I would ask this House if it would not be advisable to legislate also on the article of dried fish imported into this Dominion from that island, and have it subjected to an inspection as well; my object being to limit or lessen the importation of the article to our own ports, and thus to a certain extent protect the prices of our own in our home markets. Last year Newfoundland exported largely to the port of Lunenburg—a part of the constituency I have the honour to represent—and which materially reduced the prices of the article in our own market to the sacrifice of our poor fishermen. I might say, whilst on my feet, that I made a request in the last Session of the last Parliament, or the Session that I last attended, for a fish bounty to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. And I made an appeal to-day that the sum for distribution be increased. I feel satisfied that as the Government accorded me the request in the first instance when I asked it, they will treat me similarly in this case, and thus confer on the hard worked sons of toil, the fishermen, subjected as they are to so many risks and privations, a right as well as a benefit they so richly deserve.

Motion agreed to.

#### TREATISES ON AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY.

Mr. GIGAULT, (Translation) in moving for copies of all "petitions to the Minister of Agriculture, praying that prizes be awarded for the best essays, treatises or other literary works on agricultural industry and mechanical arts, and that pamphlets and essays on agricultural industry and mechanical arts be circulated among the farmers and artisans, said: Mr. Speaker, it is an acknowledged fact that the existence of our agricultural schools has had a good deal to do with the improvement of the art of agriculture in this country; but, unfortunately, only a very limited number of students are admitted to these institutions. Could we not—ought we not to generalize, to a larger extent, the study of the agricultural science? Such is the question which I submit to the House, and which, owing to its importance, I should like to have discussed by others better able than I am to do it justice. In 1876, the French Government ordered an investigation to be made on the state and wants of agriculture. Information was gathered in foreign countries, and it was found that wherever agricultural science had been diffused, agricultural industry had progressed in proportion to the diffusion of that science. In fact, it is to be remarked that all the most enlightened Governments of Europe are trying to propagate this science. Thus, it is seen that in Germany there are 158 agricultural academies and 55 experimental farms. The managers of these farms distribute among the farmers, reports of all the experiments made on such farms,

In Austria, we find 69 agricultural schools; in France, 3 colleges; in Scotland 43 agricultural schools. This last-named country is the most advanced in agriculture, and a publicist rightly says that in the most humble college in Scotland, you will find a treatise on agriculture, and that the Scotch farmer owes to the fact of his reading such essays, the skill which he displays in his agricultural pursuit. In the United States there are to be found 32 agricultural colleges besides several model farms. In 1862, the American Congress, which occupies a position somewhat similar to that of the Federal Government in Canada, passed a Bill granting about 9,000,000 acres of land to the different States in the Union, on condition that each State should establish a mechanical or an agricultural college. As everybody knows, a board has been established in Washington to gather every information and take cognizance of every new discovery relating to agriculture. In Massachusetts a similar board exists, and it is so with several other States in the Union; and the French Consul in his report, made in 1867, to the agricultural investigation held in France, said that the diffusion of agricultural science in the United States had had a great deal to do with the improvement and increase of the agricultural production in the United States; and he remarked that this increase in the agricultural production was felt, not only in the western States, but also in the eastern States, where farming has been going on for many long years. Could not the Federal Government lend a helping hand to the Local Governments to propagate agricultural knowledge? I do not wish to say that agriculture has made no progress in this country; in fact, if I ventured to make such an assertion, statistics and facts would contradict me. Our agriculture has been enriched by the cheese industry, which has wrought a very happy transformation in our mode of culture. In fact, in 1867, we only exported cheese to the amount of \$193,554; in 1871, our export of this commodity amounted to \$1,109,906 and in 1881 it amounted to \$5,510,443. Now if we examine our exportation of farm produce we find also that the increase of the agricultural production has been a great deal more rapid than the increase of the population and of the acreage of farms improved and tilled in the country. In 1871 our exportation of farm produce only amounted to \$22,436,071; in 1881, ten years later, it amounted to \$42,628,546. If we refer to the census which was taken in 1871 and 1881, we find that the total number of acres of improved land in Canada was, in 1871, 17,336,288 acres, and in 1881, 21,899,181 acres, or an increase of a little more than one-fourth, while our agricultural production has more than doubled during that period of ten years. Our Local Governments have done a good deal towards the improvement of agriculture by circulating agricultural newspapers and also by giving subsidies to schools; but, owing to their limited pecuniary means, I think that they have not done all that could have been done to promote to a larger extent the improvement of agriculture, I think that our Federal Government might do well to imitate the American Congress and to annex a Board of Agriculture to the Department of Agriculture. The direction of that Board might be put into the hands of our best agriculturalists, who would gather the information and distribute reports giving the new inventions and all information, generally, considered by them as useful to promote greater improvement in the system of culture heretofore followed in the country. Far from me the idea of pretending, Mr. Speaker, that theory alone will make good farmers, I say that skill in agriculture, as in any other calling, lies in a combination of practice and theory. I know that a theorist, having no knowledge or practice, is greatly inferior to a practitioner without theory. But on the other hand, it seems to me that the Government, by putting at the disposal of our farmers all the resources of modern science, would furnish to the farming community

M. GIGAULT.

the means of giving back to the soil, exhausted as it often is, the elements of fertility of which it has been deprived by a production often too active, or by exhausting crops. It has been proved, Mr. Speaker, that often, and I may say always, the fate of the merchant or of the manufacturer is intimately connected with the success or reverses of the farming community. The crops have hardly sprouted from the ground, when both the merchant and manufacturer are figuring on the prospect of the yield; and according to the appearance of the crop, according to the hopes of the farmer, the merchant regulates his importations, and the manufacturer the production of his manufacture. Thus it is shown, that the interests of agriculture are the first of social interests. Thus it is clearly proved that agriculture is the basis of public prosperity, and when we find that to be the case, it seems to me that we ought not to be afraid to sacrifice something in order to improve the condition of those who till the land. The present Government has certainly done much for agriculture by favouring the construction of railways. By so doing, they have given to farmers great facilities for the sale of their products. They have, moreover, encouraged agriculture by the fostering of our industries, and by so doing they have given to the farming community a greater number of buyers and consumers; but it seems to me that they might crown this very patriotic policy by encouraging, in a larger measure, the diffusion of agricultural science. While discussing this question, let us not forget that four-fifths of our population belong to the farming class; that our agricultural resources are immense, and that to be developed they only want strong arms and intelligent labour to largely increase our public wealth. Mr. Speaker, the idea to which I now give expression is not a new one; it is contained in several of our Statutes authorizing agricultural societies, boards of art and boards of trade, to circulate and distribute books and essays on the agricultural and mechanical arts; but, unfortunately, owing to the want of means, it has been impossible to give effect to the provisions of those Statutes. I hope that the Federal Government, with the mighty resources at its disposal, will find the means to propagate the agricultural knowledge of which our farmers are in such great need, to increase the fertility of our soil.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the statement just made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) makes it unnecessary for me to enter into the details of the question. However, I feel that it is my duty to say a few words in support of his speech, and to ask, on behalf of the farming community, that the Government may be pleased to direct some of their energy towards the progress of agriculture in Canada. Each year the Government prints a large number of pamphlets. We, the representatives of the people, receive a certain number of these to distribute among our constituents, and I think we might willingly dispense with some of these pamphlets, whose place might be taken by other works on agriculture and the mechanical arts. I am satisfied that these pamphlets would be received with much more satisfaction by our farmers than the reports on explorations or trips made in the North-West. I remember that not very long ago we had the report of the Scotch delegates who, at the request of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, visited the prairies of the North-West. These delegates have certainly done their duty, and they have made, on the incidents of their journey, a report as accurate as could be. But I have observed, not without wonder, that they had commenced their observations on the border of the Province of Quebec; they have not found it in their power to say one word in favour of this Province. To make up for this, they have praised up, perhaps beyond measure, Manitoba and the prairies of the North-West. I have seen one of these documents, the shrewd writer of which had discovered that in our rural

districts, churches were larger than houses. Whether up to this day he has been able to find out for what reason, I have not yet learned; and while travelling in one of our country places he was very much surprised to find that there were still some stumps in the ground—at first sight he took them for natives of the place. Perhaps we do not deserve such a high compliment, but, at all events, this betokens the depth of his observations. I think that documents of this sort might well be left aside, and that our farmers would find much more benefit by receiving works on mechanics and the various agricultural industries. From this point of view, I think that the Government should grant the motion just made by my hon. friend. While we are discussing this matter, there is another question which I will submit to the Government. A few years ago professors of agriculture were appointed for Manitoba and the North-West. In the appointment of these professors an important element has been forgotten altogether, and the farmers of our nationality, who do not understand the language of Shakespeare, should have had some reason to ask, for themselves at least, the appointment as a professor of some one able to express himself in the language of Bossuet and of Racine. I have no doubt that the Government, now that they are aware of such a want in this professional staff, will, with their usual impartiality and the good will which they have always shown, give to the French element of Manitoba and the North-West, the consideration to which it is entitled.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). In answer to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) I beg to say, on behalf of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that if there are in this Department any petitions of the nature of those mentioned in the motion just made, such petitions will be laid before the House; but he is under the impression that there are none. As to the remarks made by the hon. member for Rouville and by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), I beg to state also, on behalf of my colleague, that he concurs fully in the idea of circulating documents, treatises, or essays on agriculture and the mechanical arts. Quite often such treatises are not within the reach of our population and have not the practical bearing which these hon. members would wish to find in them; but the intention of the Government is certainly to act in the way these hon. gentlemen have just pointed out. As to the documents sent into Manitoba and the North-West, or in other parts of Canada where the French language is used, it is the intention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture that these people should receive therein the language with which they are most familiar, to wit, the French language; and I am convinced that it will be sufficient to draw his attention to the matter to cause him to avail himself of the first opportunity to comply with the desires of the hon. member who made this motion.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE EXCHANGE BANK OF CANADA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for a statement, in detail, of the account of the Government of Canada with the Exchange Bank of Canada, showing the various sums deposited by Government with, and withdrawn from the bank, with the dates of such deposits and withdrawals, and the amounts and dates of all payments of interest thereon, and the present state of the account, with a statement of the terms on which such deposits were made, and all correspondence, telegraphs, Orders in Council, bonds or other securities relative to any such deposits or withdrawals. He said: Before this motion is put, I desire to say a few words. I do not propose to enter into any discussion of the position of the affairs of that unfortunate bank, partly because the matter is now before the courts, and partly also because I dare say that if even a portion of the information I have received be correct, the attention

of the Government may not improbably be directed to the state of the present law, and they may find it necessary to give some further security to the public in connection with banks. That, of course, is for the consideration of the Government themselves; but with regard to the Exchange Bank, I may say that it had a record which certainly called for considerable caution on the part of the Government in making additional deposits with it. I do not know how those deposits were secured—that we shall hear presently; but there is one point on which, I think, some information might be properly asked now and given by the hon. Minister of Finance; that is, with regard to the statement made—with respect to which some official explanation, or apology, or whatever it may be called, was offered apparently on behalf of the hon. gentleman—that a further advance was made to that bank, and that a bond for a large amount was taken from the gentlemen connected with it to secure that advance. I need hardly say that that is a very unusual proceeding, and one which is, I think, to be regretted—a proceeding which might lead to various complications, both local and otherwise; and in any case, I cannot suppose, that the hon. Minister of Finance wants to add to his other duties that of deciding upon the personal solvency of gentlemen who come to ask for advances to banks. I should be glad if the hon. Minister would, on the present occasion, put the country into possession of some of the facts in relation to this matter; at any rate, so far as the advance made on this particular bond is concerned. The minor details can, of course, be had later, and, if necessary, some action may then be taken.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think it would be more convenient to have this subject discussed, if a discussion is considered desirable, after the papers are laid on the Table of the House, because those papers will contain a report of the matter, which I do not wish unintentionally to misrepresent. I may state, however, that the bank was in difficulty—there was, I think, an anticipation of something of the kind before Parliament rose last year—and a very considerable pressure was brought upon the bank and a considerable amount of money withdrawn. The bank applied to the Government, and the Government, after consulting the Deputy Minister of Finance, and looking into the matter, thought it safe, and in the interest of the public, to advance \$200,000 to the bank at 5 per cent. interest, and on conditions similar to those on which advances were made to the Ontario Bank two years ago, and the Consolidated Bank. Some time elapsed, and it was found that the run continued, and it was doubtful if the \$200,000 would carry them through. They made application to the Government for another \$100,000, offering personal security in addition to the security that would be held under the Banking Act; and after considering the matter the Government accepted that additional security for the advance of another \$100,000. A call was made for \$100,000 of the \$300,000 before the bank suspended. A second call was made, but before the day expired on which that call was made the bank suspended, or closed its doors. But I say nothing further until all the papers are laid before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I presume, after the hon. gentleman's statement, that he will take care that the papers are laid on the Table of the House at a very early day.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Very early.  
Motion agreed to.

#### THE STEAMER PRINCESS LOUISE.

Mr. WELDON, in moving for copy of contract and specifications entered into by the Government with Jotham O'Brien for the building of the steamer *Princess Louise*; statement

of all amounts paid on account of the building of the said vessel; copies of all orders and instructions relating to the towing of the said steamer from Maccan to Halifax, and also any contracts, correspondence or documents in reference to the procuring and building of engines for the said steamer, said: Before this motion passes, I wish to say a few words regarding this vessel and the manner in which it was towed into the harbour of Halifax; and I think it is a matter which requires investigation. By a return laid on the Table of the House, last year, it appears tenders were invited for the construction of the hull, spars and rigging of a vessel of 500 tons, for the use of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. A number of tenders, varying in amount from \$25,000 the lowest, to \$72,000 the highest, were submitted. The lowest tenderer failed, and the contract was subsequently awarded to Mr. O'Brien of Maccan, for the sum of \$29,000. At the time the return was laid on the Table, the contract was not signed, owing to the illness of the contractor, although the work was in progress. Whether it has since been signed, the hon. Minister can inform the House. So far as Mr. O'Brien is concerned, he is known as a ship builder of considerable experience, who has built some of the largest ships that have sailed out of the Bay of Fundy. The vessel was launched, I think, on the 30th November, and a tug boat, the *Hercules*, was sent from St. John for the purpose of towing her down the river to meet the *Newfield*, which took her in tow on the morning of Sunday, the 2nd December, to bring her to Halifax from Maccan, a distance of 300 miles at least, along a rocky and dangerous coast, and at the worst season of the year. In the afternoon a gale sprung up, and the result was that close at Digby, within sight of the light and within a few miles of the entrance to Annapolis Basin, the hawser parted on account of inferior equipment, and the vessel was cast on the rocks. Not only was she entirely dashed to pieces, but the melancholy loss of eight lives was added. I venture to say that no owner of a vessel in Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, would have risked bringing a ship in tow in that condition from Maccan to Halifax at that season of the year when that coast is exposed to severe and violent gales, nor would any underwriter have been willing to take such a risk except at an enormous premium. That the vessel was not properly equipped for the voyage, we have the statement of the captain of the *Newfield* made before the Board of Enquiry. One of her anchors was unshackled, of course, for the purpose of enabling the hawser to be used, but when the port anchor was attempted to be used it was found also to be unshackled. The crew were unable to bend the sails, and when they attempted to get up the jib and a maintrysail, it was too late, as the vessel had already gone on the rocks. What makes this want of proper equipment more extraordinary is the fact that nearly opposite Maccan is the port of St. John, where the vessel could have been properly fitted out with all facilities, as well as in Halifax, and then have proceeded to England for her engines if necessary; and even so far as the engines were concerned they could have been obtained at the port of St. John as well. I admit that with regard to engines for ocean service, England stands unequalled but as regards engines for the working service connected with our bays, I think our makers compare favourably with the English makers. I need only mention Fleming & Sons, of St. John, and Burrill & Johnson, of Yarmouth, N. S., both of whom are now building engines for vessels employed on the same waters in which this one was intended to be employed. With regard to the equipment of this vessel, Capt. Guilford's statement is this:

"She ought to have been better prepared for the voyage before she left Cumberland Basin. Her bow anchors should have been shackled and her sails bent."

Again, in violation of the law she was sent out without proper side lights, and burning a bright light which the captain

Mr. WELDON.

had caused to be put up in direct violation of the Statutes. She was also sent out on a dangerous unnecessary course of navigation, without being properly equipped, although the voyage was one which required that the vessel should be thoroughly equipped. The consequence was that when the hawser broke the crew were helpless. I hope the Government will take steps to ascertain without delay the causes whereby not only loss of property, but also loss of life, was occasioned.

Mr. McLELAN. All the papers in connection with the matter will be brought down. The hon. gentleman has referred to the contract, and to the delay that occurred last year in signing it. Subsequently it was signed, and it was carried out in a manner that elicited the commendation of the inspector who reported she was the best vessel that had been constructed in the Maritime Provinces. The latter part of the hon. gentleman's remarks refers more particularly to the next question that he has on the paper, respecting the unfortunate loss of that vessel. When all the papers are brought down the hon. gentleman, and this House, will be in a better position to understand and discuss this question. Owing to the melancholy loss of Capt. Brown, in whose charge the vessel was at the time, there are many questions put by the hon. gentleman that cannot be very well answered. The vessel was placed in charge of Capt. Brown. The Minister of the Department had every confidence in his skill and experience, and relied on his seeing that the vessel was equipped in such a manner as to be, to all appearances, safe. The captain's attention was called on the day of the launch to the fact that the chains coming on board had not been coupled together, but he replied that he supposed the operation of the windlass was quite sufficient to check it when he desired. The windlass did not work as expected, and the chain went out and was lost. I believe the whole equipment of the vessel was on board, and a few hours work would have bent the sails and placed her in a position to be managed by sails. Why the sails were not bent I am unable to say, and, owing to the sad loss of Capt. Brown, we cannot ascertain why he did not attend to this before starting. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that we have good mechanics in this country, and he asked why we could not have got the engines built here instead of in Glasgow. The hon. gentleman has stated that Great Britain is unrivalled in the construction of marine engines, and it was because we desired to have engines that were perfect, that were built by manufacturers who stand unrivalled in that work, that we decided to have these built at Glasgow; and we found that we should have less expense to send the vessel there to have them put in than to pay the freight that was demanded by shippers, the owners of steamships or sailing vessels, to have them brought to this country and placed in here. It was for the purpose of having the best possible engines that could be placed on board of her, and to have it done more economically, that she was sent over. The original intention was to have the engines brought to this country and put in here; but, owing to a failure on the part of the contractors to have them completed within the time agreed upon, it was decided to send the vessel over there, and this made it that period to which the hon. gentleman referred as a late period in the season. It was unfortunate that the work was delayed so long that it became late in the season and the stormy season of the year, but the whole matter was entrusted to Capt. Gilbert and Brown, men of long experience, and they were consulted upon this matter before any action was decided upon. Consultation was held with these gentlemen, who were the most experienced officers of the Department, who had had experience both in sailing vessels and steam vessels, and upon their advice the course was decided upon of towing the vessel to Halifax in order to

sail to Glasgow to have the engines put in there. It was represented that the *Newfield*, at the close of her season's work, before laying up, could call for the vessel, and it was expected that she would call at St. John for the vessel at the close of her season's work and take her to Halifax; and there the new vessel could watch an opportunity for favourable weather to get clear of the land and sail for Glasgow. It was upon the advice of these gentlemen, who had long experience in matters of this kind, that the course was adopted which unfortunately resulted in the loss of the vessel and of the lives of most of those on board. The papers connected with this matter will be brought down at a very early day, and then the hon. gentleman will be in a position to discuss it more fully and with a better understanding of the case than can be done at present.

Motion agreed to.

#### LOCATION OF THE NORTH-WEST CAPITAL AT REGINA.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Mr. Speaker, there was a motion made during last Session of Parliament, by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), asking for some of the correspondence and information referred to in the motion I propose submitting to you. That correspondence has not been brought down, although it was moved for at a very early period of the Session; and those of us who take some little interest in the North-West, and especially in the Regina region, were very anxious to see the correspondence that was moved for, and understand exactly the terms upon which the town of Regina was put in the market in the latter part of 1882. The hon. gentleman will recollect that some discussion took place upon this subject during the last Session of Parliament, and the hon. leader of the House, in his reply to the hon. member for West Elgin, if my recollection serves me aright, stated that the land was the joint property of the Government, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the North-West Land Company, and that it was put in the market for the joint benefit of the three parties to whom I refer. My hon. friend complained of the mode in which the town of Regina was put upon the market, that it was put there by a lottery. The hon. First Minister repudiated all responsibility in connection with the mode in which the town site was put upon the market—that is, as to the lottery part of it. Now, I know that, however it may have been put upon the market, or by whose authority it was so put upon the market, it was put upon the market, and people were induced to buy upon certain representations made by the agents of the owners of the property, that is, the agents of the Government, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and of the North-West Land Company. Those representations were made at the time of the sale; they were made both before and after and at the time the land was sold by this lottery process and otherwise. One of the representations was that Regina was to be the future capital of the Province of Assiniboia; another representation was that it was to be a divisional terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway; another representation was that the North-West Mounted Police barracks would be stationed at Regina. These representations were clearly and distinctly made, and made with a view of inducing persons to purchase property there. I do not complain that the representations were not made in good faith at the time. Possibly they were made by the agents in good faith; but whether they had authority for making those representations or not from the Government here is one of the points I just wish to know, and I desire to know by the motion which was made during last Session of Parliament. Now, it is quite clear that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not made Regina a divisional terminus. The divisional terminus is at Moose Jaw, forty-five miles west of the

town of Regina. It is quite manifest that, to a purchaser of property at Regina, it would be of the first possible consequence to have the railway company interested in the town of Regina, to have it a divisional terminus, with buildings and repair shops, and things of that kind there. Now, there is nothing of that kind. The large buildings—and they are large and valuable buildings—erected by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are erected at Moose Jaw, and there is nothing at Regina except a small country station. It is equally clear, Sir, that the North-West Mounted Police barracks are not at Regina; they are two and a half miles from the limits of the city of Regina. The Governor's residence is a mile from the city of Regina, and the North-West Council fully a mile from the city of Regina. Now, upon the representation that the divisional terminus would be at Regina, that the North-West Mounted Police barracks would be at Regina, the Governor's residence there, and the North-West Council there, these people were induced to purchase—so they say. I have in my hand a petition signed by nearly every purchaser of town lots living in the city of Regina, all making that representation, that they were so induced to buy, and but for those representations they would not have purchased, and those representations have not been carried out. Now, I am not complaining of the Government in this respect. I do not know how far they are responsible, or are not responsible, for the matter; I do not know how far they have control over the location of the terminus. I know nothing about that, therefore I make no complaint against the Government on that head. I simply state the facts as they are represented to me by the purchasers of lots at Regina, and I state their ground of complaint. As to the erection of the barracks for the Mounted Police there, I presume that was under the control of the Government, and if so, and if the representations to which I have alluded have been made by the authority of the Government, then these representations have not been carried out, and these people have not been dealt with in good faith. Now, we can easily understand the importance to the people there of some expression of opinion on the part of the Government, at all events, as to the course the syndicate, or the joint owners of the property take with respect to the completion of the contracts of purchase. They say they have been dealt with in bad faith, they repudiate the sales that were made, and there were large sales made, involving considerable sums of money. They repudiate those sales altogether, and they ask the Government to deal with them in a generous and in a liberal spirit. They ask this syndicate, the joint owners of this property, not to compel them to pay for land that they purchased under certain representations, which representations have not been carried out. I ask for the papers that have been referred to here, in order that we may be able to understand the whole matter from beginning to end. If the Government have arrived at any conclusion on the matter, I shall be glad to hear it. If they have arrived at any definite conclusion I am quite sure the people in the neighbourhood of Regina will be glad to hear it, because the action of the Government, and the action of the railway company in not carrying out those representations, have very seriously retarded the progress and injured the prosperity of that place. We can easily understand that if a man goes up there to locate himself, under the belief that Regina was to be a divisional terminus and that the North-West barracks would be established there, and he finds it two and a half miles from the town, and the terminus at Moose Jaw, of course he is disappointed. A blacksmith, or a carpenter, goes there on the strength of the representations that the divisional terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be established there, and he finds that terminus forty-five miles west of Regina, he is not likely to settle at Regina. Now, it is unfortunate that the representations should have been made, if they were not in-

tended to be carried out—it is unfortunate they should have been made at all. I know, as a matter of fact, that people did purchase there, solely on the faith of those representations, and one can easily understand how great an attraction to any place would be the establishment of a Capital, like that of the Province of Assiniboia, where the divisional terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway would also be, as well as the North-West Mounted Police barracks, the Governor's residence, and that of the North-West Council. Now, these are all gone, and the people there feel very much disappointed, grievously disappointed, and they trust that, in some way, relief will be given to those who invested their money on the strength of those representations. In moving for these papers, I hope the Minister who has charge of this Department will see that the returns moved for last Session are brought down, as well as the papers I now ask for. I, therefore, move for:

Copies of all Orders-in-Council respecting the location of the Seat of Government for the North-West Territories at Regina.

Copies of correspondence having reference to the selection of Regina as the Capital of the said Territories.

Copies of all correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the North-West Land Company, or the Agents of the said Companies and the Government respecting the said Town Site.

Copies of any agreement or agreements between the said Companies or either of them and the Government respecting the sale of lots in said town, showing the interest each of said parties to said agreements had therein; the conditions on which the Government agreed to the said selection; the terms on which the lots in said town were to be sold. Also, a Return showing the number of lots sold, the aggregate price, the amount paid, the amount unpaid, the Agent acting for the Government in effecting sales, the instructions to such Agent, his reports; all correspondence from any of the parties aforesaid during the year 1883; all complaints or remonstrances respecting the violation of the conditions on which said lots were sold.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry the papers were not brought down last Session. I do not really know now why they were not. There was a great amount of work thrown upon the Department in the way of making the returns that were so largely moved for last Session, and were so very generally granted. I shall see that the papers are brought down at once. I stated generally last Session that an arrangement was made between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government that they should have a joint interest in it. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company being a commercial company, and of course, it being their interest to get as large a sum of money for the lots in the city as possible, the Government thought that they might well be appointed instead of an ordinary Government Land Agent, to lay out the town sites, in a joint interest, the expenses being in common, and the net proceeds being divided. Of course, I cannot speak as to the representations made at the sales on the spot, but after the statement made by the hon. gentleman I shall feel it my duty to call upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to get a statement from their agent as to what representations were made by themselves, by their agents, or by any official, or anyone that may have been employed in the matter. So far as the Government is concerned, the only understanding which was entered into and the only statement made was that the town of Regina should be the capital of Assiniboia and of the North-West until, in process of time, that country was divided into different Provinces, each of which would, of course, have its own capital. That was one statement or promise, and that has been carried out. The seat of Government is at Regina; the Lieutenant Governor is at Regina. I understand the hon. gentleman says that persons complain—he does not make the complaint himself—that the Lieutenant Governor's residence is in the environs, in the vicinity of Regina, and is not situated within the town plot or the locality which is at present laid out into town lots. But that complaint will not hold water for a moment. The residence is in the immediate vicinity of Regina, and Regina is made the capital. I do not think there was any breach of the pledge

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

made by the Government of the day and by Parliament when Her Majesty selected Ottawa to be the seat of Government for the Dominion, because the Governor General's residence is at New Edinburgh, not in the city of Ottawa. And the same remark applies to Regina. It is convenient that the Lieutenant Governor's house should not be in the commercial part of the town, but should have some ground attached to it; and I suppose that the Governor's house with its grounds well laid out, will prove a substantial ornament and advantage to Regina. So with respect to the Mounted Police. It was stated that whenever the railway should be built, the Mounted Police, instead of being stationed in small detachments all over the country, should have their headquarters at Regina. And that has been carried out. The largest body assembled at one place is assembled at the Regina barracks. These are not within the town site, because it was found necessary for the efficiency of the force that there should be a very considerable tract of land about the barracks. The barracks are on the line of the railway, and all the promises made by the Government in this regard have been carried out. As regards representations that have been made and correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government, and representations made by any officer of the company, these constitute an important matter. I will see that the papers are brought down without any delay, and then the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of discussing with myself and in the House, the whole subject to which his motion refers.

Motion agreed to.

#### IMPORTATIONS OF WHEAT AND FLOUR.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the House should have information at a very early date with regard to the quantity of wheat and flour that has been imported into and exported from the various Provinces of the Dominion. Judging from a remark made by the Minister of Customs the other day, I thought that a motion asking for this information up to December 31st, might involve a little delay, as the returns might not have been received from all the Provinces. I have, therefore, prepared two motions on the subject, in the hope that the return asked for in the first motion may be given to the House immediately and the other as soon as practicable. I beg to move for a return showing the quantity of wheat and flour imported into and exported from the various Provinces of the Dominion, during the five months ending 30th November, 1883.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I further beg to move for a return showing the quantity of wheat and flour and corn and cornmeal imported into and exported from the various Provinces of the Dominion, during the month of December, 1883.

Motion agreed to.

#### DRAWBACKS ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have had occasion at different times to make a motion similar to the one I am about to place in your hands, Mr. Speaker. I make this motion for a two-fold reason. In the first place, I desire that this return may be a continuous one, and I move it, therefore, from the date when the last one was presented to the House till now. In the second place, I move it for the purpose of bringing before the notice of the Minister of Customs a fault of which I think he has been guilty, with a view to its being remedied, though I certainly thought it would not have been necessary to have brought this subject again before the House. The hon. Minister must be aware from the returns placed in our hands for the past year, that

the exports of our manufactured goods have decreased; that they have never since he has been in the position he now occupies reached the extent they did in 1878. I have pointed out repeatedly that our manufacturers have been hampered by additional duties being placed upon their raw material, which have enhanced the cost of the manufactured article, and that to compete successfully in the markets of the world with goods, the prices of which were so enhanced, becomes a very difficult matter. I have also pointed out that our manufacturers have to compete in foreign markets with manufacturers who are aided in their efforts by Consuls representing the nations to which they belong, an advantage that only those engaged in promoting a foreign trade can understand. I think it is too bad when our manufacturers are under the disadvantage of not having the assistance of a Consul of our own to take them by the hand as the Consuls do the manufacturers of other nations, and in addition to that, when our manufacturers are harassed in the importation of goods entering into the manufacture of articles to be exported, that the relief promised them by the Customs Department by way of drawback of the duty upon the articles so entering into the manufacture, has not been given them. Last Session I found that the Minister had varied the regulations with respect to affidavits which had to be made in favour of certain parties, and I pointed out a remarkable coincidence in the case of those parties, and I asked him—I did not charge him with having done anything wrong, for I thought his concession in their case was a right one—to extend those concessions to all other manufacturers, and I thought I had his promise that the regulations would be so altered. I am informed that this has not been done, at all events with regard to all manufacturers, and I call his attention to it now in order that, if he has been so much occupied with other matters in his Department that he has been unable to attend to this particular item, which is one of considerable importance, he may find time ere long to remedy it. I beg to move for a return of all claims presented for drawbacks on goods manufactured for export (not included in the last return made to this House), showing the names of all applicants, their place of business, the articles on which the drawback was claimed, and the amount of each claim, distinguishing between the claims which have been allowed and those which have been disallowed, and those under consideration and not yet decided, and giving the reason for such disallowance: also copies of all regulations made by the Department with reference to such claims, together with a copy of one allowed claim and the sworn declaration thereto of each exporter.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to bringing down all the information for which the hon. gentleman asks. The House is now tolerably well versed, I think, in the complaints which have made at various times by the hon. gentleman who has made this motion. We have heard it in the same language, I think, some seven or eight times, and I have no doubt we shall have it repeated again once or twice before the Session closes. I am quite aware that he pointed out, or attempted to point out, that the exportation of certain manufactures had not been increased since the imposition of the present duties, which have been levied under what is better known as the National Policy. I thought I answered that question tolerably well on a previous occasion, when I pointed out the large outlet which had been provided for certain manufactures of the older Provinces in the North-West Territories and Manitoba, and also by means of the great interprovincial trade which has been created and worked up between the different Provinces; that though my hon. friend did not deny that the manufacturers were all busily engaged and had been so for the last three or four years the output of each of these manufacturers was greater than on previous occasions;

and that the reason their goods had not been exported to the foreign market was the fact of a greater market existing within our own borders. I pointed out that we had in fact created a home market by this interprovincial trade, and also by the fact of keeping out to a certain extent those manufactures which otherwise would have been brought into the country. At that time I gave the figures as they then presented themselves to me, and had I supposed that the question was about to be mooted again, I think the statements which could be laid before the House would show that the trade has marvellously increased the last two or three years. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means when he speaks of the harassing of the importers in the importation of the raw material which enters into the various manufactures made in this country. I have simply to say that every case that has been brought under the notice of the Department, and under my own in particular, in which the manufacturers or the importers considered themselves aggrieved, has received my personal attention, not only by communication with them by the Department, but where they were of a very serious character, I have gone to the localities personally, and I have never yet failed to satisfy the people that the action of the Department has been under the law, and that whatever has been done has been done in the interest solely of the honest importer. I do not pretend to say—it would be absurd to suppose—that in working out a complex Tariff like ours, and with so many ports as there are in this Dominion, we could have perfect uniformity where we have so many collectors who take different views of even common orders that may be issued, which to an ordinary man one would suppose would be perfectly plain. I do not pretend or expect that the Department or its officers will ever arrive at that state of perfection in which they can issue orders which will be thoroughly understood by every one of the officers who have to put the law in force. With regard to the remark made by the hon. gentleman in reference to the varied affidavits, I have simply to make this statement, that every claim for drawbacks has been judged upon its own merits, and just as far as the law would permit the Department, just so far have they gone in order to encourage to the fullest extent the exportation of every conceivable kind of article manufactured in this country. I do not know to what particular case the hon. gentleman refers at the present time, but I do say that no manufacturer has made application for a drawback, or for information which might lead him to increase his manufactures or to make contracts for the foreign market, to whose case my attention has not been given, and in which I have not put the most liberal possible construction upon the law as it formerly existed and as it now exists. If there are any cases which my hon. friend has in his mind's eye, or of which he has any knowledge, in which this has not been done, I should be glad, on the part of the Government, to have my attention called to them. The hon. member is altogether mistaken when he says I have not given personal attention to all these matters. I do not hesitate to say that in every case in which these drawbacks have been asked for, or in which any difficulty has arisen between the manufacturers and the officers of my Department, my attention has been called to it, and I have investigated and read all the papers connected with it. I have yet to learn of any case that has not had the attention, not only of myself, but of the officers of the Department. I say further that the papers will show that even in the case to which the hon. gentleman referred during last Session, if he had not interrupted me in the manner he did, I would have shown that letters were sent to that particular manufacturer, asking him to amend his claims and the Department would meet his case so far as the law would permit, and that no answer was ever made to that request. Yet the hon. gentleman having this particular case in his mind's eye at all

times—for it seems to haunt him on every occasion he addresses the House on this question—did not allow me to proceed to place him and the House in possession of these facts. Nor has that manufacturer yet made any application to amend the demands he had made, and which I have repeatedly pointed out could not be acceded to in the manner in which they were made. I can assure the hon. gentleman that no change has been made which would be detrimental to the manufacturer or that would hamper him in any way in creating a foreign trade, if he can find a foreign market for the output of his establishment. As we have no Foreign Consuls we have adopted the principle of accepting the declaration and certificates of the British Consuls at the different foreign ports, and also of the American Consuls where there are no British Consuls, so that the House will see that every facility has been offered that can possibly be offered in order to create an export trade. I shall be very glad to have all the information which my hon. friend has asked for, not only in this motion, but in the other, brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Motion agreed to.

#### RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of all Departmental orders and advertisements as to the proposed Canadian Loan of four millions, with statement of the offers made with rates and amounts, the offers accepted, with rates and amounts, the amounts since taken and the rate, and also the rate at which balance of the loan is now held.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Report of Capt. Scott, R. N., and assessors, upon the loss of the Steamer *Princess Louise*, and the evidence taken on the enquiry into such loss.—(Mr. Weldon.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 5:30 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 24th January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three O'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. BEATY moved that the time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills be extended to Saturday, the 9th of February next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, of course every Session we decide that next Session we won't have these extensions, and then the first thing we do is to make them. Now, it does seem to me that the hon. gentleman, by proposing an extension for so long a period as to the 9th, is inviting the promoters of Private Bills to wait till somewhere about the 7th or 8th before putting in their petitions, and that it would be much better to extend, if it is necessary to extend at all, for a week than for a fortnight.

Mr. BEATY. The view of the Committee was that to extend to the 9th and make that final, would be better than to extend to an earlier date, and then extend again. This is intended to be the last extension as well as the first, as far as the Committee are concerned.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. BLAKE. If my hon. friend says that is an intention which is to become operative this Session, I shall be better pleased.

Mr. BEATY. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 9) to amend the several Acts relating to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 10) further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 11) respecting the Union of certain Methodist Churches therein named.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 13) to repeal an Act to render Members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included, or which may hereafter be included, within the Dominion of Canada, ineligible for sitting or voting in the House Commons of Canada.—(Mr. Ouimet.)

#### FRAUD IN RELATION TO PUBLIC CONTRACTS.

Mr. CAMERON. I have been requested by Mr. Casgrain to move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) to amend the Act for the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys.

Bill read the first time.

#### BAYFIELD HARBOUR.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT enquired, Whether the attention of the Minister of Public Works has been called to the injury done to the Harbour of Bayfield by recent storms, and whether it is the intention of Government to provide a sum in the Estimates for its repairs?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that my attention has been called to the injury done to the harbour at Bayfield by the recent storms. The question of providing a sum in the Estimates for its repairs is now engaging the attention of the Department.

#### SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Mr. McMULLEN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, a Bill for the purpose of equalizing and increasing the salaries of the Judges of the several courts in the Dominion?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry to say that the Government is not in a position to give an answer to the hon. gentleman just now.

#### GRAVENHURST AND CALLANDER RAILWAY.

Mr. COCKBURN, in moving for copies of all correspondence with railway companies or individuals, respecting the construction or subsidizing of the proposed railway link between Gravenhurst and Callander, also copies of any agreements or proposals affecting the same, said: In making this motion I wish it to be understood that I am not actuated by any desire to embarrass the Government or to pry into the private affairs of companies or individuals. Circumstances that have taken place regarding this important scheme, constrain me to make some enquiry respecting it. Hon. gentlemen do not need to be told of the importance of this link or branch of railway which is intended to serve most important interests. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that this scheme has already been received with very

great favour by the House, and a very handsome subsidy was cheerfully and unanimously voted for it by members on both sides. This scheme is so well known to the majority of people throughout the country that I need not enlarge upon it. It is one of very great commercial promise, both as a through line and as a local line, and a great many people throughout central and western Ontario, more particularly in the newer settlements of the northern country, are becoming very impatient, and are beginning to feel uneasy, about the subject. Notwithstanding that a handsome subsidy of \$12,000 per mile was granted to this scheme some time ago, we find that nothing has yet been done—the first sod has not yet been turned, therefore a great number of people throughout that region are becoming very uneasy about it, and it is desirable that the Government and the House should take some steps to get the road constructed by making an arrangement with some company, or some person or other. I am not speaking in the interest of any party or railway company; all I wish is that this vexatious delay should be put an end to, and that something may be done as soon as possible. I stated before that this scheme is one of very great promise, not only as a through line, but as a local line; and I should think it would offer great inducements for any railway company to undertake, as there are already important settlements along the proposed line, much larger than most persons have any idea of. The line is upwards of 100 miles in length, and I know of no scheme so well calculated to produce so much benefit, at so small an outlay, as the scheme in question. I trust, therefore, that, if no private company is prepared or willing to enter upon the construction, the Government themselves will at once undertake the work as a Government work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that there is no objection at all to the motion made by the hon. gentleman. The Government will be very glad to bring down any papers connected with this matter at an early day. I may say, however, that negotiations are going forward with a view to secure the construction of the road, and, perhaps, it would be better to have those completed before the papers are laid upon the Table. The House will require no evidence of the importance that the Government attached to the construction of this line, when it is remembered that a proposition was submitted to, and approved by, the House, last Session, to grant a very large subsidy to this line. It will be remembered that we stated at that time to the House our determination to make no arrangement for the construction of this very important line of communication between Gravenhurst and the Canadian Pacific Railway, that would not preserve the entire independence of the line, and prevent its usefulness being interfered with by any local interest, as we wanted that line to remain entirely independent. The delay in securing its construction, I may say, has grown out of the difficulty of carrying out that assurance that was given to the House, and which the Government regarded so binding as to prevent their making any arrangements that would not meet that view of the case. I am in hopes, however, that at an early period we will be prepared to submit to the House proposals that will accomplish the object in view.

Motion agreed to.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. LISTER moved for a return giving the name of each city, town and village, in the Dominion of Canada, in which public buildings, consisting of Post Office or Custom House or both, have been erected since 1st January, 1879; also giving the name of each city and town in the Dominion in which such buildings are in course of erection, together with the cost and estimated cost of each.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I move that the following words be added to the motion:—

With a statement showing the population of each such city, town or village, and also a statement showing the revenues derived from the public offices of each such city, town or village.

I hope the hon. member will have no objection to adding these words.

Mr. LISTER. I have no objection.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I see no objection to the motion made by the hon. member, nor to the amendment, but I desire that instead of the date being 1st January, 1879, it should be 1st January, 1874. If the hon. gentleman will amend his motion to that effect, I shall not oppose its adoption.

Mr. COOK. I request the mover of the motion to make it also cover buildings in course of construction.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### UNION JACQUES CARTIER RAILWAY.

Mr. HOUDE. Some weeks ago the press announced that a new railway line, small in length, but great in importance as a connecting link, had just been opened at the back of Montreal, between Sault au Récollet and Lachine, the Union Jacques Cartier Railway. The city of Quebec and the country lying between the north shore of the St. Lawrence and Montreal, particularly rejoiced in that fact, because it was to the people there the beginning of an era of through traffic, that is traffic without transhipment, with the west and New England States at all seasons of the year. But a few days later there came other news which spoiled the rejoicing caused by the first announcement: the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had cut off the communication between the Union Jacques Cartier Railway and the North Shore Railway. If I am not mistaken, an appeal was immediately made to the Federal Government, praying them to try to have that difference settled. It is in order to have the nature of that appeal made better known to this House and the public generally, that I move the motion of which I have given notice. As the case is now before the courts, I do not wish to say anything to prejudice it; but I believe I may be allowed to call the serious attention of the Government to the great injury done to many business men and farmers, by the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have caused traffic to be stopped on the Union Jacques Cartier Railway, by refusing to carry the cars of the North Shore Railway from St. Martin to Sault au Récollet, and *vice versa*. The result of this is that the merchants of Quebec cannot have flour and other produce of the west shipped through to them, nor can exporters of hay, &c., on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, especially between Three Rivers and Montreal, have their cars sent through to New England, their usual market, which causes annoyance, and, in several instances, within my personal knowledge, heavy loss. It seems to me the Government would be fully justified in interfering to induce the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to better respect the public interests, while guarding their own, and to assent to some reasonable compromise. For instance, they might very well carry the cars of the North Shore Railway from St. Martin to Sault au Récollet and back, keeping a record of the number of cars so carried, and wait for the judicial authorities, now seized of the case, to finally decide as to the remuneration claimed for the service. If I am well informed, and I think I am, the other contending party would assent to such an agreement, which would surely be a fair one. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company ought not to object to it. At all events the Government should justly and legitimately protect a large portion of the public by making that great and proud concern, which I suppose they have some means of influ-

encing, show themselves in a little more favourable light with respect to this matter. I hope, therefore, the Government will see their way to interfere, with the public interest in view, and that with the least possible delay. I beg to move for correspondence exchanged between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and any other railway company, with regard to the opening of the Union Jacques Cartier Railway.

Mr. GIROUARD. The motion which has been made by my hon. friend is one which interests a portion of my county. This railway runs from Lachine to Back River, passing through a very important parish at the back of the city of Montreal. It was built I do not say mainly with the intention, but certainly with the intention, of affording communication with the city of Montreal, and thence by railway in an easterly as well as a westerly direction. It so happens that in consequence of the decision of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company no trains are running on the road although it has been completed for some months. I think it is contended on the part of the Union Jacques Cartier Railway Company, that they have running powers over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I believe this right is denied by the latter Company. I do not wish to say one word in favour of or against the pretensions of either party. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company may be right, or the Union Jacques Cartier Company may be right. But it seems to me it is a very extraordinary power to exercise on behalf of a company like the Canadian Pacific Railway, which to a certain extent is a national company, to say: We will not allow any trains to pass over our road; and I think that the Canadian Pacific Railway should allow these trains to pass, reserving to the courts of justice to determine the rates to be paid that company under the general provisions of the Railway Act, or under some special provisions which are alleged to have been made in the sale effected by the Quebec Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not know whether this Parliament has or has not jurisdiction in the matter, but whether it has or not I hope the Canadian Pacific Railway will see the impropriety of refusing to allow the trains of this company to pass over their line, though they may reserve the determination of their rights in the manner I have stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say with reference to this question, that there can be no objection to bringing down any correspondence in the hands of the Government. It is very unfortunate that the difficulty should have arisen, and that the trade of a very important section of the country should have been so materially interfered with, owing to the want of accord upon the question between the two companies concerned, namely, the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Grand Trunk Railway Company made communication to me pointing out that they were unable to carry on their traffic through inability to run over a portion of the road built and owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I immediately referred the question to the Department of Justice to ascertain if the Government had any power to interfere. The answer of that Department was that we possessed no power whatever; that this Parliament alone was in a position to give running powers to any one company to run over the line of any other company. That neither the Government nor the Railway Committee of the Privy Council were clothed with any power which would enable us to interfere. Having received that answer as to the question of law, I used my best offices with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the matter, by suggesting to them my anxiety that there should be no interruption of this traffic. The statement made by the company was: We are quite prepared to allow traffic to run over our lines, but for the protection of our rights we require that the parties should agree to pay us a certain amount, subject to  
Mr. HOUDÉ.

the final adjudication of what rights they may have. We do not wish to obstruct the traffic for a single moment, but the course we are taking is indispensable to protect our legal rights and enable us to obtain the consideration to which we are entitled. I am sorry that no means were found either by adopting that mode, or of allowing traffic to go on, subject to compensation by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or by any other mode, until the matter should be finally determined. I believe it has been taken to the courts, and the only power which, under the circumstances, has any means of dealing with the question is this Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

#### DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS.

Mr. MULOCK moved for copies of all Orders in Council, reports and correspondence not already brought down, in reference to the exercise or non-exercise of the power of disallowance as to any Provincial Acts; with a statement of the dates of prorogation of each of the Provincial Assemblies; and of the dates at which the Acts of the Session were received at Ottawa; and copy of the despatches addressed to the Lieutenant Governors on the subject of the transmission to the Government of Canada of such Acts.

Mr. BLAKE. In this connection I would call the attention of the Government to the laxity of practice which so far as I can understand has grown up with reference to the transmission of the Acts of the Local Legislatures. It was found when I had the responsibility in this regard, that there were very considerable delays in the transmission of the Acts, and during that period an Order in Council was passed under which instructions were sent to the Lieutenant Governors of the various Provinces requesting, and so far as might be, enjoining them within a fixed period—I think it was six weeks after the conclusion of the Local Assembly—to transmit their Acts for the consideration of the Executive. It is very clear that at the earliest convenient moment, after the Acts have been assented to, they should be so transmitted, because, if an indefinite period is to elapse before the transmission, during all that time these Acts upon which the power of disallowance may ultimately be exercised remain valid, and, strictly speaking, until transmitted it is not possible for the Government to act upon them. Now, I am informed that in more than one instance a much longer period than six weeks, a period approximating to a year, has elapsed without the Acts of the Local Legislatures having been transmitted to the Secretary of State, and that, in consequence, it is stated, and I dare say correctly, that it is impossible for the Government to consider of these Acts whether or no they should be allowed. I would, therefore, in connection with my hon. friend's motion—which I have no doubt will pass, because except as to the latter part it is a customary motion, and as to the latter portion it is a proper one—call attention to these facts and suggest the propriety of the Government reminding their officers, the Lieutenant Governors, of the Order which was passed, and calling them to perform it so far as practicable.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the Dominion Government have a year from the receipt of the Bills in which to act.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly; but what I pointed out to the hon. gentleman was that, until received, an Act which may ultimately be found to be objectionable and disallowed, remains valid, and by delaying forever to transmit the Act, you delay forever the exercise of the power.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh, yes.

Motion agreed to.

## MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Statement showing for the time elapsed since the period covered by the Order of the House of Commons of last Session with reference to the Superannuation Fund: 1. The number of persons on the list for the year as entitled to the benefit of the Act; 2. The number superannuated during the year under the Act; 3. The number retired during the year on a gratuity under the Act; 4. The total amount paid into the fund from the beginning by those who were during the year superannuated, or retired on a gratuity; distinguishing between those whose superannuation was caused by the abolition of office, those who were superannuated otherwise, and those who retired on a gratuity; 5. The numbers of persons on the list for the year who died in the service; and 6. The total amount paid into the fund from the beginning by those who during the year died in the service.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada, not already brought down, on the question of the legislative power with reference to the regulation of the sale of intoxicating liquors, and of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Hodge against the Queen on the same subject, and of the shorthand writer's notes of the proceedings before the Committee, and of any correspondence in connection with the case; and also, for copies of the shorthand writer's notes of the proceedings before the Committee in the case of Russell and the Queen.—(Mr. Blake)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 4:05 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 25th January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## REPORT.

The following Report was laid on the Table:—

Report of Minister of Railways and Canals.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 14) to amalgamate the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto and the Toronto Corn Exchange Association.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 15) to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in Appeal.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)

Bill (No. 16) for the declaration of titles to land and to facilitate its transfer in the Territories of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

## MANITOBA PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that this House do, on Tuesday, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may authorize the advance, to the Province of Manitoba, in aid of the Public Schools therein, of the sum of \$10,000, the advance whereof, in the fiscal year 1880-81, was authorized by the Act 41 Vic., Chap. 13, and a further

sum not exceeding \$30,000, being \$15,000 for each of the fiscal years 1881-82 and 1882-83; the said sums to be advanced out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and to be repaid thereto with interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum, out of the first proceeds of the sales of "School Lands" in the said Province under the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.

Motion agreed to.

## OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BOWELL, in moving to add the names of Messrs. Foster and Royal to the Select Committee for the supervision of the Official Reports of the Debates of this House, said: My attention has been called to the fact that it would be better to have another gentleman representing the French language upon the Committee, and also one from the Maritime Provinces; and looking through the list of members of the House, we thought the two members suggested would be, perhaps, as eligible as any others for the position. I suppose the House will have no particular objection to this motion.

Mr. BLAKE. This Committee, which is a House Committee, to discharge duties which are important, and may become delicate, with respect to the publication of the debates, has been, I believe, always, and I know certainly is to-day, composed of proportions which, as is proper, give the Ministerial side of the House a majority, but in the proportion of five to four. The hon. gentleman now proposes that these proportions should be changed to seven to four. I think that is objectionable for many reasons. It would be very much better to allow the proportions to remain as at present, and the hon. gentleman might, at least, have adopted the name of another member from this side of the House. I, therefore, suggest that the name of an hon. member from this side of the House be substituted for one of the two names proposed—I do not object to the names otherwise—in order to keep the majority as it is, and the two sides of the House as nearly as possible on an equality.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not hear the hon. gentleman suggest any name. There can be no possible objection to adding another name to the list, but I think the two names I have suggested should be placed on the Committee. If the hon. gentleman thinks his side of the House will not be sufficiently protected, there can be no objection whatever to adding another name.

Mr. BLAKE. The addition of another name, when the hon. member is proposing two additional names, will not retain the proportion. That is the reason I proposed a substitution instead of an addition.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will reflect, he will remember that the representation of his side of the House on that Committee is much greater than on any other Committee of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, and for obvious reasons.

Mr. BOWELL. I frankly confess I thought nothing of that matter. I suggested two names as being those of members who should represent the House on the Committee. If the hon. member will suggest a name I will move that it be added; but I do not feel inclined to withdraw either of the names I have suggested.

Mr. BLAKE. I suggest the name of Mr. Innes.

Mr. BOWELL. A very good name; and I move the addition of the name of Mr. Innes to the names mentioned in the motion.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

## GOLD MINING IN THE N. W. T.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session of Parliament, to

introduce and pass an Act relating to the mining of gold and other minerals, excepting coal, in the North-West Territories?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that section 42 of the Dominion Lands Act, 1883, provides that lands containing coal or other minerals shall be disposed of in such manner, and on such terms and conditions, as may from time to time be fixed by the Governor in Council by regulations to be made in that behalf. The regulations relating to the mining of gold and other minerals, except coal, have been prepared, and are awaiting the consideration of the Governor in Council. They will be laid on the Table early next week. The regulations respecting the mining of coal have already been laid on the Table.

#### MINING ON BAKER CREEK, N. W. T.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Has any person been authorized by the Government to grant mining licenses in the North-West Territories? If so, name, date of appointment and salary. If no such appointment has been made, has a grant of land been made by the Government to the Healy or Dennis Company, on Baker Creek, or on the south side of the Bow River, south of Silver City? If so, when was the grant made, what quantity of land is covered by it, and what was the consideration? If no such grant made, has the said company or any other company, or any person or persons, received a license or been in any way authorized to mine for minerals in the North-West? If so, the date of each license and the quantity of land covered?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Department of the Interior is aware that Messrs. Dennis and Healy have made a discovery on what is known as Baker Creek. We have now an application from them in the Department for a mining location. No grant can be made to them, or anyone else, until the mining regulations are in force; then their case will be dealt with under the regulations. No person has been authorized to grant mining licenses in the North-West.

#### CANADIAN IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, What is the estimate of the Government as to the number of immigrants who have settled in Canada during the last year; of the number of immigrants who have settled in Manitoba and the North-West; and of the number of immigrants from other parts of Canada who have settled in Manitoba and the North-West?

Mr. POPE. The number of immigrants who came into Canada during last year and expressed their intention of settling here, was, according to the returns of our agents and others, 133,303. There were also reported on the line between Emerson and the Rocky Mountains, 1,000 people. In my opinion this number is underestimated, and such is the opinion of our agents. As to the number of immigrants who have settled in Manitoba and the North-West, that is placed at 50,400. I am not in a position to answer the last clause of the hon. gentleman's question, but I will hand him an answer.

#### BANK RETURNS.

Mr. MASSUE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, a measure to provide that the returns made by banks shall be examined and controlled by inspectors?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In answer to the hon. gentleman's enquiry, I may say that the subject to which he has called attention is now engaging the consideration of the Government.

#### SUPPLY FARM No. 20.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for a return showing all Orders in Council or Departmental Orders respecting the Mr. LISTER.

sale of Supply Farm No. 20 on Fish Creek, near Calgary, or authorizing the sale of said farm. Also, a return showing: 1. The number of acres under cultivation in said farm at the time of sale. 2. The buildings thereon and the cost thereof. 3. All applications for the purchase of said farm. 4. A copy of the conveyance or agreement entered into between the Government and the purchaser. 5. The price agreed to be paid for said farm, and how paid or payable. 6. And all correspondence between the Government, or the Department of the Interior, and any person, respecting said farm and the sale thereof. He said: On Monday last I drew the attention of the Government to this farm by making the following enquiry of the Ministry:

"Whether Supply Farm No. 20, on Fish Creek, near Calgary, has been sold; when, to whom, and for what price, and whether by private sale or public competition?"

In reply to that question the hon. First Minister answered:

"Supply Farm No. 20 has been sold to the Hon. Dr. Robitaille at a price of \$3 per acre, by private sale, and not by public competition."

I must say I was somewhat surprised to hear from the hon. First Minister that this valuable property had been disposed of by the Government by private sale, and at \$3 per acre. The farm, as I understand, is a large and valuable farm, consisting of, I think, some 5,000 acres, established some years ago by the Government as a supply farm; the object being to raise upon it grain to supply the instruction farms and the Indians. The farm has been in operation, and, so far as I can understand, in successful operation, for some years. A large number of men have been employed upon it, and a considerable amount has been expended in improving, cultivating, and building upon it. It is situated within a few miles of Calgary, in what is said to be one of the very best portions of the North-West Territory; the land is said to be first class land. Now, the exact amount expended upon the farm it is difficult to ascertain from the public documents. It is stated in one report that in 1880 there were 465 acres under cultivation, most of which was fenced; that there were buildings of some value on the premises; that other improvements had been made thereon, but to what extent it is a very difficult matter to gather from the reports submitted to the House by the Minister in charge of Indian Affairs. So far as I have been able to ascertain, I should say that we have expended at least over \$10,000 on that farm which has been sold for \$3 per acre by private sale to the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec. Now, as I said, Sir, the farm was established for a particular purpose, and, so far as one can gather from the reports, it has been a successful farm, adapted to the purposes for which it was intended. Judging also by the documents to which we have access, there was no reason whatever why the farm should have been sold, and certainly no reason that I can see why it should have been sold by private sale to Dr. Robitaille, the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec. The first report I could lay my hands upon was a communication from Norman T. McLeod, one of the Indian Agents in the North-West, to the Lieutenant Governor. In that report Mr. McLeod speaks of this farm, and of various other farms; points out the difficulty of operating them; and, of course, one would easily understand how, at that time, in 1880, there was considerable difficulty in operating them, isolated as they were and difficult of access. In Sessional Paper No. 14, of the year 1881, I find that Mr. McLeod, among other things, makes the following statement:—

"I regret having to report the almost total failure which has attended the operations on the two supply farms, at Fish Creek and at Pincher Creek, greatly owing to unavoidable causes. The spring was cold and late, and vegetation slow. The land was not in a state to expect a full crop from it, the greater part of it having only been broken for the first time in the spring, which caused the seeding to be backward. The seed intended for them was not delivered in time, and on the 23rd of August a heavy snow storm, followed by severe frost, cut off the late

sown grain. The farm at Fish Creek was also visited by a severe hail storm in July, which damaged the growing crops considerably. These storms are said to be usual in this country. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, the farms in the neighbourhood, where the land was properly prepared and sowed early, have yielded fair crops of barley and oats, showing that these grains may be raised successfully; peas will also yield good returns, but there being no demand for them at present they are not cultivated to any extent. They would make a valuable addition to the food supply for the Indians. Wheat is more uncertain; but, I think, more from the inferiority of the seed used, and the want of care in preparing it before sowing so as to prevent smut, than from the unsuitableness of the climate and soil."

We find, however, that as the reports come down year after year these difficulties disappear, and in the end they are able to grow crops successfully; and this property is said by the Inspector of Indian Agencies to be a valuable property. I find that Mr. Wadsworth, Inspector of Indian Agencies and Farms, in his report to Lieutenant Governor Dewdney, dated on the 1st of December, 1881, and appearing in the Sessional Papers of 1882, speaks of this farm in these words:

"I next visited the Fish Creek Supply Farm, arriving there on the 5th May. Mr. J. J. McHugh was in charge, having reached there from Rivière Qui Barre some ten days previously. He was actively engaged in putting in the seed, grain, roots, &c.; although in some degree hampered by inexperienced workmen and lack of horse power he was making good progress. The quantity of land broken here is 465 acres, most of which is fenced; that the farm is very badly equipped for extensive operations is apparent. In a country where wages are high, and food enormously dear, it stands to reason that to farm profitably labour-saving machines must be extensively used, also that horses should be used instead of oxen."

You will observe that this report is dated on the 1st of December, 1881, and has reference to the proceedings of that year. You will also observe that the report speaks of 465 acres having been cultivated, nearly all of which was fenced. I find in the Sessional Papers for 1883 a report from the same gentleman to Lieutenant Governor Dewdney, having reference to the year 1882. He says:

"The crops on the supply farms have not been very good. There will be between one and two thousand bushels on the Fish Creek Farm, also a large crop of peas and barley. The peas I shall send for seed to the reserves next spring, as I think they will be good to grow for food. The Indians can make soup of them. At Calgary, the Sarcees were not so successful, but we managed to take in a good many potatoes and other seed for next spring from the Fish Creek Farm, and I hope, next year, to make a good showing on this reserve."

There is nothing there that would indicate that the authorities up there, who had supervision and charge of this farm, communicated to the Government that it was desirable that the farm should be sold or disposed of in any way. Mr. Wadsworth, in the same report, further says:

"Under the management of Mr. Doyle, this farm was in fine order; a large crop had been sown which promised well. My remarks upon the discontinuance of Pincher Creek Supply Farm will also apply here. I may state that it is a very valuable property, and should, if sold, realize a good sum of money."

Now, that is the report made by Mr. Wadsworth, the Inspector of Indian Agencies, to the Department, which must have been known to Mr. Dewdney, and to the Minister in charge of the Department; but there is no suggestion that the farm should be disposed of. On the contrary, in a previous portion of the same report Mr. Wadsworth speaks of the continued success of the farm, and says that ultimately it would prove of great advantage to the Indians of the North-West. Now, we were told by the hon. First Minister that the farm has been sold; that it has been sold to the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec, and sold at the magnificent sum of \$3 an acre. It has been sold privately; the public were not aware that this farm was to be put on the market; nobody, so far as I am aware, knew except Mr. Robitaille and another Lieutenant Governor. I do not know why the Government sold this farm. I am not now enquiring why. They may have had reasons, but nobody knows what these reasons were. But what I do complain of is that this farm was sold at private sale, and for at least one-third of its value. That is the estimate of gentlemen who live in the neighbourhood

of the farm—friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, men who live in the city of Calgary. These gentlemen have stated to me that the property was worth three times what the Government got for it. The hon. First Minister tells us that it was sold to Lieutenant Governor Robitaille by private sale. Will the hon. gentleman say that there is no other Lieutenant Governor interested in that sale? I am prepared to give the hon. gentleman my authority that another Lieutenant Governor is interested in this farm. I state, without fear of successful contradiction, that two Lieutenant Governors went out to that farm, inspected it, and made an estimate of its value. I know, further, that one of the Lieutenant Governors, whose name the hon. gentleman did not give to the House, was in negotiation for the sale of a portion of that farm after it was bought from the Government. I say that if that farm was sold nominally to Lieutenant Governor Robitaille, there is another Lieutenant Governor as deeply interested in it as Mr. Robitaille. I say that if that is so, it is an outrage and a scandal which the Government ought to get rid of. I do not say now that the hon. First Minister, or the Government, were aware of all the circumstances; I cannot say, until the papers come down, whether they were in communication with the other Lieutenant Governor, or not; but I do say that it is not consistent with the duty that hon. gentleman owes to the Government and the public, that a man in his position, who gets the first report about a particular piece of property, should avail himself of that information, and, either for himself or any other person, secure an interest in the property. Nobody, except the officials, is aware of what these reports contain until they are submitted to Parliament; and there is no doubt that he had full knowledge of the fact that the Inspector of Indian Agencies reported to the Government that this was a valuable property and would realize a large sum of money, else he would not have joined in purchasing it by private sale. I say no more until the documents come down. I state, not what has been told me by my political friends, but by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in the city of Calgary, who complain bitterly of the sale of that property without public notice, and without the public having an opportunity of bidding for this valuable property. I contend that it is not a proper way of dealing with the public domain of this country, especially with such a property as this, upon which the Government had spent a large sum of money in cultivation, in erecting buildings, and in making other improvements. I ask the hon. gentleman if he knows that \$1,500 was spent in building a bridge across Fish Creek, which runs through the property, in order to benefit the farm? Did the Government take this into account when they sold the property to Mr. Robitaille for \$3 an acre? Does that cover the cost of all the improvements on the property? Even if it does, the Government have not received the value of the land, and they have practically given it away. Now, I say, in the first place, that it was unfair that this property should have been sold in this secret, underhand way—the public should have had an opportunity of bidding for it when it was put on the market; I say that it was sold for a great deal less than its value; I say that it was sold under circumstances which demand from the Government, if not from Parliament, a thorough enquiry; and I say that it was sold to Lieutenant Governor Dewdney, and another Lieutenant Governor, I believe, was interested in the purchase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to the motion being adopted, and the papers will be brought down at once. I rather regret the hon. gentleman did not pursue the usual course of reserving any remarks until he had the whole case before him. He has not had that advantage. He evidently considered it was important to himself, and the rest of the House, to get these papers

down in order that they might make up their minds on the subject, or he would not have moved for them. If he had all the information requisite to form an opinion, there was no necessity for his motion; but if not, he should have reserved comment until he could have spoken with some guarantee of correctness. There was evidently not a parliamentary animus actuating the hon. gentleman, when he said there are two Lieutenant Governors concerned in this, and that he would give their names if I asked for them; and wound up by saying that one of them was Lieutenant Governor Dewdney. He does not assert, but he insinuates, that Lieutenant Governor Dewdney is the purchaser of this place; and he insinuates this because two Lieutenant Governors drove out together and went over the farm together. That is the evidence he adduces to show that Lieutenant Governor Dewdney had an interest in the purchase of this farm. The hon. gentleman should remember that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, Mr. Dewdney, is the Commissioner for the management of Indian Affairs, and it was his duty to visit the farm. He was instructed to do so, and to report to the Government and the Department, as Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Therefore, in the performance of his duty, not as Lieutenant Governor, but as Commissioner, he went, in obedience to instructions, to make a valuation, and he did make it. That is the whole basis of the attack on Mr. Dewdney. Why this gentleman, because he is a public official, should be held liable to insinuations of that kind from an hon. member in his place, I do not see. It is a grave thing to make those charges. He has said that he heard from hon. gentlemen on this side that the people were very indignant over the matter. Well, this farm, a good many years ago, in the early settlement of that country, when there were few or no settlers, no means of getting provisions, and no railways, was laid out as a supply farm for the Indians. It was considered as a tentative matter, and the previous Government, I believe, laid this place out as a supply farm for Indians—the Blackfeet, and all those tribes stretching across the foot of the Rocky Mountains. The farm was not surveyed, but the site was taken up as an eligible one by the officers of that day, without reference to future surveys of any kind. The hon. gentleman will find, by the report of Mr. Wadsworth, that from some cause or other this farm has not been a commercial and financial success. The time has passed for the necessity of a supply farm of this kind, and the authorities of the Indian Department thought necessary to close this bill of expense which was annually a loss. It was closed, and the farm was transferred back to the Indian Department, ceasing to be an Indian farm. Then we had to consider what was to be done with it. It is a farm of some 4,500 acres more or less—I am not sure whether it has been surveyed yet or not; perhaps it has; but the moment it went back to the Department of Interior, it became, like other public lands in the North-West, open to homesteading and pre-emption, and also giving the Canadian Pacific Railway a claim to the odd numbered sections, a portion being within the twenty four mile belt. They had a right to their land, and if there were any school lands included, as I suppose there would be in those 4,500 acres, they were to be dealt with under the law relating to school lands. Over this farm were scattered buildings, principally of logs and of some years duration, which would be of little or no value if the farm were broken up in quarter-sections, except for the material they would afford the homesteader, who, mind you, was to get the land for nothing. If this land was not sold as one farm, it would have to be broken up into quarter-sections, and any homesteader could get land under the law upon entering himself for it as such. The hon. gentleman says this place ought to be put up at public auction. Well, we could not put it up as a whole farm at public auction, because the Government did not own it as a whole farm. Lieutenant Governor Robitaille, who took a fancy to the place, and who says as

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

soon as his term of office is over he is going to transfer himself to the North-West to settle there—

Mr. COOK. Is he going to take his piggery with him?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I dare say my hon. friend will find a very hospitable reception if he visits him there in the North-West. It could not be sold as a whole farm, and Mr. Robitaille was told he could make his own bargains with the Canadian Pacific Railway for their lands; but that as far as the school lands were concerned he could not get them, as they must be kept to be dealt with under the law which prescribes the mode of selling school lands. It can only be sold by public auction, and only when it has been surveyed, and at a price equivalent to the price which is obtained for the neighbouring lands. Therefore he did not get this 4,500 acres. He only got those portions of it that belonged to the Canadian Government. He did not get the Canadian Pacific Railway lands; he did not get the school lands; and he only got the even-numbered sections when surveyed. Now, these buildings were, as I have stated, of comparatively little value, and we could not put them up to auction. It was of great importance to get some person who would buy the whole farm. Mr. Robitaille said: "I have seen the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities, and I think I shall be able to make a bargain with them; I will run my risk of that." I will read, Mr. Speaker, from a report of the Deputy Minister. When I saw, yesterday, that the hon. gentleman showed symptoms of making a speech, I brought the papers over here, though it is rather inconvenient to quote papers higglety-pigglety in this way, when they are not before the House. On June 28th, 1883, the Deputy of the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Burgess, made this report to me as Minister of the Interior:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
"OTTAWA, June 28th, 1883.

"SIR,—I have the honour to direct attention to the fact that the Deputy of the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs has notified this Department that the tract of land known as the Fish Creek Farm, situated near the junction of the Fish Creek with the Bow River, in the District of Alberta, North-West Territories, is no longer required for Indian purposes, and possession of the same has been surrendered to this Department, to be dealt with as may be deemed proper.

"The Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs further states that it is proposed to dispense at once with the services of the person now in charge of the farm buildings and premises.

"Permit me respectfully to submit that, in order to dispose of this property to the best advantage, it is desirable that it should be sold at once, as every day's delay means deterioration of the farm buildings and decrease in the value of the breaking and all the other improvements.

"Moreover the tract of land attached to the buildings having, up to this period, been cultivated as one farm, it would be in the public interest to sell it in one block intact, so that the full value of the improvements made thereon by the Indian Department may be realized.

"I have, therefore, the honour to recommend that the authority of His Excellency the Governor General in Council, as required by section 24 of the Dominion Lands Act, 1883, be asked for the sale by this Department of the farm (with the buildings thereon) known as the Fish Creek Indian Farm, as shown on the tracing herewith, and more particularly described as follows:—

Here follows the description—

"Subject, however, when the surveys of the land have been made and confirmed, to any rights therein which may accrue by law to the Hudson's Bay Company."

Yes, the Hudson's Bay Company—I said the Canadian Pacific Company—

"And the school endowment; and subject also to such rights, if any, in the odd numbered sections therein which may accrue to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under 44 Vic., chap. 1.

"The price to be not less than \$3 an acre."

That is the report of Mr. Burgess. Subsequently that report was adopted, and I may say here that we considered that \$3 an acre was a very good price indeed. The nominal price of land by the Statute was \$1 an acre, and to get \$2 an acre additional for the old log buildings we considered was a very good bargain. The hon. gentleman says the land is worth more now. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is just now a boom at Calgary, something like the

boom that existed at Winnipeg a couple of years ago; but my hon. friend who sits behind me from the West Riding of Durham (Mr. Williams) has been over the ground, and says he would not give half the money for it. He has been over the ground, and on the farm, and has seen the improvements. On the 17th July, 1883, there was this further report from the Deputy Minister:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
"OTTAWA, 17th July, 1883.

"SIR,—With reference to the Order in Council of the 7th inst., transferring to this Department the Indian farm situated on the Fish Creek, in the District of Alberta, North-West Territories, and authorizing the sale of the land, with the buildings thereon, as one farm, at a price of not less than \$3 per acre, I have the honour to call your attention to the fact that the papers from the Department of Indian Affairs, which are now on record in this office, disclose that the Hon. Theodore Robitaille, of Quebec, made an offer of \$10,000 some time ago for the property, and Mr. Dewdney, Indian Commissioner, who has had the best means of arriving at correct conclusions as to the value of the farm, recommends the acceptance of the offer.

"The area is 4,733 acres, and I suggest that Mr. Robitaille be given the opportunity of purchasing at the upset price named in the Order in Council, namely \$3 per acre. As the land is not surveyed, and the respective rights of the Hudson's Bay Company, the school endowment, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, cannot at present be ascertained, I further recommend that for the purposes of the sale the area at the disposal of the Government be, for the present, computed at one half the whole area, or 2,366½ acres; that the terms of payment be one fourth of the purchase money of that area in cash, and the remainder in three equal annual instalments, with interest at the rate of 6 per centum per annum.

"When the survey is made and the interests of all the parties mentioned in this letter have been ascertained, the payments to be subject to readjustment, by increase or reduction, as the case may be.

"This would not accord exactly with Mr. Robitaille's offer, as it is evident he expected for \$10,000 to acquire the whole property from the Government direct, and the rate per acre would be higher than he contemplated. The proposition I make, however, is consistent with the policy of the Department, and in accordance with the provisions of the Order in Council transferring the farm."

This is a report from the Deputy Minister to myself. I believe it was the very best disposition of the property that could be made; I believe there has been a full value got for it and for the buildings; I believe that it would have only caused delay, without any good purpose whatever, to have advertized it, and put it up to auction. I am quite certain of that; we have had experience of that; we have been trying to sell the buildings at Fort Pelly; we have advertized them very largely, and we have not been able to get a bid for them, and the buildings are crumbling down. It is quite clear that the same result would have followed in this particular instance. This is the explanation. I am quite satisfied that the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec has not made his fortune out of this speculation; I am quite satisfied that, for the 2,000 and odd acres that the Government have sold to him, they are getting a high price, and much more than they would have got if it had been broken up into sections and homesteaded and pre-empted. The whole of the papers will be brought down with full particulars, and I shall have the opportunity of discussing the matter with the hon. gentleman again. In the meantime, I have not the slightest objection to the motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does not appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the First Minister has quite met the statement of my hon. friend behind me. My hon. friend's objection was—and a most just objection it is—that sales should be made by private contract to gentlemen in the position of the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, or any other party. Now, I heard something about this transaction myself. It was very freely canvassed and discussed in the North-West, and I will tell the hon. gentleman this: that I was credibly informed, and I believe it is the case, that one man, resident in the immediate neighbourhood of this same property, offered \$10 an acre for any 200 acres of this 4,700—not to the Government, but to the gentleman to whom the Government sold it. I was informed of that on authority which I am inclined to believe was correct.

I have not seen the property myself—I do not know whether the bargain may be a desirable one or not; but I do believe that the people in the North-West, and the people in the country generally, will agree with me in thinking that it is not expedient that private sales should be made by the Department of large portions of the public property to Lieutenant Governors or any other parties. It may be all right; the Government may have got all this property was really worth; but it is quite clear to me—and I think will be clear to everybody who considers the subject fairly—that to allow this to be done opens wide the door to all manner of jobbery and to an improper kind of speculation; and that it is much to be regretted that a transaction of this kind should have occurred between a gentleman occupying the position of a Lieutenant Governor and the Department of the Interior.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand then, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman desires the inauguration of a new policy. He desires that the lands in the North-West should be sold by public auction. Why, Sir, not an acre has been sold by public auction. It is in accordance with the law that every acre has been sold by private sale. The only exception—and it is made a special exception—is in regard to the school lands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that at any rate the public ought to have known that that land was to be disposed of by private sale. Those people in the neighbourhood did not know that—no man appears to have known it, except the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, and, perhaps, also some others.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite one thing to talk of land being sold as this was, and another thing to talk of land being sold by private sale, in the way in which the hon. gentleman mentions. When he says this land was sold by private sale, and that land was sold by private sale, he knows perfectly well that the sales he speaks of were of properties which have been announced to the public as open to any man to take at a fixed price. Was that done here? Was the public made aware that this farm was open to anybody who chose to apply for it at \$3 an acre? We know it was not. We know, therefore, this case differs from the rule in the North-West Territories entirely—unless, indeed, there be other exceptions which we have not yet learned.

Mr. COOK. There is one thing that must be taken into consideration. The hon. leader of the Government has stated that if I went to the North-West, no doubt I would be entertained at the Lieutenant Governor's residence. I want him to understand that I do not go to the North-West. A great many of his own friends go there, and probably he had given them an opportunity of getting entertained at the hands of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec. Probably, also, he is just paving the way for that hon. gentleman for another appointment as Lieutenant Governor of that Province. I wish to give my hon. friend to understand that I do not require to be entertained, nor shall I have the opportunity of being entertained at the hands of the Lieutenant Governor, even if he should come down to Ontario with his farm and the piggery upon it.

Mr. ORTON. I do not know that I can throw much light upon this subject; but a matter came to my knowledge that I think will go to show how difficult it is for the Government to obtain fair prices for buildings erected on the public lands in the North-West. I understand that at Livingstone, some time ago, something like \$40,000 was expended by hon. gentlemen opposite in erecting police barracks. A short time ago the present Government offered by public tender the section of land which was to form the town of Livingstone, on the old route of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and all the buildings, which cost something like \$40,000. They were offered to public

competition, and the highest tender received for these buildings and the whole section, was \$2,000. The Government thought very properly, I think, that it was so small a sum compared with the immense amount that had been expended, that they did not sell that property to any of the tenderers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that experience goes to show that the Government were justified in thinking that if a large area of land were given to any one individual, it might approach nearer to reimbursing the money they had expended in such public buildings as were erected on the farm at Calgary. However, it seems very strange to me to hear my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron), and my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), say anything as to the possibility of any gentleman making any money out of the lands in the North-West, when we so well know that these very gentlemen took advantage—I do not say improperly at all—to speculate in lands in the North-West to a very large extent, under the land regulations, which, I believe, were in operation during the *regime* of the hon. member for East York—

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. ORTON. Under Mr. Mills, as Minister of the Interior, when the regulations were somewhat as follows: That anybody could buy land at \$1 an acre, and pay for it at the rate of 10 cents an acre for ten years. If I am properly informed, those hon. gentlemen together obtained no less than 30,000 acres of these lands—the most valuable lands in southern Manitoba; and they sold those lands at \$9 an acre very shortly afterwards, realizing the very handsome sum of something like \$200,000—so I am informed. I think that when these gentlemen have made so large an amount of money themselves, they ought not to be so very jealous if a few friends on this side of the House undertake to speculate in that country. I know very well a great many of those gentlemen who have speculated in that country have lost money by it. It is well known to-day that many people in Ontario, both friends and opponents of the Government, who have invested in lands in that country, have lost very seriously by it—though I hope it will not be so with these gentlemen. But it seems to me to be a fact that lands to-day are not as saleable in that country as they were under the boom, though I believe they are gradually improving. Though a healthy state of affairs is beginning to exist in that country, I think at the same time that good lands south of the railway, prime lands, could not under the present depression bring a larger sum than \$3 per acre. And when we recollect that those lands in question are situated so very far away from any possible market, it does not seem to me that the sum is so extremely small, and I think the Government, on the whole, have made a very good sale.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman has stated that my hon. friend in front of me (Sir Richard Cartwright) and myself speculated in western lands under the Government of my hon. friend from East York. I wish to state that I never bought an acre of land while my hon. friend from East York was in power—not an acre of public land.

Mr. ORTON. I did not say you did.

Mr. CAMERON. I wish to state to the hon. gentleman that his information is incorrect—that I never had an interest in 30,000 acres, nor one-half 30,000 acres, of land. I wish to state to the hon. gentleman, further, that, to the best of my recollection, all the lands I ever bought in the North-West directly from the Government, were two sections, and I bought them from the Government of the hon. gentleman who sits before me on the other side of the House. I wish to state to the hon. gentleman, for his information, in order that he may be better

Mr. ORTON.

informed in the future, that if I did buy land in the North-West, out of which I am glad to say I made a little honest money, I bought a large portion of it from a son of the colleague of the hon. gentleman opposite, who was in the Government of Canada for a number of years. I bought it of him second-hand; I paid a fair price for it; and, of course, as lands went up, I made a little honest money out of it. Now, I do not think the hon. gentleman has any ground of complaint against me. I do not think he ought to have made that statement without being better informed as to what the real facts were. I am sure if he had known that the lands that I bought were bought from a son of a colleague of the present First Minister, he would not have said anything on the subject at all. I bought no lands from the Government except two sections; I bought no lands from the Mackenzie Government at all; whatever land I did buy there, I bought second-hand, and perhaps to better advantage than some hon. gentlemen on the other side have bought. I did not buy any timber limits at \$5 a square mile and sell them for \$2,000. The hon. First Minister complains that I have made a statement of the facts on making this motion, whereas I ought to have waited until the papers came down, and then have made my statement. Sir, I have tried that over and over again in this House. There were, at least, twenty motions made by me last Session in connection with the administration of public affairs in the North-West, and to this day there is scarcely one of these returns brought down. It might suit the purpose of hon. gentlemen opposite for these motions to be made without a word of comment, and then wait for the papers coming down until Parliament is about closing. There were, perhaps, a hundred motions made last Session, most of them having reference to the affairs in the North-West, and not a single one of them has been submitted to Parliament as yet.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may also request the attention of the House for one moment. I am not going to trouble the House with any narrative of my private affairs. Those affairs are my own business, and not the business of my hon. friends opposite. But I will just say this, as a matter which is due to myself, and, perhaps, due to the hon. gentleman, as he has alluded to it—that I bought no land at all from the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I should have considered myself guilty of a very gross dereliction of duty, if I had bought any land at all while I was a member of the Cabinet. What I did do, if the hon. gentleman desires to know, was to purchase some lands on which the Government, I believe, had first mortgage, and which I took good care to pay for promptly. That is all the transactions I had with the Government—and I do not think that any one would suspect the Government of the hon. First Minister of giving me any undue or unfair favours.

Mr. ORTON. I did not accuse the hon. gentlemen of purchasing land from the Government of which they were supporters at that time, nor did I accuse them of buying land from the present Government. All I did state was that they had bought from a number of individuals large areas of land bought from the Government under the regulations in force under the previous and present Government for a short time; and we know very well that a great many in that country bought land at 10 cents per acre, as a first instalment, at \$1 per acre. These gentlemen were very sharp in looking up individuals all over the country and securing land from them, and they made lots of money. I congratulated them on the fact, and I said, under those circumstances, they should not be so jealous of other individuals who paid a comparative good price to the Government for lands and made some money out of them.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman stated that the hon. member behind me and myself had

bought under the regulations laid down by Mr. Mills. We did nothing of the kind. At the time at which we purchased, Mr. Mills' regulations had been all abolished, and certain regulations adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite introduced.  
Motion agreed to.

#### REPORTS OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER ON IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all reports of the High Commissioner on the subject of immigration to Canada, not already brought down, said: We have heard something of the doings of the High Commissioner with respect to the transport of cattle from Canada to England, but as yet not much information has been vouchsafed to the House as to what has been done in regard to immigration to Canada since last Session. Two gentlemen have filled that office, and have dealt with the important subject of emigration to Canada, on which hon. gentlemen opposite were so inflated last Session; and with respect to which I was glad to hear the statement of the hon. Minister of Agriculture a short time ago in support of the statement of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) made during the debate on the Address, that there had been a large immigration to this country. We know that during this period negotiations of an important description with the Home Government, and with corporations and individuals who were discussing various plans for immigration on a large scale, have been progressing. Such, at all events, is our public information, and I cannot doubt, as was the duty of the last and the present High Commissioner, some reports have been sent to the Department, under whose instructions they have acted in this regard. They should come down—and come down early—and with this view I move the motion. Are there some such reports?

Mr. POPE. I do not know; I will bring them down if there are any.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the reports of the High Commissioner are of such little consequence that the hon. Minister does not even know whether they exist or not.

Motion agreed to.

#### PERSONS ENTERING MANITOBA BY RAIL.

Mr. BLAKE moved for a statement of the number of persons entering Manitoba by rail, during each month of the last calendar year; and of the number of persons leaving Manitoba by rail during each such month; also, for copies of all correspondence, reports, data and statements on which are based the estimates made by the Government of the number of immigrants who have come from specified countries, and settled in each Province of Canada, and in the North-West Territories, during the year; and of the number of Canadians who have left each province or territory or the Dominion, during the year. He said: I do not propose to enter at any length into the grounds of this motion. I stated them briefly last year when I made a similar motion, to which the hon. gentleman acceded. The motion passed; but, as happened with some other motions to which the hon. gentleman alluded a moment ago, it was fruitless in any other result.

Mr. POPE. I told you it would be so at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. No. The hon. gentleman said he could not give much information, but he could give some, and I did not even get what he could give. The hon. gentleman stated there would be a difficulty—or at all events at some period during the Session he stated that—in getting the number of persons entering and leaving Manitoba by rail, and he promised he would make an effort to secure that information for the current year. I trust he has made that

effort, because I will repeat to-day what I have said on various occasions, that I dispute the accuracy of the calculations which he has made, and I dispute the accuracy of the data on which the calculations have been based with respect to immigration into Manitoba and the North-West. I stated that the hon. gentleman himself had resorted to a similar mode of ascertaining, approximately, the immigration into the United States from Canada, as that which I proposed he should resort to in obtaining his information in regard to immigration into the North-West. He did that for a purpose. For a purpose, he was able to ascertain the number of persons who had passed one way or the other by the great railway of the country—a particular point as to which there was a dispute. With respect to Manitoba and the North-West, the hon. gentleman's plan has been, as I understand it, to obtain a return from somebody who gets aboard the trains and is supposed to count the passengers, those who go in, and a certain percentage of deduction is made for those going out. With respect to the return of those who go in, I have conversed with several persons who have travelled to the North-West by train, and they have told me that on the occasion on which they travelled they did not discern this enquirer and the counting to which the hon. gentleman referred; and, therefore, I do not myself believe that it has taken place upon all occasions. I believe it is loose; that the plan does not accurately represent the number of those who have gone in; and if it turns out to hit, approximately, the number given by the railway returns, it will be the result of a happy guess or conjecture, rather than of a really accurate detailed account. Then with respect to the deduction made for those who go out. The hon. gentleman has persisted up to this year—I do not know what he will do this year—in assuming that 17 per cent. of those who have gone in is a proper calculation in order to arrive at the number who have left. This is based upon the supposed ascertained results of an early years when the movement of persons in and out was a very few thousands—I forget the number, but a number quite inadequate compared with recent numbers. It was before what was alluded to to-day, and so often in this House, by the First Minister and others, as "the boom," before the speculative period, before there was a very large number going in and out; and we all know that since that time many persons have gone into that country two or three times a year and returned. We know that a large number, even of those intending to settle, have gone into the country to prospect and have returned. We know that the calculation of 17 per cent. is wholly inadequate; and, therefore, even if you assume the calculation with regard to those going into the country to be correct, the deduction which the hon. gentleman has been making for the last two or three years is wholly inadequate, and so the results are inaccurate. For this reason it is I have been persevering for some time past in my efforts to obtain more accurate information with respect to those who actually have gone to settle in the North-West. I feel great interest in obtaining a return covering this information, for which, as I have said, I obtained an Order of the House last year, but without success, so far as obtaining the result of that Order. It is impossible to understand what the calculations of the Government are. It was only, I think, on 10th January, that a statement obviously official appeared in the Toronto organ of the Government, the *Mail* newspaper, giving the details of the movement of the immigration of the year, and stating it in the various details with the general result—I cannot say for a 1,000 or so, but if I rightly remember, a result of 110,000. Now, the movement he gives us to-day is 130,400, or 20,000 more. Of course, I do not know where the inaccuracy is, whether in the later or the earlier statement.

Mr. POPE. We gave you the returns we had at that time, and we give you the returns at the end of the year.

Mr. BLAKE. But the return was stated to be on the 10th of January, and that it was a return for the operations of the year.

Mr. POPE. Many of them were not in.

Mr. BLAKE. But the return was as I have stated. I once again insist on the importance of our having the opportunity, as a House of Parliament, of investigating the material on which the Government is acting—the data, and statements, and papers from which they draw these general results. Nothing can be more important to us than to be able to establish, as a fact, that there is flowing into this country as a permanent immigration of settlers here anything like the figures which the hon. gentleman states; and, therefore, it is of the greatest consequence that the material should be before us, so that we should be able to verify and speak with confidence in favour of the calculations of the Government. The hon. gentleman says, to-day, in answer to my question, that some 50,400 were the entrants into Manitoba. Even according to his own calculation of the deduction to be made, which is 17 per cent., that would give us something like 41,000 or 42,000 as his estimate of the emigration to Manitoba for the year, or of the settlement in that Province for the year. I do not believe there has been any such settlement from all I can ascertain. I believe that if there did go in the 50,000 that he speaks of, a great deal more than 8,000 left the country, if you calculate the various sources of exit and the various purposes of exit which applied during the year. From all I can hear, the figures of the hon. gentleman are exaggerated as to the settlement, if I am to assume that he is to apply to the calculation of 50,400 the deduction only of 17 per cent., and assume that the balance remained settled in the country. But even so, that balance of 41,000 or 42,000, contrasts but very unfavourably with the account which he gave us last Session: Last Session he stated with great confidence that altogether irrespective of the supposed immigration from Ireland *en masse*—the discussed arrangement for the coming out of 5,000 families—there would be 75,000 settlers in Manitoba and the North-West, for the year which has just elapsed. He declared that he expected to get in 40,000 from other countries than Canada—from European countries, and the United States practically—and the 35,000, being the balance of the 75,000, were to come from the old Provinces. His figures—assuming we apply the old deduction, which he has always applied—are not much more than one half this amount, and I believe those figures, so miserably contrasting with his promises for the year, are themselves, as I have stated, exaggerated. The hon. the First Minister declared that the estimates of the hon. gentleman were correct, that they were very moderate, that they were not at all exaggerated, and that he was quite satisfied that they would be realized. These were the statements, first, of the Minister specially charged with the matter, and secondly, of the hon. First Minister upon his particular responsibility, and this is the result of these statements, so far as they apply to the settlement of Manitoba and the North-West, according to the calculations of the hon. gentleman himself. I trust, Sir, that at an early day we shall have before us an answer to this motion. I trust we shall be shown what are the data upon which the Government brings down this general statement; that we shall be permitted to verify them; because I repeat what I said in the debate on the Address that all the calculations which are to be made from the various figures which are given—the figures of the census as contrasted with the hon. gentleman's figures of immigration and settlement year after year, the figures of the municipal census of Ontario—all the data we can obtain indicate that it is not possible that the results which he suggests can have actually been realized; that we can have added so much to the permanent settlement in our country,

Mr. POPE.

as he declares we have added, unless that permanent settlement has been effected by displacement of the native portion of the population approximately equivalent to it. That is not the case from these very figures. There has been a displacement, and a very considerable displacement, but not an equivalent displacement; and from all I can conjecture—and I desire to approach the subject with the assistance of the papers I now ask for—there has been no such permanent settlement from abroad—no such addition to our population otherwise, by the introduction from abroad either of Canadians or of citizens of other countries as the hon. gentleman calculates.

Mr. POPE. I might say to the hon. gentleman, as I said last year, that it will be impossible to give all the particulars asked for, but I will be happy to give him all the information I can. When that information is given, I suppose I shall find him doubting, as I find him doubting to-day. He will believe nothing that comes from the officers of my Department—nothing but what he sees with his own eyes. These returns are from disinterested parties; they are a count of the people going into that country and the people coming into this country. The people who make this count have no reason to exaggerate; still, the hon. gentleman will not believe them. It is true that I said last year that in my opinion there would be a larger immigration, and I believed so. I can appeal to my hon. friend as to the reasons which have prevented immigration—the reports and speeches which have been made by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I can appeal to the newspapers of these hon. gentlemen, and to what has been written in them, and ask him if that has not been enough to discourage people from going into the country. There has not been a single day in the whole season when any labouring man coming into this country could not find employment. In fact, Sir, I have not been able to half supply the demand of farmers for labourers; and yet reports are going to the other side of the water, daily and weekly, that people coming to this country can find nothing to do. That is quite sufficient to account for the falling off in the immigration into the North-West. But, upon the whole, the immigration has been nearly as large as I expected it would be.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh no, no!

Mr. POPE. Yes, nearly as large. There is a difference, but it is not a very large difference. Last year, there left Manitoba a considerable number; but there came in 15,000 more than left. I am not able to state exactly how the matter stands this year, but I shall be able to bring down the figures, and I hope I shall be able to remove some doubts from the hon. gentleman's mind as to the number of immigrants who came into the country. But let me point out that there is a difference between the immigration into the country and the actual settlers. There are labourers who also are immigrants, and when you take all together, you will find that we have not over-estimated. Every man who comes across the border reports to the Customs officers, in order to bring in his goods as settler's effects; and there can be no mistake about these entries. Then, we receive from our own agents invoices of the number of passengers in every ship; and there can be no mistake there. Whether there may be some of those who leave the country, I cannot say. Some may leave, but I cannot speak exactly as to the movement of population. If it should happen to turn out that the number who have left is not half of 17 per cent., that there is a very small percentage of the people coming out, I know the hon. gentleman would be pleased. I know he is a patriot, and regards his country above all party; I know he would be delighted to hear that no people have left that country at all. I am afraid I cannot say that there have not been a few; but I think I shall be able to show

the hon. gentleman that 17 per cent. have not gone out this year.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman must remember that a new mode of exit from Manitoba has been adopted of late years; that there is a way of going out by rail, and I am sorry to say, a way of going out by trail; and he must put these two together before he arrives at his percentage.

Mr. POPE. I am not sorry that there is a way of going there by trail as well as by rail. I wish there were a thousand trails by which settlers could go into that country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. POPE. I am not out of order.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is out of order in that he is speaking twice. I was replying to the motion and he misconstrued a material part of what I said. I asked him to remember that there were two ways of leaving the country, not of entering it.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose settlers can go in by trail also.

Mr. POPE. I was replying to the hon. gentleman. I hope I did it effectually?

Motion agreed to.

### CUTTING TIMBER ON INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence and departmental orders, with reference to the granting, cancellation and suspension of licenses to cut timber on lands of the Indians, near Fort William, on the Fort William Reserve, said: The reason I make this motion is that a letter has been transmitted to me which was addressed by a number of the Indians of the reserve to a friend of mine, in which they make a statement on which I base the motion, and to which I would call the attention of the Government. They say:

"It is necessary we should expose before you the whole case as clearly and concisely as possible. Some twelve years ago, that is the year the Red River Expedition took place, a certain Mr. William Plummer came to our reserve, when all the men, except three or four, were absent, having accompanied the soldiers. He exposed the object of his visit to those he found here. He had come, he said, to ask the Indians their consent to a license to cut timber on their reserve. Two of the men put their names to the surrender. A third one, as he declared afterwards, under oath, gave his name, but did not make his mark or touch the pen, saying he would do so if, after their return, he found his fellow Indians favourable to the petition. None of the signers had any authority in the band. The surrender form, with these three names on it, was left in the hands of the Rev. J. P. Choné, S.J., Missionary at Fort William. Then Mr. Plummer returned to Ottawa, after having given the Indians flour and tobacco, and told them to make their brethren sign the surrender when they had returned. Some time after, the absent came home and were called to the house of the missionaries, where the Rev. Father Choné told them of Mr. Plummer's visit and holding in his hands the surrender form, translated it and explained it to them. When they had consulted together for a few minutes they unanimously answered negatively, saying they would put their names to no paper, as they had not received what they had been promised before. They were told to reconsider the matter, but answered a second time in the same manner. Towards the fall, Mr. Plummer returned to Fort William and gathered together the Indians at the Hudson Bay Company post, the meeting taking place in presence of Mr. G. McIntyre, the then agent of the company at Fort William. Mr. Plummer proposed to all what he had previously proposed to a few. The consent asked for was unanimously denied or refused. He insisted several times, but invariably received the same answer. William Crow, who was then our First Chief, having remarked that his name was on the surrender, said to Mr. Plummer: 'Who has given you my name? You have stolen it.' Plummer blushed and answered nothing. Though Crow can write his name, another person has written it down, and nobody has witnessed the writing. Plummer, seeing his failure, became very angry, and throwing with violence on the table the surrender form he held in his hands, said: 'So I cannot obtain anything. Well, notwithstanding your opposition, the Government shall take your timber.' All returned home; two years elapsed before anything was heard about Plummer's threats; then we were told that a license had been granted by the Government to a man named Monk to cut timber on our reserve. Immediately we protested against it, and sent our protest to the Government. Our Chief has in his possession the draft of the protest drawn by Father Choné. From 1874 to the fall of 1882, three or four persons trespassed on our reserve, but all were easily stopped, except Mr. Oliver, who used to own a saw mill at Fort William. He cut a great number of our pine trees. Time and again we spoke to Amos Wright, who was then our agent,

and to S. J. Dawson, the member for Algoma, begging of them to see that Oliver should pay damages for his trespasses. Finally, Mr. Dawson told us that Oliver had used the Monk license when he made timber on our reserve. We did not understand what he meant. In the fall of 1882, Mrs. Farjanya, of Montreal, Mr. Henry Valières, of Three Rivers, and Mr. Thomas Marks, of Port Arthur, formed together a partnership called 'The Thunder Bay Lumbering Company.' The news was then spread that they were to begin to work on our reserve, using the Monk license which had come down to them, it appears, as follows: Monk before ever having made any use of his license, advertised in the papers that he would sell it. A man named Stewart bought it. He then took the late Farjanya as his partner. When Farjanya died, his widow became the owner of one-half the license and bought the other half from Stewart. Then she took Henri Valières as partner, and they both formed the said company with Thomas Marks. We then protested against their entering on the reserve, and signified our protest to Thomas Marks. They, nevertheless, began to work. We then deputed to Ottawa J. B. Binesi, who was then our Chief, with an interpreter. On their way, they took with them Mgr. Jamot, Bishop of Peterborough. When they had reached Ottawa, they had an interview with Sir John Macdonald, and presented him our petition, begging of him that he would cancel the Monk license, granted under false allegations, and stop the Thunder Bay Lumbering Company from cutting our timber and our trees. One point was immediately obtained, namely, that they should make no more cordwood, as the license had been granted only for merchantable timber; but Sir John said that, before cancelling the license or stopping the company, an enquiry about the facts of the case should have to be made. T. J. Dawson was proposed by Sir John to do the work, and accepted by the deputation. But Mr. Dawson refused to act and was replaced by Mr. Caddy, a Government officer, residing at Fort William. This latter one immediately proceeded to make the enquiry, examining under their oaths a good many Indians, Mr. McIntyre and some others. All testified according to what we have set above. Mr. Caddy made his report without delay, and placed it before Sir John. We, therefore, expected an early decision, but on the contrary those we complain of were allowed to work during the whole winter, cutting about 10,000 logs per week. However, the right Rev. Bishop Jamot, and we ourselves, often asked Sir John to give his decision, considering that our case was so clear, but, nevertheless, we could not obtain justice. We saw that Sir John was favouring Marks on account of the support his party received from him in the elections, Marks having a great deal of influence in these parts. So we told Sir John in one of our letters we hoped that this question, having nothing to do with politics, would not be influenced by them, but our remark had no effect. Last spring, when the company's work was over, the time for renewing the Monk license came, but Sir John did not renew it, saying he wished first to examine our case. Mr. Donnelly came here to tell us he had notified Marks and others, on the part of the Department, not to cut any more timber on the reserve. However, towards the middle of the summer, seeing that no decision was given, we began to suspect they wanted to play us a trick; namely, that Sir John being afraid to see another deputation from us in Ottawa, had ordered our agent to warn us as we stated above, but that when navigation was closed, and we could no longer travel, then he would again allow Marks to work on the reserve. Consequently, we decided to send another deputation to Ottawa, and wrote to our Bishop about it. He answered us not to start before he wrote us again. Meanwhile, he corresponded with Sir John and Mr. Vankoughnet. The matter was delayed from week to week, until navigation had closed, and now that we cannot travel easily, Vankoughnet has written to Mr. Donnelly to allow Marks and his partners to use again the Monk license and they are hard at work. It is in this way that we are treated by him who should protect us. Evidently politics have a great deal or rather everything to do with the case. Marks is now being rewarded for the help he gave the Ottawa Government in the last Algoma election. We were told, some years ago, that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie was defeated, partly on account of the Neebing Hotel or Town Plot Affair. We do not know how far the charges made against it may have been true, but supposing they were, then on the other side, on the Kaministiquia River, just opposite the Town Plot, on our reserve, is to be found a pendant to the Neebing Hotel case. Once more, hon. Sir, we ask your help in order that we may obtain justice. If it were absolutely necessary to send one of us to Ottawa, we would try to do so, though our poverty would make it hard for us, especially in winter.

We subscribe ourselves, honourable Sir,  
Your most humble servants,  
JOHN PIERRÉ, 1st Chief.  
his  
MICHEL + St. GERMAIN, 2nd Chief.  
mark.

The House will excuse my attempting to read all the other names. I trust the hon. gentleman will see that these papers are brought down early and that he will do something to restore the confidence of those poor people in their protector and guardian. I understand that although they are not here, Marks is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will be very glad to bring down all the papers at once. I do not know whether this will assure confidence in the signers of this letter, but I

know that the Government and the Department have acted according to what they considered to be the best interests of the Indians. I have seen a statement similar to this before. One of the statements was that a Mr. Plummer went up there while most of the tribe were away at Red River, during the time of the war, and had succeeded in securing a surrender of this timber. This Mr. Plummer was the Indian Agent at Toronto, a highly respectable person, who had been an officer of the Department for many years, and whom, no doubt, the hon. gentleman knows very well. Instructed, I presume, by the head of the Department of that day, he went to get a surrender of this timber, in order that it might be put in the market and sold for the benefit of the Indians. The hon. gentleman knows that unless the timber is so sold, the Indians will connive at a trespass on their own property either for a little money or a little spirits, and thus their property is wasted. Mr. Plummer, at that day, went there and got this order for the purpose of putting the timber in the market for the benefit of the Indians. This is a matter of every day occurrence in the Indian Department, and is in fact the only way by which the Indians get anything out of their timber. Mr. Plummer has been, in consequence of these statements, called on to make a report. As far as I can learn, he had no interest in the matter, but merely did his duty as agent in getting this surrender. To show that the recollection of Indians, or their regard for veracity, is not very accurate, or that they have been misled by parties into signing documents of which they do not understand the value, I need only state this simple fact: The Red River Expedition took place in 1870 and the statement is that the Indians were all then absent at Red River, except the three or four who signed this surrender. Upon looking at the papers you will find that these poor people have only been misled by a year. The surrender was made in 1871, when the whole thing was over and the Indians had all returned. This excuse is got up for these people by some interested persons, most likely those who are plundering the Indians of their timber and do not desire that any person should get possession of it, but that it should remain as before, subject to be trespassed on by anybody. The surrender was made by these Indians in the usual way, according to the Indian Act of that date, the year after the expedition was made, when every Indian had returned for a whole season from this war, at which they said they had all been absent. I will bring down the papers and the papers will show that fact.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, no doubt it was very unfortunate that the license was granted in the first place, but it was not supposed at that day that the timber was so very valuable as it has now become, from its proximity to the railroad, and there is no doubt that, if the arrangement had been carried out, the Indians would have been great sufferers; their timber would have gone for very much less than its real value. In the statement the hon. gentleman has just read, there is a great deal that is true, and a great deal that is very much exaggerated. It is true, as the Indians say, that they have been the losers by this license, but it is utterly incorrect that they have tried to give a political character to it. It was this Monk license, which Mr. Marks had a perfect right to buy if Mr. Monk had a right to sell; but I believe the Government has now looked thoroughly into the matter, and that there is some new arrangement made—I only heard of it the other day—by which the Indians are to be remunerated by those who are taking the timber, and I am told that the Government has arranged matters so that the Indians now get \$12,000 for the timber on the reserve.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear; that is so.

Mr. DAWSON. From all that I can hear, the parties who hold the license, Messrs. Farjana & Marks, between  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

them have to pay the value of the timber to the Indians, and I think that is a very fortunate arrangement.

Mr. COOK. I should like to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether this license was not withheld last year, or cancelled? I know Mr. Marks was here looking after the interest of his license, and he was very much annoyed that the Government had cancelled his license. Now, I would like to know, Sir, if that license had been granted for the support that Mr. Marks gave to the Opposition candidate in the Algoma election for the Local Legislature. I would like to know if \$12,000 is the price that the Government of the Dominion paid for the support of the candidate of the Opposition for the Local Legislature. That is a point that should be cleared up by the Government of the day. We know that, in different parts of the Province of Ontario, in the last election for the Local Legislature, they undertook to defeat the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mowat. We know by the courts what means were adopted for the defeat of that hon. gentleman; and, Sir, I shall be able to show in a few days how other men were brought forth as candidates in the Tory interest by the Dominion Government, by which they got subsidies and Government positions from this Government of the day here. I should like the hon. gentleman to clear up that one point: if \$12,000 was the price of one individual supporting a Tory candidate in the Local Election for Algoma, how much did they all cost?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is of an enquiring mind, and I am very glad to see he is. He says he wants to know whether the \$12,000 of which my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has spoken, was the price paid to Mr. Marks for his support. As I understand the statement of my hon. friend, the \$12,000 is the sum paid by Mr. Marks for the timber. It is \$12,000 paid by Mr. Marks to the Crown. It is not very often that a person is bribed by being obliged to pay money. People are sometimes bribed, I am told, and nobody understands it better than my hon. friend (Mr. Cook). Persons sometimes are bribed by getting money, but I never before heard of their being bribed by being obliged to pay money. This case, I may say at once, was a very troublesome one. There was a great deal of conflicting evidence. Some of the evidence was either wilfully, or inadvertently, or ignorantly inaccurate; but still it was my duty to see that the Indians should be protected, and the papers will show that the parties have been compelled, notwithstanding their strict legal rights, perhaps, if it were pressed, to have that timber under the terms of the original license, to pay a further sum of money. I will ask the House not to prejudge the case, because it is wrong that people's interests should be discussed without a full understanding of the case. The papers will be brought down at once.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to my hon. friend's assistant in discharging the duties of his office for vouchsafing some further information than the hon. gentleman chose to vouchsafe, or perhaps than he knew. I am sure none of us supposed, from what the hon. Superintendent General of Indian Affairs stated, that the question was settled. We were told that Mr. Plummer, in consequence of these representations, had been called upon to make a report, and that we would hear all about it. Now, it appears that the whole matter is settled, the sum has been fixed, and, on the payment of this additional sum, Mr. Marks and his colleagues are to have this license continued. Perhaps it was indiscreet for the hon. gentleman to better the instructions and give more full information than the somewhat older Parliamentarian who assists him in the discharge of the duties of the Indian Department was disposed to give. At all events, we are obliged to him for letting us know that there is no necessity for the poor Indians to come down to Ottawa, because the hon. gentle-

man has decided the case, whether fairly or unfairly to them, I do not know. It is true that it is not very easy to bribe persons by making them pay money, but it is very easy to give them a great favour by letting them have property at half or a quarter its price.

Motion agreed to.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOCATION.

Mr. BLAKE. I will move a motion which is similar to the motion I moved at an early part of last Session, with a view of obtaining the information up to this time, showing the condition of the railway. I move for a map or maps, showing:—1. The location of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so far as approved or constructed. 2. Its location so far as proposed to Government, but not yet approved. 3. The location of any branches constructed, and of any now contemplated by the company, so far as the Government is advised. 4. The lands set apart for the company, but not yet granted. 5. The lands granted. 6. The lands applied for, but not yet set apart. As I said, it is *verbatim* the motion of last Session.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the information asked for in this motion will be promptly furnished.

Motion agreed to.

#### ALLOWANCES TO CANADIAN MANUFACTURES REQUIRED BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for all correspondence, reports and Orders in Council not covered by the Address of last Session, relating to the allowances proposed to be paid to the Canadian manufacturers of certain goods required by the Canadian Pacific Railway; of all applications for such allowance, and correspondence in connection therewith; a statement of the calculations on which the allowances have been based, and the estimate in detail of the probable sums payable out of the Treasury in respect of each class of goods, assuming them to be made in Canada, to the extent of the company's requirements, and of the *ad valorem* percentage of all allowances on each such class. He said: This also is a copy of a motion which the House approved of last Session, but to which no return has yet been made, and to which, I presume, the Minister of Customs will lay the return on the Table at an early day. He has been good enough to make the intimation to me that what is proposed in this Address would be somewhat bulky, and I venture to make publicly the suggestion which I made to him privately, in answering that intimation, that if the other return is ready, as I presume it is, and if it is laid on the Table at once, I would be able to arrange for the elimination of any portion of the information sought by this motion which would not be essential to the obvious public purpose, which the motion is designed to serve.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to the motion. As intimated by the hon. gentleman who made the motion, it would take some little time to prepare the papers. I was under the impression, if my recollection serves me aright, that I did furnish a synopsis, if I may so term it, or extract of the information asked for by the hon. gentleman at the last Session of Parliament. It has escaped my recollection as to whether full details were presented, but if not, I will make enquiry at once and see that it is attended to. But if the hon. gentleman requires, as he has intimated, all the information asked for in the motion just made, it would take some little time to prepare the return. I may mention to the House, as I did to the hon. gentleman, that there are no less than 220 of these claims, and in connection with many of them there has been a great deal of correspondence. So

far as the Department is concerned, we should much prefer that the whole correspondence should be laid before the House, as it will then be seen that the greatest possible care has been taken, and that no more has been paid under those claims than they are absolutely entitled to by law.

Mr. BLAKE. I am a little disappointed at the hon. gentleman's statement, because he will remember that at the close of last Session he showed me what was called a return to the last motion, and it was found there was some misunderstanding on the part of some of his officers by which they had misapprehended the motion, and it was really no answer at all—it was not presented. The understanding was that the recess would be utilized—I think the expression was to the prejudice of all other business—to prepare these returns. I am afraid the recess has not been so utilized, and I do hope we will get the papers early this Session.

Mr. BOWELL. Just as early as they can be written up and copied.

Motion agreed to.

#### GRINDING IN BOND.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of all Orders in Council, departmental orders not covered by the Order of last Session, on the subject of grinding in bond, or of the regulations for grinding in bond, or for the import of wheat and flour of United States growth or manufacture; also for all correspondence with the authorities of the United States on the subject of transport of Canadian wheat into or through the United States, and of all regulations of the United States Customs authorities affecting such transport. And also, for copies of all correspondence not covered by the Order of last Session, with reference to frauds upon the Customs in the export of Canadian wheat or flour, in satisfaction or bonds given on the importation of United States wheat or flour; all reports, evidence and departmental action upon such frauds; statement of the extent thereof, names of the parties concerned, and a statement of the action of the Department thereon. He said: This also is a consolidation of two motions which were made last Session, to one, and perhaps to both, of which I believe returns are yet wanted.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would the hon. Minister say whether there is any change in the regulation with reference to the equivalent of bushels of wheat to the barrel of flour from what existed some time ago; and if so, what the equivalent is now?

Mr. BOWELL. There has been no change in the Order in Council since it was brought down last Session; consequently, the equivalent in flour has not received any consideration.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE HIGH COMMISSIONER OF CANADA.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, commissions and instructions touching the appointment of the present High Commissioner of Canada in London; and touching the discharge of the duties of the Minister of Railways during his absence in England as High Commissioner; and touching the discharge of the duties of the High Commissioner during his absence in Canada as Minister of Railways, said: It will be within the recollection of the House that during the course of last Session it was considered an open secret that the Minister of Railways was to become High Commissioner. I made enquiry on that subject, and the right hon. gentleman answered me in a diplomatic manner, by informing me that no offer had been made to the hon. gentleman, and consequently there had been no acceptance of the offer. Of course, an understanding had been reached, because,

shortly after, the hon. gentleman himself, at an entertainment which was given to the gentleman recently deposed, I regret to observe—I refer to Mr. Mousseau, late Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec—quite sufficiently indicated that his existing relations with the party to which he is an ornament, were about to be severed. Well, that was the state of things, so far as the public were informed, at the close of the Session, and immediately after the close of the Session an announcement was made that that state of things had been changed; and that while the hon. gentleman was about to assume the office of High Commissioner, he was also to retain the office of Minister of Railways. Now, I think, that when an arrangement of this kind was made, it was not an unreasonable thing to expect that the earliest opportunity would be taken of making an explanation to the House of the reasons for the change—if it was a change—and the arrangement which was substituted for the original one, for no doubt it was an important substitution. We may differ as to the constitutional propriety, as to the convenience of that arrangement; but, whether we differ or no, there can be no doubt whatever that it is an innovation on our practice, and one of sufficient consequence to entitle us, I think, to explanations upon it. I do not intend, at the present moment, to do more than to ask for those explanations, and to indicate, in the briefest possible way, the points upon which I think, mainly, they ought to be given. It seems to me that is the more proper course. In the first place, there is the question of the relation of the High Commissioner of Canada to the particular members of the Administration. He is the agent of the Administration at large, but he is also the agent of the various Ministers to whom, individually, he has been in the habit in the past of referring. We have before us instructions given to Sir Alexander Galt, as High Commissioner. It will be remembered that with respect to the negotiations with France, and I rather think with Spain also, he received instructions from the Minister of Finance. The Minister wrote the Commissioner a letter, which is published, instructing him what to do. The Commissioner went and did not do it, but I suppose the failure was not his fault—he tried to do it. The Commissioner reported to the Minister of Finance what he had done under his instructions. He reported to the Minister of Agriculture what he had done upon the subject of immigration, and I dare say to other hon. Ministers also, with respect to matters on which, under their direction, he had acted for their different Departments. It seems to me it is unfortunate that hon. Ministers should pay so little regard to those reports that, as we have learned to-day, they really do not know whether they have been made or not; that an hon. Minister was not in a position, although two days' notice was given of the motion for the production of the Lord High Commissioner's reports, to tell whether there are any reports or not. We do not know whether some subordinate, some deputy-chief, has put reports from the Commissioner away in some dusty pigeon-hole. Whether the memory of the hon. Minister of Agriculture has become oblivious, we do not know; but the fact remains that he does not know whether reports have been made by the High Commissioner either to various hon. Ministers or to one hon. Minister. As to the Commissioner acting under the directions, and carrying out the views of various hon. Ministers, I suggest that the position of an hon. gentleman who is also himself one of the hon. Ministers, is exceedingly peculiar. It is an inconsistent position, as it seems to me; it is a position of servant and of colleague as well. As a Minister, he is equally responsible, according to the theory of our Constitution—however imperfectly that theory may work in England and with us to-day—with other members of the Government for all that is done; but as Commissioner, he acts under orders; he is told to go, and he goes; do this, and

Mr. BLAKE.

he does it—or at all events he tried to do it. Then, as I have said, our system is one theoretically of undivided responsibility, unless that responsibility is purged, of course, by the Government at large declining to accept it, and we know in that case the result to individual members; and I have said that this system is imperfectly worked both in England and here. Practically our system of responsibility is largely a departmental one. Both the House and the country at large are very much disposed to hold individual Ministers very largely responsible for the conduct of their Departments. Large questions there are, as the First Minister said the other day, in regard to which therefore, it is not inconvenient he should often direct; but a First Minister has a very special responsibility, and which, this statement of the hon. gentleman is incidentally a proof of my present proposition, that there is a great number of questions in respect of which a Minister acts independently, and in respect to these, neither the House nor the country is disposed to look very harshly upon undivided responsibility but is disposed to judge of the individual Minister. The punishment to-day for breach or neglect of duty, for error or misjudgment and for whatever may be called political crime or political action, which is objected to, is a loss of confidence by the House and the country; and it is, therefore, of great consequence that a Minister should be, as far as circumstances will at all permit, in a position in which he can discharge the duties of his office, that he may do them, and be held to that responsibility to which I refer. I may be told that when he does not perform them, somebody else does. It is quite true there are acting Ministers. The Minister of Agriculture knows how that is done—that it is done in a perfunctory sort of way. We know how it was done with respect to the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway last summer, during the absence of the Minister of Railways temporarily. We know all about it: I should not say we know all about it, but we know enough about it to be able to judge with regard to it. It is a mode of doing business which is unsatisfactory. It is fitting that the Minister of Agriculture should take charge of immigration and statistics; that the Minister of Railways should take care of his own Department; and arrangements by which acting Ministers take charge are arrangements only to be tolerated as arrangements of a temporary character, due either to illness or temporary absence on public business, necessitating the non-performance of the duties of the office by the hon. Minister who is responsible. It is quite different to make an arrangement of this description under which an hon. Minister leaves the House and the country before the Session is over and returns just about in time for this Session, being absent during an interval in which important questions with respect to the great railway which forms the main subject of this Department, were to be settled; questions of the route through the Rocky Mountains, for instance; the settlement of the passes, of the financial standing of the company, of the guarantee—the papers in regard to which we hope will be brought down in a few moments—and other questions of very great importance, all of which we have not fully before us at this time. I say it is of great consequence for the practical good working of the Constitution, for the realization of that measure of responsibility upon which the efficacy of responsible Government depends, that hon. Ministers charged with Departments should, as a rule, subject to as few exceptions as possible, perform the duties assigned them; and the absence of the Minister of Railways during the whole recess practically is, in the circumstances under which he has been absent, not consistent with the Constitution as we understand it, and its practical good working. Then the Session comes and this dual officer cannot be in two places at once, not being an Irishman or a bird, and he leaves London and comes here. What is to become of the High Commissionership? We are told it is a very important

office, and one of growing importance; that it is an office which requires the ablest men and their utmost energies to discharge the duties. But the High Commissioner deserts his office in the month of December, comes out to Canada and will remain here some months, four or five months, no doubt, elapsing from the time of his leaving his office until his return. There is nearly half the year, therefore, during which we have no Commissioner. We have not an acting Commissioner, and there is only a clerk to discharge all the important duties. What! Are all the eggs addled? What about all the commercial treaties we have heard about during recent years? Is nothing going to happen? When I ventured to make a suggestion in regard to the office, I was told that there was not a moment on which a treaty was not on the carpet; that it was necessary to have a man ready to take advantage of the first opportune moment, and that an important concession by France had been lost by twenty-four hours delay. Yet the High Commissioner is here and can only act in London by cable. Thus, I have stated as briefly as possible, the difficulties, and the House is entitled to explanations as to the arrangement completed after the close of last Session, and now in force, under which the same person fills the office of Minister of Railways and High Commissioner of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection, of course, to this motion, and the Government will be very glad to bring down any papers covered by it. The hon. gentleman objects very much to my hon. friend holding the two positions. One, that of hon. Minister of Railways, will, I believe, be a tolerably permanent position—for I think he may be expected to hold it for some years, if he chooses—and the other of a more temporary nature. When Sir Alexander Galt sent in his resignation as High Commissioner, it was found absolutely necessary that some person should be on the spot in England, on account of some matters which were of pressing importance, or threatened to be of pressing importance, and that, therefore, the Government should have an officer there at once. The Government asked Sir Charles Tupper to go to England for that purpose, and go he did. The arrangement in the first place was of a temporary nature, and it is not yet of a permanent nature; but it was of very great importance that he should go to England, as I have already stated. I think that the fact—the happy fact, the accidental fact, for which, of course, we cannot take any credit—the happy accident of my hon. friend having accepted the office of High Commissioner at my request, enabled us by his peculiar knowledge, professional and otherwise, to save the trade of Canada from a very great loss. I think we cannot over-estimate the value of the assistance rendered by him as High Commissioner in the saving of the cattle trade of Canada. As we are perhaps the only country which continues that trade with England, the gain has undoubtedly been a very great one. It is quite true that a Minister is, as a general rule, bound to perform his duties by person and in person, but after all it is a question of confidence in the Government. So far as the Government is concerned, it is a question for them to see that the duties of the different Departments are thoroughly well performed. I believe the Minister of Railways, enjoyed, and still enjoys, the confidence of the country and of the majority of this House as Minister of Railways. I believe also, that my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, who performed the duties of Acting Minister of Railways, enjoys that confidence. We knew perfectly well that when this important business called away Sir Charles Tupper, for a time, from Canada, my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, on account of his well-known acquaintance with everything connected with railway matters, was peculiarly fitted to perform the duties of the Department of Railways in Sir Charles Tupper's absence. I believe that the results have shown that

every duty has been attended to; that there has been no injury or prejudice to the public service in the hands of my hon. friend, the Acting Minister of Railways; that he has performed his duty well and wisely; and I have no doubt that the Minister of Railways, when he left Canada, knew he was leaving his Department in the hands of a colleague in whom he had the utmost and most thorough confidence. When the papers are brought down, I have no doubt that this discussion will be renewed. I do not see, however, that there is anything in the argument of the inconsistency of my hon. friend being a member of the Government as Minister of Railways, and being an officer of the Government, while in England as Lord High Commissioner.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the hon. gentleman opposite has conferred the peerage upon my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, I can only give my humble sanction to the bestowal of that honour. It would, perhaps, be improper to unite these two offices for a series of years, but for a temporary purpose there is no inconsistency. The hon. gentleman knows that it is a matter of practice in England. There was no inconsistency in Lord Beaconsfield, or the Marquis of Salisbury, going to Berlin, or in Lord John Russell, a member of the Administration in England, taking part in the Treaty of Vienna, after the Crimean war, when he was Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, and when, as we all remember, his action as Minister at Vienna was repudiated by the Government of which he was a member, the result being that the Vienna Treaty, which was ratified by him, was not ratified by the English Government. The question of inconsistency was never raised, for it was frequently the case in England. My hon. friend's knowledge of parliamentary and governmental history will enable him to supply from his memory innumerable instances of members of the Cabinet going on such missions, some of rather a protracted character, and keeping their positions in the Government of England while acting as servants or officers of the joint Administration abroad. It really, after all, is a question of fitness—each instance must be governed by its own circumstance. It may be that the Minister is, perhaps, the very best person in the public interest to relieve these officers for a time, and allow them to leave headquarters and go abroad on special missions for the good of their country. In this case, it is simply a question of whether it was really in the interest of Canada at the time, that my hon. friend should consent to go to England. I do not wish to draw on discussion just now, but I shall just read a portion of the Minute of the Council under which my hon. friend was appointed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman know of any case in which a British Minister was sent as resident ambassador to a foreign court?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As a resident ambassador?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes. The hon. gentleman was our ambassador.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I recall one case, that of Lord Castlereagh, a member of the Government, who went in 1814 to Vienna and remained as Minister during a whole year. He was not nominally a resident ambassador, but he was resident there for a whole year, settling the treaties consequent upon the fall of Napoleon. There are other instances, though I cannot recall them to my recollection at this moment, but I am sure I can furnish my hon. friend many instances of the kind. The Minute of Council states;

"On a report of the 30th of May, 1883, from the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, stating that it would be necessary to appoint a High Commissioner in London in place of Sir Alexander Galt, whose resignation takes effect on the 30th of June, and that Sir Charles Tupper had consented to go to England to perform the duties of the office at present, without salary, Sir John Macdonald recommends that Sir Charles Tupper be appointed High Commissioner."

The commission framed on that Order in Council will be brought down, together with all the papers on the subject, and then if the hon. gentleman wishes to discuss the constitutional point and the expediency of carrying out the cast-iron rule that a Minister should not leave the country, then I will quite willingly discuss the matter and abide by any decision which the House may arrive at.

Mr. BLAKE. I never proposed to lay down the cast-iron rule that a Minister should not leave his office for any purpose. The hon. gentleman knows that he may challenge the opinion of the House on the question, for I do not know that a year has elapsed when Ministers have not left their offices; and we know that last year there was a perfect galaxy of Ministers in London at one time. For that reason I purposely abstained from raising that point. I do not say that there should not be a temporary absence for some particular purpose of health or public business; but the hon. gentleman has obviously felt that there is a difficulty—in fact, an impossibility—of justifying this arrangement as a permanent arrangement, for he has told us that it would be inexpedient as a permanent arrangement, and he justifies it only as a temporary arrangement. He says further that it is perhaps inexpedient that there should be an absence for a year, or during the whole period of the recess; but he says it is a question to be decided in each case by the circumstances; and when very serious public reasons called for the selection of a successor to our late High Commissioner, who was to proceed to England at once—and called, of course, for the selection of this particular person as the successor—he was justified in his opinion in proceeding. But the hon. gentleman went on to say that he would give us information as to the reasons for this appointment; and he read us an extract from an Order in Council which gave no such information. When he came to state the results of the hon. gentleman's mission, they were such as he described them to-day; and great as they may have been, remarkable as they may have been, wonderful as they may have been, they were those which the hon. gentleman did not take credit for foreseeing when he sent Sir Charles Tupper to England. It was not because he foresaw that there would be a difficulty about the live cattle trade that he sent the Minister of Railways—I beg his pardon, the High Commissioner; I am afraid we shall get into a number of difficulties of this kind this Session—that he sent the High Commissioner to England to display his knowledge of anatomy with relation to four-footed as well as two-footed animals. What was it for, then? What were the public, moving causes which led to an arrangement which the hon. gentleman indicates is merely temporary, to be justified only by some special reason? We have not heard them yet. But the hon. gentleman says: I will give you plenty of precedents—Lord Beaconsfield was at Berlin, Lord Salisbury at Berlin, and Lord Russell at Vienna, and Lord Castlereagh was at Vienna at an earlier period. But all these cases were different. As the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) pointed out, none of those gentlemen took offices under the Government, at all capable of being likened to the office of Canadian High Commissioner, as created by our Statute, and as related to the Departments of Government. When Lord Beaconsfield went to Berlin, was he to make a report to the analogue of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who shows such little respect to our High Commissioner that he does not know whether

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

he has received his report or not? Did either Lord Russell or Lord Castlereagh occupy such a position that a single Minister was to tell them what negotiations they were to undertake, or what they were to do? They occupied the highest places which a man can fill in the service of his country, except that of First Minister—and one of them was First Minister—the position of plenipotentiary acting on behalf of the country to complete a treaty—a transaction temporary in its nature, and of the highest possible consequence. The hon. gentleman says one of the members remained a long time. It is true, Lord Castlereagh remained a long time—because we know the condition of the continent at that time, when the question of the Holy Alliance was under consideration; we know the great convulsions that appertained to that time; we know the difficulties of the settlement over the Napoleonic relations; we know that there were great difficulties about precedence; we know there was a great deal for that diplomatist to do, and he took a great deal more time in which to do it than would be required to-day. Not at this conference, but at one in the Low Countries, were the difficulties such that it had to be held in a room with twelve entrances and a round table, so that there should be no question of precedence. But what we have to deal with is something of a more modern time; and if the hon. gentleman can furnish no apter precedent for the duties he has imposed on the High Commissioner of Canada than those he has cited, he has entirely failed in justifying, by precedent, if precedent were to justify, this transaction; and I doubt very much whether, when the papers come down, they will furnish more justification for it than his oral statement has done, or whether a further ventilation of the subject will prove this to have been a more expedient or constitutional course than it is shown to have been.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of all correspondence relating to any payments, claims or allowances on any account whatever in respect of the office of High Commissioner, not already brought down, and separate statements, in detail, with dates and sums of all payments made on any such accounts in respect of the office, during its tenure by Sir A. T. Galt, and by the present incumbent respectively, and an estimate, in detail, of all sums payable on any such accounts, up to this date, and yet unpaid; also, for copies of correspondence as to the letting of a residence for the High Commissioner, and statement of the terms and of the sums payable for rent, taxes and other charges, in respect of such residence and the date of the letting.

Motion agreed to.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY GUARANTEE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

#### LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons for its information, correspondence relating to the guarantee by the Government of interest on the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, so that means might be provided for the completion of the work by May, 1886.

#### GOVERNMENT HOUSE.

OTTAWA, 25th January, 1884."

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock, p. m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 28th January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## LANGTRY vs. DUMOULIN.

A Petition was read from C. and H. D. Gamble and others praying that the Clerk of the House may be ordered to attend with certain Journals and Records before the Master in Chancery in Ottawa, in the matter of Langtry, *et al*, vs. Dumoulin.

Mr. WILLIAMS moved that the petition be now read and received.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS moved that leave be given to the proper officer to attend in accordance with the prayer of the said petitioners.

Motion agreed to.

## BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 17) to repeal an Act respecting the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, and the issue of Licenses therefor.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to explain that I misunderstood the question put to me by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) on Friday last, in reference to the equivalent of wheat for a barrel of flour. I understood him to ask whether any change had been made in the Order in Council with reference to the exportation of Canadian flour as an equivalent for American flour, and consequently the answer which I gave was not correct. A change was made increasing the quantity which would be taken as an equivalent for the American flour, and this was done on account of representations which were made to the Government that the wheat of this year would not produce as much flour as that of former years.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What was the change?

Mr. BOWELL. I think the difference was about ten pounds.

## SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 9) to amend the several Acts relating to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

## PAYMENTS ON SETTLERS' LANDS.

Mr. FARROW enquired, Will the Government extend the time for payment to the settlers on lands in Manitoba? If so, what length of time will be given, and what rate of interest charged?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the present intention of the Government to change the time, but each case will be dealt with on its own merits.

## GOVERNMENTAL EXPRESS SYSTEM.

Mr. FARROW enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to mature a scheme whereby they will take the express business of the country into their hands in connection with the Post Office business?

Mr. CARLING. It is not the present intention of the Government to mature such a scheme.

## TWO CENT LETTER POSTAGE.

Mr. FARROW enquired, Is it the intention of the Government, this Session, to reduce the rate of postage on letters from three cents to two cents, as adopted in the United States?

Mr. CARLING. The matter is now under consideration.

## THE VOLUNTEERS OF 1837.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) enquired, Has the Government had under consideration the valuable services rendered to the country by the Volunteers of 1837, with a view of recognizing in some substantial way such services? If so, what conclusion has been arrived at?

Mr. CARON. The Government have not yet arrived at any conclusion on the question.

## GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. McISAAC enquired, Whether any arrangement has been made between the Government and the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company, to settle the unpaid claims of contractors and labourers for work done on the line of railway between Oxford and New Glasgow for the said company? If so, when will such claims be paid? If no such arrangement has been made, is the Minister of Railways in a position to state whether and when payment can be expected?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government have not made any arrangement to settle these claims, and I am not in a position to state whether or when any such payments can be expected?

## NEGOTIATIONS OF COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence and despatches touching the negotiations of commercial treaties, conventions or arrangements in which Canada is interested, and of all reports of the High Commissioner on the subject not already brought down; and particularly of all such papers relating to France, Spain, Brazil, Cuba or the United States. He said: It will be in the recollection of the House that during last Session, in the debate on the Budget, the hon. the Minister of Finance adverted to this general topic. He pointed out that, within three or four weeks before the time at which he was then speaking, an influential deputation had waited on the Government in reference to the extension of our trade with the West Indies. He said:

"Instead of asking Parliament, at the present time, to reduce the duty upon sugar or molasses, we propose to continue the enquiries we entered upon some time since with the view of extending trade with the West India Colonies. We have, in the past, experienced considerable difficulties, because these Colonies have very little revenue to spare. We find them anxious that we should give favourable consideration to their productions, but when we ask for a reduction of the duty on Canadian products, they hesitate, because they find it difficult to surrender the necessary revenue. In reference to Cuba, we proposed to the Spanish Government, through the High Commissioner in London, to ask Parliament for a subsidy for a steamer to ply between Canada and Cuba under the French flag, we paying the subsidy, if the products of Canada would be admitted on the terms which are extended to imports under the Spanish flag. That proposition, after some consideration, was refused. Other propositions have been before the Spanish Government for some time, and down to the present time they have not been successful, although, unlike the proposition in reference to subsidizing a steamer under the French flag, they have not refused them, and they are still under consideration. I can say, on behalf of the Government, that it is their intention during the recess to enter into negotiation with the West India Islands, and other sugar producing and coffee producing countries, to see whether any arrangement can be made by which we would be justified in submitting to Parliament, when

we next assemble, reducing the duty on sugar and molasses on receiving as an equivalent for it a reduction of duty on the natural products and manufactures of Canada. In addition to that, we have been endeavouring to negotiate arrangements with France by which the products of Canada may be admitted on more favourable terms than they are at present. Down to the present time, while the negotiations are not broken off but are still continued, we have not been successful, and I desire here and at this time to state, on behalf of the Government, that, if we fail to make satisfactory arrangements with Governments that do not place the products—the natural products and manufactures—of Canada on equal terms with those of any other country, we will ask Parliament at the next Session to impose a duty of 10 per cent. additional on their products until they grant us such terms. This is the policy of the Government with reference to these questions."

For some time past we have been moving for papers indicating the progress of the various negotiations which preceded those which the hon. gentleman has mentioned in this speech; and a motion was also made for papers with reference to the negotiations down to that time. That address has not been answered, so far as I can ascertain, and I hope we shall have a clean breast of it, and a statement made of the papers with reference to any such negotiations as are closed temporarily or permanently. Of course, I can understand the inconvenience of bringing down papers with reference to negotiations which are actively pending; but if they are practically, if not formally, abandoned, there would seem to be no difficulty about bringing down the papers; and it is important that we should know how we stand. I hope, also, that the return will embrace all the papers consequent on the declaration of war which the hon. gentleman thought fit to make in the concluding passage of this speech; and that we shall learn, by the papers, or otherwise, how far the step which he announced in this public manner he was about to take has been productive of a more favourable consideration of his propositions than they had heretofore received. I thought then, and I think still, that it would have been a more prudent and politic course on his part to inform the Governments of these countries privately that he would feel it his duty to propose such a step in case he did not conclude the negotiations by next Session, than to make a public statement in Parliament of the character to which I have alluded. But it is possible that the course taken by the hon. gentleman may have produced effects which milder measures would not have produced. With these views I make this motion.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There can be no objection to the general proposition contained in this motion; but I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a paper laid on the Table of the House last Session showing the negotiations which had taken place with Servia, Belgium, and Germany, Roumania, Ecuador, Morocco, Egypt, Montenegro and Jamaica. At that time the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in answer to a communication from the Governor General, stated:

"There exists no objection to the publication of correspondence that has taken place with reference to commercial treaties concerning Jamaica, Germany and Belgium. As correspondence is never furnished which has reference to negotiations still under discussion without the consent of the Foreign Power with whom the treaty is being made, it would be necessary to obtain from the Governments of France and Spain their consent to the publication of any correspondence which has taken place on the subject of treaties, and I suggest that the placing of such papers on the Table of the Dominion House of Commons be delayed until the matters still under discussion are brought to a final conclusion."

I may state to the hon. member that the negotiations with Spain have not yet been brought to a conclusion. Further negotiation took place between the High Commissioner and the Government of France, which for the time being did terminate the correspondence; but there is no doubt that, on the return of the High Commissioner to England, the negotiations with Spain will be continued, and the negotiations with France will probably re-open. However, I think it probable that the correspondence with France may be in such a position that, without violating the conditions laid down in this despatch, it may be laid before Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE.

#### JUDICIAL SALARIES.

Mr. VAIL, in moving for copies of any correspondence on the subject of the increase or re-adjustment of the judicial salaries, said: It will be remembered by all who were present last Session, when the resolution providing for the salary of an additional Judge of the Appeal Court of Ontario was before the House, that the hon. First Minister stated that some pressure had been brought to bear on the Government for the increase of the Judges' salaries of Ontario and Montreal; and I inferred from that statement that some correspondence had taken place on the subject. The hon. First Minister further stated that the Government, during the recess, would take the matter into their consideration, and that they would be prepared, at this Session, to introduce some measure, or make some proposition with regard to it, for the approval of Parliament. The right hon. gentleman led us to believe that the salaries of the Judges of Ontario and Quebec were too low; and he rather intimated that there was a difficulty about increasing the salaries of those Judges without providing for similarly increasing the salaries of the Judges of the different Provinces. I can easily understand that. I can also understand that some of the Judges of Ontario may be very much overworked; but increasing their salaries will not remedy that. I find, by the Public Accounts, that the amount paid during the past year for the Administration of Justice, including pensions and miscellaneous, was about \$670,000. Now, that appears to be a very large sum, and as such, if properly distributed, would provide satisfactory salaries for the Judges of all the Provinces. Of course, the right hon. gentleman did not intimate to us what measure he proposed to bring down to Parliament this Session; but I am rather inclined to think that the country will hardly be willing to submit to further taxation to increase the gross amount now paid to the judiciary. It is just possible that if some of the Judges in the larger Provinces are overworked, there may be some who are underworked; and I hope that the Government, in any measure which they bring before the House, will consider whether, without increasing the sum total, they cannot—and I have no doubt it would be a very popular move, by reducing the salaries of those Judges in the larger Provinces, who have not a great deal of work—increase the salaries of Judges in the Maritime Provinces, in order to put them on a proper and fair footing with the Judges of the larger Provinces. I never could see the reason why the Judges of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia should be placed in an inferior position to the Judges of the other Provinces, with regard to salary. I do not make this motion with the view of bringing on a debate at present. If the correspondence is in such a state that it can be brought down, or if there has been further correspondence since the last prorogation of Parliament, I think the House ought to be put in possession of it, so that hon. members may see on what the Judges base their claim for an increase of their salaries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon friend's motion is very general. He moves for any correspondence on the subject of salaries. I suppose there ought to be some limit as to date.

Mr. VAIL. Any correspondence which has taken place since last Session and since the Session previous.

Mr. BLAKE. Since the 1st January, 1882.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well. The hon. gentleman says it would be very popular in the country if a slice were taken off the salaries of the Judges of Ontario and attached to those of the Judges of the Maritime Provinces. I dare say it would be popular in some portions of the Dominion, but I am not quite sure that it would be popular in the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman

says he could never understand why the salaries of the Nova Scotia Judges should be less than those of the Judges in Ontario and Quebec. I do not know that it is necessary for us to discuss that point now, for it was fully argued and settled—and they, no doubt, gave good reasons—by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a distinguished member.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### HOME AND INDIAN INSTRUCTION FARMS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I desire to get some information from the Government with respect to the management, for the last few years, of the home and instruction Indian farms of the North-West Territories; the measure of success which has attended that experiment, and the cost, as near as possible, to the country. I observe, in the report of the Department, that several of the agents have pronounced the farms a failure, and have recommended that they be closed up, and also that some of them have been closed. For instance, the farm at Rivière du Barre was recommended to be closed one and one-half years ago; the farm at Saddle Lake was also recommended to be closed by Mr. Wadsworth, in his report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in the North-West Territories made in 1882; farm 24, on Fish Creek, is also, I believe, closed, although it has been, in some measure, a successful one. Mr. Wadsworth does not mention the grounds of this recommendation, but if my memory serves me right he has recommended the closing of this farm. Mr. MacDonnell, Indian Agent at Regina, says he has closed up farms numbers one and two under Treaty number four. Upon the whole, I gather from the report that all the farms, or a large number of them, are either closed up or about to be closed. I have not been able to find in the report what reasons actuated the North-West officials in recommending this line of action, and am therefore desirous of getting information on the subject. I am told that the farm at Dudley, and the farm at Battleford, and that at Qu'Appelle, have been closed this last year. Now, I desire to know the reasons for this course, and how far the experiment made—in my judgment a good and wise experiment—has been successful; and what has become of, or what is intended to be done with the large staff of officials necessarily connected with those farms. I am also anxious to ascertain how many Indians have been employed on them, and to what extent, if any, the Indians have been induced to settle down to agricultural pursuits. The last clause of my motion I have put in, because I understand Mr. Wadsworth has not yet made a report to the Department. He had not, on the 1st December, inspected any of the agencies south of the railway, and I doubt whether he has been able since to overtake that work. I desire, if this information be not in the volume itself which we expect to receive shortly, that a supplementary report be brought down among the papers asked for. I, therefore, beg to move for a return showing the number of home farms and Indian instruction farms closed, or that have ceased to be worked, since the 1st of January, 1882. 2. The location of such farms, and the name and designation thereof. 3. The reason why closed or ceased to be worked. 4. The name of the Superintendent, Manager and Instructor. 5. The number of men employed on each farm in 1882 and 1883, the names and nationality of such employes; specifying particularly the number of Indians so employed. 6. The cost of each farm for said years separately. 7. The report of T. P. Wadsworth, Inspector of Indian Agencies and Farms for 1883, or any supplementary report made by him.

Motion agreed to.

#### CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE HUGHES.

Mr. WILSON moved for copies of all petitions and other communications preferring charges in regard to the official

conduct of D. J. Hughes, County Judge of Elgin, and asking for an enquiry into the same; also, for a copy of the report or judgment on enquiry into the conduct of the said Judge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the first part of the Address, asking for petitions and other communications; but, in reference to the last limb of the motion, I may say that there is no report or judgment on the enquiry into the conduct of the Judge. If the hon. gentlemen will strike that out, the first part can go.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly was led to understand, and verily believed, that there had been a commission and a report after a thorough investigation—a report by the Court of Impeachment prior to the time of Confederation; and it is for that I move.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh! I did not understand.

Mr. WILSON. I suppose the hon. the First Minister will not object to bring that down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh! no. I was under the impression that there was some late petition that was referred to, and I asked the Minister of Justice, and he said there was no report on the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. There are two things—there are late petitions, and there is a former enquiry. The hon. gentleman remembers the old proceedings in the Court of Impeachment in Toronto years ago. That is obviously what the hon. gentleman refers to in the last limb of his motion; but there are also late petitions.

Motion agreed to.

#### INSPECTION OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND STEAMBOATS.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, last Session I made a motion for some documents and papers as to the state of repair in which the *Northern Light* was, and the contracts for the conveyance of mails and passengers between Prince Edward Island and the Mainland. I was not fortunate enough to get the papers, though I asked for them several times. I regret it very much, because I think that, if they had been brought down and a discussion had taken place upon the matter, some of the trouble which has since arisen would have been avoided. Since last Session, the Steamboat Inspection Act has been brought into operation in the Island, and the result has been the stoppage of the company's steamers and of the whole trade of the Island for a time, throwing the whole thing into confusion, and to the endless annoyance of the merchants and traders engaged in that trade. At the time, there was a general outcry against the whole proceeding, and even the Government press denounced the whole thing as an outrage of the worst kind. Whether it is so or not we shall see when the papers come down. I prefer passing no judgment until we have the full particulars; but it is absolutely necessary to have the facts at the earliest possible moment. The hon. Minister who has charge of the Department of Marine will recollect that the Steamboat Inspection Act of 1882 was brought into effect in the Maritime Provinces by the appointment of Mr. Coker; and the Act provides that he shall inspect all steamboats that carry passengers, and that they shall not carry passengers without his certificate. The facts as to the inspection of the steamboats between Prince Edward Island and the Mainland are these: Last year no inspection was made by Mr. Coker. The winter passed without his visiting the Island; but I am informed, and I believe credibly informed, that he wrote to the company instructing them that, if Mr. Sloggett, Lloyds' inspector on the Island, would inspect the boats that winter, he would be satisfied. That, I believe, was done. If Mr. Sloggett made any report to Mr. Coker,

or to the Department of Marine—I suppose he would make it to Mr. Coker, by whom he was employed—I hope it will be brought down, and will be considered to come within the language of the motion I have made. Mr. Coker, the inspector, never came near the Island that summer, until the season was very far advanced. In the latter end of August—on the 28th, I believe—the gentleman paid a visit there, and it is charged, with what truth the papers will show when they come down, that he did not make any proper inspection of these boats, but simply came over in the boats from Shediac to Summerside, and from Charlottetown to Pictou. He made no report to the company of his inspection. Whether it was a cursory or a complete one I do not know, but he made no report to the company, stating any requirements which, in his opinion, were necessary to make these boats thoroughly sea-going; and it was not until the last day of September, or about that time, that the company received from Mr. Coker any certificate whatever of the capacity of their boats or of their right to carry passengers. Now, I do not wish to attack the Inspection Act at all. The principle of that Act I think to be an excellent one. It has been already passed upon by this House, and it has been received with universal approval; but the details of that Act are capable of being improved upon very much, as I think the unfortunate facts connected with this unfortunate service between the Island and the Mainland will show. On the 28th September, Mr. Coker forwarded his certificate, and, to the astonishment of the company and to the loss of everybody engaged in the carrying trade there, it was found that the certificate enabled the boats to run for only one month, that it expired on the 3rd of October. It is charged—and I think there is some justice in the charge—that the inspector should have made his inspection, if he was not overburdened with work, early in the spring, so that any repairs which might, in his opinion, be necessary to make the boats thoroughly sea-going, should have been made before the heavy part of the season came on. I believe his district comprises all the Maritime Provinces, and I am told, by those who understand these matters better than I do, that that is too large a district for any one to properly fulfil the duties of Inspector of Hulls. If he chose to rely on the report of the local inspector, then it was wrong, grievously wrong, of him to go there in the month of September, and stop the boats running altogether. If he did not choose to rely upon the local inspector's report, I think it was his duty early in the spring to have made such a report as would have enabled the company to put their boats in proper order for the fall work. As between the company and the Government, of course, it is a small matter. What I wished to speak about are the interests of the public at large. The public at large had no control over the inspector; the Department had, but I am not aware whether any orders were given to Mr. Coker, the Inspector, to go to the Island and inspect these boats early in the summer, or not; or whether he was left to his own discretion. If he was left to his own discretion, he exercised it badly and injuriously, so far as the general public was concerned. The result, so far as the public was concerned, was that the boats stopped running at the very time when the exports of the Island had to be carried abroad, when the passenger traffic was increasing, and when hundreds of people wanted to cross daily. At the very time that all our produce was ready for exportation, the two boats stopped running. I am instructed that application was made to the Minister to allow the boats to run, as freighted, and I am told that application was refused. I do not know—I do not say—that the Minister of Marine was to blame in the matter. As the matter now stands, he is obliged to receive the report of his inspector, and will either have to dismiss the inspector or else adopt his report. The boats were not only refused the privilege of carrying

Mr. DAVIES.

passengers, which may or may not have been right; but they were refused the privilege of carrying freight, and the whole communication between the Island and the Mainland was thrown into great confusion. The Department sent down the *Napoleon III.* to do the best she could; but the Island members know very well that the construction of that steamer is such that she is not capable of being laden and unladen with the same facility as the other boats, and consequently she could not do the work at all. Fortunately for the merchants there, a new steamer was purchased by the navigation company there from Glasgow, and she aided the *Napoleon III.* in doing the work. Now, my object in moving for the papers is chiefly to ascertain whether the reports published in the papers are correct. The repairs required by Mr. Coker to be done to the two boats, it is stated in the press, are, first, that the *St. Lawrence* should be strengthened by having two arches placed from one end to the other in the boat; and, that as regards the other boat, her guards should be raised three or four feet. That has been stated in the papers to be the language of Mr. Coker's report. If that is the language of his report, I believe there is a very unanimous opinion on the part of ship-owners, ship-builders, and shipwrights—of everybody who knows anything about the Island—that such repairs cannot be carried out with safety. As regards the *St. Lawrence*, there are two arches in her already, and I am instructed the third one cannot be put in. So far as the *Princess of Wales* is concerned, if her guards are raised three feet, constructed as she is, carrying her cargo altogether on deck, I am informed by those who understand the question thoroughly, that it will end in her upsetting. However, we will see when the papers come down. But I wish chiefly to call the Minister's attention to Mr. Coker's report. No matter what it might be, no matter how harshly it might reflect upon the company, his report is practically final, and from it there is no appeal. It is true, the Act gives an appeal to the Minister, but even that appeal must be practically worthless, because the Minister of the day is but a mere puppet in the hands of the inspectors—he must take their reports and act upon them. Practically, there is no appeal from the order made by these inspectors. No matter how arbitrary their orders may be, no matter how uncalled for the repairs which they insist upon may be, the ship-owner is entirely at the mercy of the inspector. In the case to which I especially refer now, the public also are at his mercy, because when these two boats were stopped the trade of the Island was stopped for a time. The Minister, as I said, sent down this other boat, and it did some good in helping us over the difficulty. But I wished particularly to call his attention, in the first place, to the absolute necessity that exists for amending that Steamboat Inspection Act, and providing for appeal somewhat similar to the provision contained in the British Merchants' Shipping Act of 1876. I believe the Government of Canada at that time were instrumental in having those clauses inserted in the British Act. It was felt it would be an intolerable hardship that Canadian ship-owners should be subjected to the arbitrary order of a simple inspector in England, and at their instigation, I believe, a court of appeals was established in every port, to which every ship-owner can appeal if he is dissatisfied with the order of the inspector. This court of appeal consists either of a stipendiary magistrate and two shipwrights, or of a local commissioner and two shipwrights—the latter to act as assessors. Now, if we had such a court established here in the chief ports of the Dominion, there would be no hardship, because even if the Government Inspector required very heavy repairs to be made, unless the facts justified it, the ship-owner could appeal to this court. This is not a local question; it is not confined to Prince Edward Island, but extends over the whole of Canada. Every ship-owner, every steamboat owner, is completely at the mercy of these inspectors. I,

therefore, submit to the consideration of the Minister these two points: Whether the area of the district which is given to the inspector is not entirely too large; secondly, whether there should not be, in common justice, an appeal from his decision to a competent court. Now, as regards the inspector, the hon. Minister knows well, I believe, that at present he resides in St. John. These two boats are now being repaired in Charlottetown, but the inspector does not cross over—he cannot very well cross over at this time of the year in the ice-boat on account of his size and age, to inspect these boats—and the result will be that in the spring we may be in just as bad a plight as we were last year. I submit there should be an inspector appointed for the Island itself as one district, and one for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. That is not too much to ask; and I think it is a necessity that such an officer should exist. The hon. Minister himself is a ship-owner, and he knows how absolutely impossible it is to make a thorough inspection of a steamboat in the summer. Last year, I am told, the inspector never opened a seam, never took out a plank of the steamboat he condemned in his report as worthless. I took occasion to go to a captain of one of the steamboats, who has been in service twenty years, and whose record is one of which any captain may be proud. He has never had an accident on his boat during those twenty or twenty-five years that he has been carrying the mails and passengers across those Straits. He never had an accident, and he reported to me, in conversation, that the boat never was in better condition than she was then when she was stopped—so far as he knew, and he made a very close inspection. It appears the inspector acted in a very arbitrary manner, from what I am told—I should be sorry to make a charge against him until I have seen all the papers. The inspector is known to myself and to the public, as a good shipwright, and he was for many years Lloyds' surveyor of the Island. I am simply stating the facts as I ascertained them in conversation with those who ought to know; and it is perfectly incomprehensible to me how the inspector came to the conclusion that these boats should be stopped. However, I hope the Minister will agree with me that it is high time the Steamboat Inspection Act, giving, as it does, those extraordinary and arbitrary powers to the inspectors, should be amended, so that ship-owners should have the privilege of appeal, from what they consider an unjust decision, to a court of appeal. I do not believe there is another Act in the world vesting a more arbitrary power in one man, than that Act does. The Minister knows that, according to Lloyds' rules, if a ship is to be inspected, in order to be re-classed, it is not left for one man to do. Lloyds' surveyor has to take another man with him. The report of two inspectors is necessary before a vessel can obtain her class. The same rule prevails under all British classification. There is a body to which appeal can be made if the report is considered unjust. The committee of Lloyds is behind that. Besides, under the English Act, it is provided that if the inspector makes an improper report and detains a vessel improperly, so that the owner loses money, the owner can recover damages in the civil courts. Here, vessel owners are entirely without remedy. The inspector goes over to the Island for a couple of days and gives what is charged to be a most cursory examination of the boat, goes away, sends a report stopping the vessel from running, and there is no remedy against him or the Department, and no appeal to any person whatever. The principle adopted in that Inspection Act is a good one. The travelling public have a right to have it guaranteed that the steamers on which they travel have been properly inspected by a competent officer. I think that is a capital provision; I only suggested one or two amendments to it—but I should like to see that provision applied to steamboats belonging to the Government when used for the same purposes as private steamboats. The Steamboat Inspection

Act specially exempts from its operation steamers owned by the Queen. The Minister sent down the *Northern Light* to take the place of private steamboats. He stopped the private boats from running because they had not got inspectors' certificates, and he declared they were dangerous to life and property. The hon. gentleman not only stopped those private boats from running, but he filled the place with a steamer which the Government Inspector ordered to be placed on the slips for repairs only last summer. The same inspector who stopped the boats ordered that Government vessel to be placed on the slips at Pictou. She went there in pursuance of that order, but in consequence of instructions issued by the Department, she was taken away and the repairs, though declared to be necessary to make her safe for passenger traffic, were never carried out. The result was that the boat, which was considered unseaworthy, was used during the fall months, the most stormy portion of the year, in carrying passengers to and from the Island. I do not know whether the Minister of Marine is prepared to take full responsibility for the continuance of that state of affairs. I hope the reports will be brought down and that the Minister, at the earliest possible day, will take steps to have that boat placed in a proper state of repair. She is doing work now, or at least she was up till last week, and as the Straits have been pretty open, she has done fairly good work. It was stated in the public press, and also by the inspector, that she needs repairs to put her in a seaworthy condition. It is no secret, it is talked about openly by the people in that part of the Dominion, that the boat requires repairing, and that immediately. What I complain of on the part of the Government is, that while they stopped the boats of the Navigation Company, when the inspector's certificates expired—and for that I do not blame them, as I think under the law, they were bound to do so—they substituted a boat which does not possess a certificate, a boat which it is acknowledged is unable to possess one, and which has already been removed from her class at Lloyds; and this fact should be a strong reason to convince the Minister that she is not seaworthy or fit to carry passengers. I do not desire to detain the House further in regard to this matter, but I hope the papers for which I move will be brought down this Session. I think I made six or seven applications for similar papers last year and never obtained them. There is a large class of people interested in these papers, and it is necessary to obtain them in order that we may be able to judge whether the inspector has or has not properly discharged the duties which belong to his office during the past season.

Mr. McLELAN. The papers asked for by the hon. gentleman will be brought down with all dispatch. I am not aware that there were applications made to my Department for papers last year which have not been complied with. I will, however, ascertain if there are any returns for last year which have not been brought down. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the inspector for the Lower Provinces has too much work to perform. I have not had any complaint from the inspector that he is overworked or that there is more work than he can overtake. I will make enquiry into that matter and see whether additional assistance is required. If the certificates of the previous year had expired, it was the duty of the company to have made application to the inspector to have the boats inspected. It seems that, according to my recollection and the statement of the hon. gentleman, they were not inspected until August. The inspector then gave a certificate to run until 31st October. In that certificate the inspector notified the owners of the boats that they could run to that date only, and that surely should have been sufficient notice to the parties to have provided other boats. The Steam Navigation Company receive a large subsidy

from the Government, about \$10,000 a year, for performing the service. There is a large freight and passenger traffic by those boats, and with the receipts of that traffic and the Government subsidy, the company should have provided boats fit for the service. The hon. gentleman, I think, will admit, and the whole people of the Island will admit, that the Government are doing all that is necessary, by furnishing that subsidy, to enable good and satisfactory boats to be placed upon the route. Such being the fact, and the company having the notice of the inspector that those boats could not be permitted to run after 31st October, no complaint can lie against either the inspector or the Government. It can lie only against the company, who should have provided other boats to have taken the place of those which were declared by the inspector to be unsafe to run during the stormy season of the year. The hon. gentleman has complained of the lack of satisfactory inspection—that the inspector did not satisfactorily perform his duty in examining the boats. These are wooden boats which were built twenty years ago, and have run without accident so far. The inspector was familiar with them and made a passage over in one of them, and from his examination and his knowledge of the effect of twenty years' wear upon wood, he knew they were unsafe to run during the stormy season of the year. Late in October, the steamboat company made application to me to be permitted to carry freight after the 31st of October, and stating in that application the repairs that were necessary, and that they intended to make those repairs on the boat during this winter. The Board of Steamboat Inspectors, both of machinery and hulls, was sitting in Ottawa at the time I received that application. I referred the application to Mr. Coker, and through him to the board, and the answer came, as I expected, that they could not permit them even to carry freight, and the company was notified of that fact. The hon. gentleman says that the steamboat owners are entirely at the mercy of the inspector. I do not consider that to be the case. Under the law, there is an appeal to the Minister, and if the owner of the steamboat presents a case to the Minister in which an evident injustice has been done him, it would be the Minister's duty, either on his own motion or by calling in other inspectors or other assistants, to consider the case and rectify the wrong, if a wrong had been done. But in this case, the gentleman who made the application stated that their boats required repairs, and that this winter, after the season of navigation had closed, they proposed to make all those repairs which the Inspector had stated would be necessary in order to render them seaworthy; but neither myself, Mr. Coker, nor the Board of Inspectors considered that it was wise or prudent that the boats should run either with passengers or freight during that month. The promise to make them more seaworthy afterwards would do them no good, so far as the month of November was concerned, and so the permission even to carry freight was withheld. I am not in a position to state whether Mr. Sloggett knew anything about the position of those boats during the summer; he made no report to me officially, though he may have made a report to Mr. Coker. I had an opportunity of knowing Mr. Coker's opinion, and he did not go further than to say that the boats might be run with a half cargo. Even Mr. Sloggett, who is supposed to be more familiar with the condition of the boats than Mr. Coker, did not go further than to say that possibly, an arrangement might be made to run them with half loads. That could not be acceded to, and the only course that could be taken was to stop. I think the company, which has enjoyed the profits of the Government subsidy and the profits coming from that traffic for years, after having the notice which was given by the inspector, Mr. Coker, should have put other boats on the route so that the people of the Island should suffer no inconvenience by even a temporary interruption of the passenger and freight traffic. When I

Mr. McLELAN.

found that they were not supplying other boats, I sent down the steamer *Napoleon III.* to give such accommodation as her capacity afforded to the traffic between Pictou and Charlottetown, and I believe that, with the assistance of the *Northern Light*, she succeeded in keeping up the traffic and carrying it all without any great inconvenience to the people. I know there was a good deal of excitement at the time, but the *Napoleon III.* was sent down almost immediately on the stoppage of the other boat, so that no great inconvenience resulted. As to the *Northern Light* being put on the slip, Mr. Coker found that from her peculiar construction he could not examine her without her being placed on the slip, and without any communication with the Department, she was sent to Pictou for that purpose. When I ascertained that that had been done, I sent down Mr. McElhinney, a Government Inspector, who had sailed the vessel in the winter of 1882, and in the summer of 1882 had superintended the repairs made upon her, and who had also examined her last spring in the slip. After an examination of her, he was satisfied to give her a certificate without the necessity of putting her in the slip, and I ordered the vessel back to Charlottetown without being put in the slip at Pictou. Whatever repairs the *Northern Light* may require, from the difficult service in which she has been employed, will be effected so far as possible. The papers will be brought down immediately.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am glad the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has amended his motion by including the *Northern Light*; and I trust that when the papers come down we shall find that that ship is reported by the inspector, as stated by the hon. Minister, to be in a good state of repair. She has heretofore been rendering very important service to the Province by keeping up the communication in seasons when ordinary boats could not do so. But if reports speak truly, she is not altogether up to the mark in many respects. We know that she has to meet a great many difficulties in prosecuting her work, by encountering ice, and she requires to be a more than ordinarily strong boat. Report says that such is not the case at present; that she is considerably weakened, owing to the very great difficulties she has to encounter; and seamen who are acquainted with ships, and the working of ships, say that the oakum, after a certain number of years decays, and that nothing has been done for the past few years to see whether it requires to be renewed or not. I am also informed—though I cannot say how correctly—that in her last passage to the Island she got a grip in the ice which showed that she is evidently become somewhat weakened. I trust that the hon. Minister of Marine will take the earliest opportunity, when the season arrives next year, to see that the vessel is thoroughly overhauled. I am told that to do that in a competent manner, it will be necessary to have her machinery and engines removed in order that she may be properly strengthened. I am glad to be informed that such is the intention of the Department. With respect to the Steam Navigation Company's boats, I have not much to say, further than that heretofore these boats have done their duty to the satisfaction of the travelling public, without any accident or mishap whatever. There is no doubt that a great deal of inconvenience has been suffered by the people of the Province, owing to the unseasonable time at which they were stopped running; but the Government, I am glad to say, showed a disposition to assist the public as far as possible, by putting on other boats to take their place. Their certificate having run out, the Government had no other course to take, consistent with their duty to the public in seeing that these boats were run under proper inspection. I trust that these boats being now thoroughly overhauled, the Government and the company may be able to resume a contract which they have heretofore carried out to the satisfaction of the people of our Province, at least.

Mr. McINTYRE. I am glad to see, from the remarks of my hon. colleague, that his opinions with regard to the *Northern Light* have undergone a complete change. I remember, prior to 1878, what the opinions of that hon. gentleman, as well as his friends, were with regard to this ship. I must congratulate the hon. gentleman on his change of sentiment, and in doing so I hope I congratulate some of his friends also. With regard to the condition of the *Northern Light*, I would refer to a statement made last year by Capt. McElhinney, before the committee appointed to consider the question of navigation between Prince Edward Island and the Mainland. He said that he considered the *Northern Light*, after the repairs she had undergone, as strong as she had been when new. Under these circumstances, I do not see why she cannot be run now as well as she was five or six years ago. As soon as there is any appearance of ice, the vessel is laid up, and that is the way our terms of Union are being carried out, which provided that constant steam communication should be maintained both winter and summer. I thought, when the committee was appointed last year, that we had heard the last of this discussion for some time. The Chairman, the hon. member for Prince County (Mr. Hackett) was anxious that the report should be presented as soon as possible, before the Supplementary Estimates were brought down. That was done, but I regret to say that we were disappointed when they did make their appearance, because no appropriation was made. Last fall matters were in a worse position than before. The Steam Navigation Company's boats were taken off, and for some reason the place of these boats was supplied by nothing less than a war ship, the crew of which were dressed up in navy blue and brass buttons, who seemed to have come down there more for the purpose of overawing these troublesome islanders than carrying their freight and passengers, which was uppermost in their minds. As soon as winter set in, it became too cold for her to run, but I think she got heat enough in Halifax, where she took fire. As usual, we had to fall back on the *Northern Light*, which did remarkably well until the close of navigation, and would do well yet if kept on the route. I have nothing to say with regard to the Steam Navigation Company's boats being taken off, until the papers are brought down; but as long as there are gentlemen here who are willing to give excuses for the shortcomings of the Government in this respect, we may expect that nothing will be done in the future, no more than in the past, towards the amelioration of our condition. As for our future prospect, I do not see a glimmer of hope as long as the present Government is in power.

Mr. McLELAN. I would say for the information of hon. members from the Island, that in addition to exercising care that the *Northern Light* is kept in as good a state of repair as possible, considering her age and the hardship of the service in which she is engaged, we provided a new boat to take the place of the steamer *Glendon*, and in view of this peculiar service, I had a vessel constructed of wood instead of iron, so that in case of accident to the *Northern Light*, by which that vessel might become disabled, the new one could be put on for this service. It is my intention to ask Parliament to provide means for so strengthening her that she shall be able to take the place of the *Northern Light* in case that vessel should become entirely disabled. I am told that with but very little additional expense, and very little change in the model, she can be made as fit for going through the ice as Newfoundland whaling ships. I think a vessel thus constructed will be able to attend to the summer navigation, and in case the *Northern Light* should become disabled, will be available for winter service.

Mr. DAVIES. I desire to correct one misapprehension into which the hon. gentleman fell, when he expressed the opinion that the inspector had given the company ample

notice as to the repairs to be made. I think the hon. gentleman cannot have read the papers, or he would not have given the inspector that endorsement. In the winter previous, the company repaired those boats at Mr. Coker's request, under Lloyds' inspection, at a cost of about \$9,000 each. Having complied with his request, they had a right to assume, when Mr. Coker found no fault during the summer months, that the work was done to his satisfaction. But when Mr. Coker came to the Island in August, he did not do, as most inspectors would do, and as Lloyds' required to be done—make his report to the owner of the ship at once; but he delayed his report and certificates for a whole month, and it was not until the last day of September, when it became impossible for the company to make the repairs which Mr. Coker instructed them to make, that he furnished a report to the Minister, which only extended their certificate one month. I submit that his conduct is wholly indefensible, and all the inconvenience and loss occasioned the Island merchants during the last summer, are due to lack of duty in this respect. I may possibly be wrong, and after full explanations may alter my opinion, but I entirely dissent from the statement made by the hon. Minister, that because Mr. Coker made a trip across in the boat, he was competent to give a report as to her condition. The hon. Minister, as a ship-owner, knows very well that an inspection cannot be made unless the boat is opened up and properly examined, and I am sure he would not give a fig for the report of an inspector who, after merely walking about the deck, pretended to give an opinion concerning her seaworthiness. I hope that the hon. Minister does not really believe that an appeal made from the inspector to himself is sufficient. I read a report, made by the President of the Board of Trade in England, upon the necessity of appeals, and upon that section of the English law which gives the right of appeal to the President of the Board of Trade. He declared, as the result of his experience, that the President of the Board of Trade was a mere puppet in the hands of his inspectors. The experience of the Board of Trade in England, as regards the inspectors there, must necessarily be the same as that of the Minister of Marine here. If an inspector made a report on a ship in British Columbia, how is the hon. Minister here to judge, when appealed to, whether that report be correct or not? The hon. Minister, as a ship-owner, knows well that an appeal should be made to persons duly qualified, who would make a personal inspection of the boat themselves. This is not a local question, but one that affects the entire shipping of the whole Dominion, and which the late Sir Albert Smith and the late Government thought so important that they sent a special deputation to England for the purpose of having such an appeal placed in the English Act. There it has worked admirably. I know an instance where the inspectors at the Port of Liverpool stopped a Canadian ship from sailing, and on appeal being taken to the local board, withdrew their stoppage order. It would be an intolerable nuisance to invest one man with the arbitrary power of decreeing whether a ship or steamer is fitted to carry freight and passengers, without giving the option of appeal to some competent tribunal—a tribunal in each shipping port of the Dominion, composed after the manner prescribed in the English Act. I hope the hon. Minister will consider this matter before the Session is over.

Mr. HACKETT. It was not my intention to say any thing about this matter, had the hon. member for King's not made a remark reflecting on the committee of which he was a member. When that committee was in session, it was considered important that it should make a report before Parliament closed, so that the Government might take action. I am glad to find that a great many of the recommendations made by the committee are being carried out by the Government. The railway has been built to Cape Traverse, additional vessels have been placed on the

route between the Capes, additional hands are employed and the Government are using every exertion to carry on the mail service between the Island and the Mainland, in accordance with the terms of the Union. With regard to the boats running for the last fifteen or twenty years between the Island and the Mainland, at a very inconvenient season, I have not much to say. I do not see, when the matter was referred to a competent inspector, and when, on the 29th August he made an inspection and reported these boats to be unfit for the service, that the hon. Minister could do otherwise than prevent the boats from running. He was bound to do so in the interest of the public. While I am willing to give credit to the company for what they did in the past, I agree with the hon. Minister that when they knew, last December, that the boats would not be allowed to run after the 31st of October, they had sufficient time to make arrangements to replace their boats by competent craft. But this company, which has received a large subsidy from the present Government, and a subsidy previously from the Island Government, did nothing except make overtures to charter the *Northern Light* as a substitute for their boats. In so doing, they were not looking to the interests of the Island. The stoppage of communication at that time was a serious matter to the people, and caused a good deal of indignation. As is well known, the spring season on the Island is late, the seeding is late, and the harvest is late; so that the farmers have to bring their produce to market in the months of November and December. Therefore they were very indignant that communication with the Mainland, by the boats which formerly kept up that communication, should be stopped on the 1st of November, and this stoppage resulted in great loss both to them and the merchants. I must, however, admit that the Government did the best they could under the circumstances. They placed the *Northern Light* on the route between Georgetown and Pictou and Charlottetown, and then sent down the *Napoleon III.* for the purpose of assisting the *Northern Light* and the new boat, the *Summerside*, between Summerside and Shediac. The hon. member for King's makes light of the fact that the *Napoleon III.* was sent down for the purpose of keeping up communication, and wants to make it appear that she came down as a war ship. Well, it would be a compliment to the people of the Island that a war ship should be taken from her legitimate course, and placed on the route between the Island and the Mainland. But this steamer—a vessel of 700 tons used for the purpose of carrying supplies to the different lighthouse—is not engaged in warlike, but in peaceable operations, and is adapted to the carriage of a large quantity of freight, as well as a considerable number of passengers. The greatest inconvenience resulting last fall, was between Summerside and Shediac. The company placed a new ship, the *Summerside*, on that route, which was not adapted to the carriage of passengers at all. She was brought there for the purpose of carrying freight, and thus supplementing the other two boats in that respect. Every one acquainted with the geography of the Island knows that people travelling west go to the Mainland, cross from Summerside to Shediac, and thence to Moncton, where they take the train, so that the great traffic is at Summerside. This boat is not fit for that traffic, and consequently great hardships were suffered by the passengers; many of whom, I believe, preferred to cross in small sailing vessels and open boats, and as many as twenty and thirty men, women and children, have been huddled in these small boats, crossing over to the Mainland. This is not what the Government should do in carrying out the terms of Confederation. It was guaranteed by the terms that efficient steam communication should be kept up between the Island and the Mainland, and, when the people found that they had to take the same old means of conveyance, the same old ves-

Mr. HACKETT.

sels and boats that were used in this way some fifteen or twenty years ago, for the purpose of doing their business on the Mainland and crossing over, they were naturally very indignant, and there was much excitement on the Island at the time. That excitement has pretty well subsided, and I trust the Government will make some arrangement for a permanency of the service. It will be difficult for them to do that until they have completed the railways to the Capes, but those railways should be completed at the earliest possible moment; piers should be built on both sides, and I believe a ferry established there would be the means of keeping up communication pretty satisfactorily. This is not a mere local matter. It affects the whole Dominion of Canada, because the people of Prince Edward Island are large consumers of the manufactured goods of the other portions of the Dominion. I think from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 worth of the products of other portions of the Dominion are sold in the Island every year, so that it is not a mere local matter, but one extending to the whole of the Dominion of Canada; and it is to be hoped, therefore, that the Government will take steps to place proper boats between Summerside and Shediac, and establish them permanently, so that there shall be no doubt as to their movements, as to when this boat is going out or that boat coming in, and that continuous and efficient communication shall be kept up between the Island and the Mainland, as guaranteed by the terms of Union. The people believed that, when once they became a portion of the Dominion of Canada, these terms would be carried out, and that they would be able to take advantage of the whole system of railways of the Dominion; and, while this is undone, while there is no satisfactory arrangement made, there will be excitement on the Island. There will be discontent, and it will be a fruitful source of trouble to the Government as well. I hope, therefore, that this is the last we shall hear of the matter in the House for some time, and that energetic action will be taken for the purpose of carrying out these terms.

Mr. YEO. I am very much pleased that this question has come up, of communication between the Mainland and Prince Edward Island. Summerside harbour is the great west port for freight and passengers of the whole Island, and we expected something better to be done latterly than was done in the past. If the Government had notified the steamship company in time to get other ships to take the place of those they had, the Government would not be to blame; but if they did not do so, they were to blame. I am very sorry for it, and it is a great pity. At the time the late Government was in power, the only thought was to get a change and get this present party in power, and the Island would be amply provided for in the shape of steam communication; but instead of that, we have suffered more latterly than we ever did before, and it looks as if it was going to be worse. It is very surprising that a gentleman like Mr. Coker could condemn two ships and order another on the slip, and as soon as she got on the slip order her off again; that his eyesight could condemn one ship and could not see through the other. There must be something in this Mr. Coker not condemning the *Northern Light*, because she has only run a short time, and either the company or the captain of that ship, who is a very fine man, must be afraid to run her; perhaps he knows the danger he is in. Last year we had an investigation here, and we were promised a railway, and we were to have it right away. That is a railway. The people of the Island have been working on it all the summer, and, when they expected to get their pay from the contractors, or sub-contractors, they were knocked out of their pay. I do not understand how it is. There is nothing this year has hurt Prince County so much as not being able to get its produce away. The Government has no interest at

all in Prince County, it is true. There is communication from Charlottetown, but the greatest trade is from Summerside, where there is no provision whatever, only it is left to passengers to go in sailing vessels. Twenty passengers went out in a small vessel from Summerside in the morning; they were on board that vessel all day and all that night, and had to land back in Summerside again, the wind being ahead and it being calm. I think that is a shameful state of affairs, and I hope the Government will lose no time in attempting to carry out the terms, which I do not believe they have ever tried to do. Either give us better steam communication or, as I wanted them to do last winter, commence a tunnel without any further delay.

Motion agreed to.

#### COAL CARRIED BY THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN. In moving the resolution of which I have given notice, I may say that I have been induced to do so by looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns. I find that during the year 1883, there have been imported into this country 400,000 tons more coal than the previous year, and I find that there has been \$225,000 more duty paid. I am anxious to know how it is that the Nova Scotia coal mines have not contributed to a greater extent than they have, to the coal trade of this country. When the National Policy was inaugurated, hon. gentlemen opposite declared that by putting a duty upon coal, the coal miners of Nova Scotia would obtain the entire coal trade of this Dominion, and that the coal of Nova Scotia would find its way as far west as the cities of Hamilton and Toronto. I have been making enquiries with regard to the coal that has been brought to this city of Ottawa, and I find that the only parties bringing it are the Government, for the purpose of heating the Parliament Buildings. I do not think that any other person has brought coal to this city from Nova Scotia. All coal dealers west of here are buying their coal in the States, and paying a duty of 60 cents per ton, while Nova Scotia miners are simply supplying the trade east of here. I am anxious to find out why the miners of Nova Scotia have not made more effort to send their coal further west, and that is the reason I am asking for the returns mentioned in my resolution. We may possibly find that it is owing to the fact that the hon. Minister of Railways is imposing such very heavy tariff rates upon coal coming over the Intercolonial, that it is impossible for the Nova Scotia miners to pay those rates and compete with American coal. I will not say that is the case. I am not prepared, either, to insinuate that the hon. Minister of Railways would be guilty of such an act, when he has been such a strong advocate of the National Policy. I should rather infer that he would do everything in his power to encourage the shipment of coal further west. On the other hand, possibly, we might find out that we are not only paying Nova Scotia miners 60 cents duty per ton in order to encourage them to ship their coal westward, but that we are also giving them greater facilities over the Intercolonial than the ordinary expenses of running the road will warrant—though I am not prepared to say that such is the case. I want, also, to find out how much coal has been shipped over the Intercolonial, what rate per ton has been charged, what has been paid and everything of that nature. I certainly hold that before the hon. Minister of Railways makes his railway statement to this House, we should be put in possession of the information my motion asks for. We want these facts, to be able intelligently to understand and discuss the coal question. I may also say that within the last few years a large amount of money has been expended by the companies themselves to improve the facilities for the movement of coal over the Intercolonial, and I desire to know how far that expenditure has resulted

in securing the object sought for: I hope the hon. Minister of Railways will allow these papers to be laid before the House in good time, so that we may be able intelligently to discuss the whole question when he makes his statement. I, therefore, move for a return of the number of tons of coal carried by the Intercolonial Railway, from points along the line, during the year ending 31st December, 1883, showing the place where delivered and the rate per ton per mile for the carriage thereof; also, the special rates granted, if any, to whom granted, from what place, to what place, the distance and the rate per ton per mile.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman who has made this motion does not seem to have included in it the number of tons of coal that have been carried from the mines of Nova Scotia to the different ports of the Dominion by steamboats and sailing vessels. If he had supplemented his motion by adding that, I am sure there would have been no objection to the remarks he has made, for he would then show much more clearly the extent of the interprovincial trade in coal. I, therefore, beg leave to move, in amendment, that the following words be added:—

“ And also the number of tons of coal carried from Nova Scotia by steamboat and sailing vessel to the different ports of the Dominion.”

Mr. HESSON: I think that it is quite right we should get all the information the hon. gentleman asks for, in order to discuss this question intelligently. He appears, however, to be under the impression, from all the knowledge he possesses, that Nova Scotia coal has not been carried farther west than the city of Ottawa, and that the only coal brought here has been brought by the Dominion Government for the purpose of heating the Parliament Buildings. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman is of an enquiring turn of mind, he may be interested in learning that coal from Nova Scotia has been delivered very largely as far west as the town of Brockville, and has been consumed there by Grand Trunk engines. It has also been carried as far west as Toronto, in barges, where it has given great satisfaction. If the hon. gentleman desires to get information as to the working of the National Policy, and its effect in developing that very important industry in Canada, I think he ought to allow his mind to grasp the conclusion that it is also possible to export coal from Nova Scotia and Cape Breton by water as well as rail. Therefore, I second the amendment just proposed.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### SUPERANNUATION FUND.

M. McMULLEN, in moving for a return of the total amount paid into the Superannuation Fund during the time of service by each of those superannuated during the year ending the 31st December, 1883, said: The information asked for in this resolution is the only item required, in addition to the returns presented to the House, regarding superannuation, to enable us intelligently to understand the operation of the superannuation system.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of all despatches from the Imperial Government not yet brought down in relation to the Vice-Admiralty Courts in the Dominion, and the change of procedure and practice therein.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Local Government of Nova Scotia and the Department of Railways and Canals, respecting railway matters, in the Province of Nova Scotia, of a date since the 6th March, 1883.—(Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton.)

Statement of the amount expended in connection with the public building at Antigonish, from 1st November, 1881, to the 15th January, instant; giving the names of all persons to whom any portion of the expenditure had been paid, together with the amount paid to each, and for what; also copies of all correspondence relating to the building between the said dates.—(Mr. McIsaac.)

Return showing quantity and value of wheat and wheat flour (separately) and duty collected thereon, imported from the United States and entered for consumption, for six months ending 31st December, 1883.—(Mr. Dundas.)

A vetilled statement with dates, items and vouchers of the expenditure of the sums of \$5,000 and \$2,688.74, under warrants issued by the Governor General, dated 7th November 1883, and 17th January, 1884, for the payment to *Le Courier de St. Hyacinthe* of the said several sums; also, for similar particulars with reference to the expenditure of \$3,329.20, under warrant dated October 27th, 1883, for publication of the proceedings of the Royal Society.—(Mr. Somerville, Brant.)

Return showing the expenses in detail, with dates, incurred by the several members of the Government, and any other person or persons in the service of the Government, sent to England or elsewhere, on behalf of the Government, from 2nd April, 1883, to the present date.—(Mr. Somerville, Brant.)

Copies of any official memoranda of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of public letters or memoranda of any of the officers of the company relative to its position and prospects and transactions (including the recent guarantee) not already brought down; statements showing the amount of the subscribed stock of the company, with the date and amount of each subscription, and the amount paid up and to be paid up on such subscribed stock, with the date of each payment in cash, and the rate of discount at which any such stock was issued by the company to the subscribers or to any syndicate or parties who undertook its issue to the public; statement of the amount paid out of capital for interest on the capital stock, and the rate of such payment.

Statement of the facts as to the acquisition by or on behalf of the company, of any interest in or by any of its officers or any person on its account, or in any shares or securities of any of the following railway companies:—Credit Valley, Ontario and Quebec, Atlantic and North-Western, Toronto, Grey and Bruce, Hamilton and North-Western, South Eastern, Montreal, Portland and Boston, St. Lawrence and Ottawa, or in any companies having lines in Manitoba or the North-West (or elsewhere, with the dates, amounts and particulars, and copies of the documents relating to such acquisition, and to the obligations of the companies thereunder.

Statement of the various matters required to be returned under "The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879," and amendments thereto:—(1) For the fiscal year 1881-82; (2) for the fiscal year 1882-83, in each case separately, as to (a) the line of railway specifically provided for by the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; (b) the branches and extensions already acquired or controlled by the company.

Like statements with like particulars, separately, as to (a) and (b).

The Eastern and Western Divisions of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Statement of the total sum expended up to the 30th June, 1883, by the company under their contract: (a) For work of construction on the line to be built by the company, as particularly specified in the contract; (b) for rolling stock for the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as particularly specified in the contract; (c) for works of construction on extensions and branches and lines controlled by the company, not embraced in the railway particularly specified by

Mr. McMULLEN.

the contract; (d) for rolling stock for all extensions and branches not so embraced.

Like Statements to those hereinbefore mentioned, up to the 31st December, 1883.

Statement of the receipts of the company up to the 30th June, 1883, on account of: (a) Cash subsidy; (b) land grant bonds; (c) bonuses; (d) lands sales or transactions not embraced in the operations connected with land grant bonds; (e) number of acres of land subsidy; (f) amounts of bonuses agreed for though not paid. Like statements up to 31st December, 1883.—(Mr. Blake.)

Address to His Excellency the Governor General, representing that on the 5th March, 1883, an humble Address was presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying amongst other things for a statement showing the amount of the subscribed stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, prior to the authorization for an increase of its capital stock from \$25,000,000 to \$100,000,000, and of the amounts paid upon such subscribed stock, with the date of each payment in cash, and also of the amounts (if any) satisfied by the acquisition of property or otherwise, specifying in such case the consideration therefor, and the amount of stock given and the date. Representing further, that the reply furnished by the company, with a view to answering the said Address, omits the information asked for as above stated; and praying that His Excellency will be graciously pleased to cause such information to be obtained and laid before this House.—(Mr. Blake.)

Address to His Excellency the Governor General, representing that by the Act of 1881 to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, it is provided that the several railway companies shall furnish yearly returns to the Minister of Railways, containing certain information specified in the schedule of the said Act; and in addition such other information and returns as shall, from time to time, be required by the Governor in Council; representing further that among the returns specified in the schedule, is the following: "Statement containing copies of all contracts made by the company for the construction of any part of the railway." Representing further, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has not as yet complied with the law in this respect, in so far as regards the returns made to the Minister of Railways and laid before this House. Representing further, that it is of high public consequence that the law should be complied with and the information furnished; and praying that His Excellency will be graciously pleased to cause steps to be taken with a view to secure compliance with the law and the supply of the information required, namely, copies of all contracts made by the company for the construction of any part of its railway.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copy of the instrument of incorporation or association of a construction company, called the North American Contracting Company, or by some similar name, with which a contract has been made for the construction of part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for a statement of the names of shareholders or associates thereof.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statement showing the revenue and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway, accrued for the six months of the year ending 31st December, 1883, under the several divisions similar to annual statement B, Intercolonial Railway, in the Public Accounts.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Return showing the quantity of rolling stock purchased for the Intercolonial Railway during the year ending 31st December, 1883, giving each kind of rolling stock, and whether purchased under contract or otherwise, the parties from whom bought, and the cost of each kind. Also, a statement showing what has been built during the year in the Government workshops, giving each kind.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, instructions to and correspondence with the Commissioners under the Commission

issued in connection with the claims arising out of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and statement of the matters referred to them, and of the moneys paid to them and to the secretary, and of the number of days during which the commissioners sat, all subsequent to the period covered by the return to the Address of last Session.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Return giving a full statement of all coal entered ex-warehouse, free, or for exportation, during the years ending 30th June, 1882 and 1883; showing the quantity so entered at each port, the names of persons having entered, the quantities ex-warehoused, by each person, and if exported, the name of the vessel or railroad by which exported, the place to which exported, and copies of the cancelling certificates, showing that such coal has been landed in the ports to which exported.—(Mr. Weldon.)

All memorials, petitions of any kind, not covered by the Order of last Session, asking for a drawback on sugar refined in Canada, when exported to any foreign country, the party applying, their statement of drawback proposed, and any answers of the Government thereto; also, copy of any regulations made for such drawback.—(Mr. Weldon.)

All claims presented for drawback on materials used for ship-building for the year ending 30th June, 1883. Also for the six months ending 31st December, 1883, giving the name of the applicant, the name and tonnage of the vessel, the amount claimed and the amount paid.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Statement showing name, tonnage, and owner or owners of each vessel that received bounty during the years 1882 and 1883, under the Act appropriating \$150,000 "to aid in the development of the sea fisheries," the amount paid to each vessel; also, the name, tonnage, owner or owners of vessels applying for same, and refused, and the grounds of refusal.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Return showing quantity of spirits, beer and all other intoxicating liquors imported, manufactured and entered for consumption in the Dominion of Canada, during the year ending 31st December, 1883, by Provinces, with the Customs and Excise duties accruing thereon, and the total cost thereof.—(Mr. McCraney.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 5:40 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 29th January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 18) to incorporate the Pilots engaged in the service between Montreal and Quebec.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Bill (No. 19) to grant certain powers to the Commercial Cable Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 20) to amend the Act incorporating the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. MacDougald.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

### SELF GOVERNMENT AMONG INDIAN COMMUNITIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in introducing Bill (No. 22) to provide for the introduction among Indian com-

munities of a system of self government, said: This is a Bill intended to meet a difficulty connected with the more advanced bands of Indians whose self government is now carried on in council, where they can discuss matters affecting their communities and where the chiefs have the principal power. In some of the more advanced communities the Indians are civilized to all intents and purposes, and it is thought well that there should be something more than a mere informal council where they cannot speak authoritatively. The Bill is tentative to a considerable extent. It provides that in such Indian communities as the Governor in Council thinks fit for the operation of this Act, the Indians shall meet on a certain day and elect six councillors; that those six councillors shall elect a chief councillor, who shall be what would be called a reeve among the white communities in Ontario; and that they shall have the same powers as are given to the chiefs under the Indian Act, and also certain additional powers of arranging among themselves for the improvement of their reserves. These are, shortly, the provisions of the Act.

Mr. BLAKE. This is not the title which was given to the Bill in the notice paper. I suppose that the title was perhaps thought rather more extensive than the purpose of the Bill warranted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was because I had not the Bill before me when I gave notice.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman had not seen the Bill, then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, as I prepared the Bill, I ought to have seen it.

Bill read the first time.

### AGREEMENT WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House do, on Friday next, go into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the following Resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to make provision for giving effect to the agreement entered into between the Governments of Canada and British Columbia laid before this House by Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

2. That it is expedient to grant and appropriate seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars in aid of the construction of a railway and line of telegraph from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, according to the terms and subject to the conditions of the said agreement.

3. That it is expedient to grant and appropriate the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the purchase from the said Province of the dry dock at Esquimalt, and such further sum as may be required to repay to the said Province the amounts expended by the Government thereof or remaining due at the passing of the Act authorizing this grant for work or material supplied by the said Government since the 27th day of June, 1882.

4. That it is expedient to authorize the grant to "The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company," incorporated, or to be incorporated, by the Legislature of British Columbia, for the construction of the said railway, of the lands and the appurtenances thereof, or rights connected therewith, that are or may be placed in the hands of the Government of Canada by that of the said Province in aid of or for purposes relating to the construction of the said railway, subject to the terms, limitations, reservations, and conditions mentioned in the agreement aforesaid.

5. That it is expedient to authorize the importation, free of duty, of all steel rails, fish-plates, and other articles of iron or steel, timber and materials for bridges to be used in the first construction of the railway and lines of telegraph mentioned in the preceding Resolutions.

6. That it is expedient to provide that the said railway and line of telegraph and the lands, franchises, and other appurtenances thereof shall, upon the completion and equipment thereof, and subject to the conditions, limitations, and reservations mentioned in the agreement aforesaid and the schedules thereunto annexed, and so far as Her Majesty shall have power to grant the same, but no further, be the property of the said company.

7. That it is expedient to provide that the Government of Canada may pay interest at the rate of four per cent. per annum on any money deposited by the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, as security for the due performance of their contract with Her Majesty respecting the said railway.

8. That it is expedient to make legislative provision for giving effect to the agreement aforesaid, and that the mover of these Resolutions have leave to bring in a Bill for that purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I had supposed that the hon. gentleman on this motion would have given some general explanation of the arrangement and its effects, and particularly of that point as to which one cannot very well judge from the papers which have been laid before us, viz., what the real cost to the Dominion of the dry dock will be under this arrangement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall be prepared on Friday to give full explanations; and, of course, at this early period of the Session there will be no object in hurrying, and the matter can stand over *de die in diem*.

Motion agreed to.

#### REPORT.

The following Report was laid on the Table:

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended 31st December, 1883.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

#### MANITOBA PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed Resolution (page 43) with respect to aid to Manitoba for Public Schools therein.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to make some explanation of this.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes. It will be in the memory of many hon. members, that some three years ago a proposal was made to Parliament and accepted by it, to make an advance of \$10,000 a year for three years, to assist the Government of Manitoba in providing the necessary means for the education of the people of that Province. The first and second payments of \$10,000 a year were made under the authority of that Act. The third payment was not made within the year, but lapsed; and therefore it is considered advisable that we should ask Parliament, not only for authority for the payment of that sum of \$10,000, but also to advance \$15,000 for each of the years 1881-82 and 1882-83, to aid the Government of Manitoba in defraying the expense of education during those years. Owing to the sparseness of the population, it has been very expensive to carry on the work of education in that Province; and the Government have thought it desirable to delay the sale of the lands reserved for educational purposes until they would bring reasonably high prices, and to ask Parliament to make these advances in the meantime, the Government of Manitoba paying the Dominion Government 5 per cent. interest until the advances are refunded from the proceeds of the sale of the lands. The Government assented to the proposition of the Government of Manitoba—in fact, the latter asked something more, but this is the arrangement we agreed to submit to the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman state how much land has been sold, and what amount has been realized therefrom?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am speaking from memory, but I do not think any lands have been sold. The Government proposed to sell some at auction last spring, I think, but the Government of Manitoba, if my memory serves me, advised us to postpone the sale, and I do not think any lands have since been sold.

Mr. BLAKE. From the hon. gentleman's statement, I understand that this Resolution is the result of a proposition made by the Government of Manitoba to this Government,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

to which they have either wholly or partly assented. I think when a financial or other proposition is made by the Government, based upon negotiations between them and a Provincial Government, it is the duty of the Government to bring down the papers which evidence the basis of the negotiations. If the Government of Manitoba have made a suggestion, and there has been correspondence which results in this proposition, we ought to have the papers, so that we could see what the views of that Government and of this Government were, and how far it has been the wish of the Dominion Government to meet the views of the Province. With regard to the proposition itself, I do not think any member of this House will be found to say that an arrangement arrived at with a just degree of prudence, for the education of the young people of Manitoba at this early period, should be received otherwise than with favour. No doubt we should, at the earliest moment, devise a general system of education for that Province. But with reference to the fund which we are creating, with reference to the lands which we believe we cannot trust the people of Manitoba themselves to administer, I think the hon. gentleman has not wholly recollected the circumstances as they have occurred to my own mind and as they have appeared in the public prints. I think that serious difficulties have been, and probably will be, encountered in carrying out the policy of the Government with reference to the school lands. If the hon. gentleman would refer to the Department he will find—at any rate the newspapers have said so—that the difficulty in the way of selling has been the fact of squatting on the land. A great many claims have been made by individuals that their rights, as they call them, as squatters on the school lands should be respected, and they complained that it was a hardship to sell these school lands by auction. In consequence of representations of that description, the sale which was advertised was postponed and has never been resumed. What I have to say is this, that if the system be continued of keeping the school lands locked up, and at the same time of allowing people to squat on them, you are just breeding trouble. The same objections which have been made before will certainly be made again with added force if you permit these lands to be so occupied. There, therefore, ought to be some business-like adjustment of the question as to the terms on which school lands should be opened for settlement, and some immediate arrangement of the business, so far as regards those persons who have squatted on school lands, should be arrived at, for this is one of those things that time will not heal, but will make worse.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is correct in a certain sense in his recollections. The Government, under the Dominion Lands Act, advertised a public sale, and the hon. gentleman will remember that the Statute provides for the selling of school lands by public auction and in no other way. Some two or three years ago they were advertised for sale. As regards the major part of the lots there could be no objection, but with regard to others there were claims of persons who had settled on them, some of whom said they did not know they were school lands, and others that they had settled under the terms of the Dominion Lands Act of that day, which enabled them to settle, and gave them certain inchoate rights. In addition to all that there was a communication from the Manitoba Government, which is primarily interested in the sale of these lands at the highest price, that they did not consider the time an expedient one for putting these lands on the market. In consequence of these two difficulties—in the first place the claims of certain individuals, and in the next the remonstrance of the Manitoba Government—the sale was postponed; and I believe the Manitoba Government are now sorry that the sale was postponed. I think they would have got as good prices

then as they are likely to get now. That is the position of matters. Under the Dominion Lands Act of that day, a doubt arose as to whether these parties entering upon unsurveyed lands, which afterwards proved to be school lands, had not certain rights, and that their rights would override the clause of the Act providing that all school lands shall be sold by auction. Those individual cases are now being judged by the officers of the Department, and the law was so amended that by no possibility, after the passing of the last Dominion Lands Act, could there be any claims set up for occupation, nor anything against the right of the country to have these lands sold by auction to the highest bidder, for school purposes. There has been no communication since, that I at this moment remember, except that the individual members of the Manitoba Government have stated that they are now of opinion the opening of the season next spring would be a good period for putting a limited portion of these lands on the market, and it is the intention of the Government to do so. My hon. friend understands, no doubt, the reason why the last \$10,000 was not paid. It was mere neglect of the Ontario Government to demand payment, and under the strict terms of the Statute the money could not be paid. As regards the other terms of the Resolution, it provides that there will be a further assistance of \$15,000 a year for two years. There was no written communication, for this reason, that Mr. Desrivieres, a member of the Manitoba Government, came down especially to Ottawa and was heard in Council. Of course, the Government said they had no doubt Parliament would grant the \$10,000, and after hearing him we came to the conclusion we should make these two additional grants; he expressing the opinion of his Government that next season would be a favourable opportunity for putting the lands on the market, from which might be expected sufficient to go far towards furnishing the whole amount of the advance.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. gentleman will bring down at an early stage any correspondence there may be on the subject.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the leader of the Government has stated that a representative of the Manitoba Government appeared before the Government. I have no recollection of any written communication.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Premier was quite right in saying that the Minister of Finance had explained about that \$10,000, and that no objection was made to it at all. In fact this is not the first time the hon. gentleman has asked for \$10,000 to educate the people of this country.

Resolution ordered to be reported.

#### SALARY OF CARIBOO COUNTY COURT JUDGE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Legislature of the Province of British Columbia passed, in 1883, an Act establishing five County Courts, and of course it was expected that Parliament here would provide salaries for the five Judges. However it was thought by the Government here, especially by the Minister of Justice, Sir Alexander Campbell, that this was perhaps premature, that we had just provided two salaries for two additional Judges of the Supreme Court and that with the sparse population of British Columbia there was no necessity for five Supreme Court Judges and for five County Court Judges in that Province. When Sir Alexander Campbell was in Victoria this summer, he discussed that with the Government, and they came to an agreement that, for the present, they would only want the salary provided for one Judge—the Judge for the

Cariboo district—the difficulty being that there was a difference between the Government and the Bench. The law as passed there provided that the Judges of the Supreme Court should live in various districts—should be distributed over the whole of British Columbia. They objected very strongly to that, and they have now come to an arrangement, a sort of compromise, by which the major part of the Judges are to live in Victoria, to form the Bench, and two of the Supreme Court Judges are to live in outer districts. Those two Judges of the Supreme Court, with this one County Judge at Cariboo, will, it is believed, be sufficient for the purpose, and, therefore, instead of providing salaries for the five County Judges under the Act of 1883, this House is only now asked to provide for the salary of one Judge. There will be or has been, I am not sure which, corresponding legislation altering the County Court Act in British Columbia, and doing away for the present with the necessity for four other Judges. I move that the House do now go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the salary of the Judge of the County Court of Cariboo, in the Province of British Columbia, shall be \$2,400 per annum; that he be paid such travelling allowances as the Governor in Council may from time to time determine and that the said salary and allowances be paid out of any unappropriated money forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. Move it for Friday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no object in that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I said there is no object at this period of the Session in going on without the usual notice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well; Friday.

Mr. BLAKE. It is rather amusing, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman should tell us to-day that in effect we are to be thankful for his saving us the salaries of four County Court Judges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. I said in effect. The hon. gentleman said that, instead of being called upon to provide the salaries of five County Court Judges, we were called upon to provide the salary of only one County Court Judge, and he intimated that that was a very small demand; but most of us, who recollect the discussion which took place when the re-arrangement of the judicial system of British Columbia was made, and we were called upon to sanction it by the late Minister of Justice, will remember that this result was predicted at that time. Then there were five Stipendiary Magistrates, who had been discharging their functions in these districts, and they were pensioned off at an expense of, I think, about \$8,000 a year, which pensions we are still paying. They were pensioned off in order that a system of Superior Court Judges, and Superior Court Judges alone, might be provided for the Province; and it was said that no increased expense would be caused, because that staff of Superior Court Judges would be wholly adequate to the discharge of the duties. I pointed out that the circumstances of the Province were such as to require, in the remote and interior part especially, local Judges, that there would be this difficulty to which the hon. gentleman has referred, that we would be called upon at an early day to replace by somebody else the persons we were pensioning off, and that, instead of the scheme being one of a permanent character, not involving a large additional expenditure, it was one that would have to be supplemented so as to cause that additional expense. That was in 1880, and now, in 1884, he proposes that we should in effect replace under another name a County Court Judge, one of those pensioned four years ago. I believe it is impossible, as I stated before, to satisfactorily

carry on the Administration of Justice in that Province without local judges. I believe that a Judge, in one sense of inferior grade, such as these Stipendiary Magistrates or County Court Judges, would be probably quite adequate to the discharge of the duty at those points, but I think it is to be much regretted that the judicial system of that Province, by the conjoint action of the British Columbia Government and this Government, which holds the purse strings and pays the money, was at that time re-arranged as it is now, that then the County Court Judges were pensioned, and now a proposal is made to re-establish one of those County Court Judges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken, Mr. Speaker, in supposing that I was appealing to his gratitude for only asking the salary of one Judge. My hon. friend is like Prince Schwarzenburg, who proposed to astonish the Czar Nicholas by his splendid ingratitude. We do not get any gratitude from the hon. gentleman for anything we may do for the good of the country. We do the good notwithstanding, and virtue is its own reward; but we are not rewarded by the gratitude of my hon. friend. He says he predicted some years ago that we would have to return to the County Court system; but years progress, Provinces grow larger, populations increase, and, if I remember aright, the chief objection taken by the whole of the bar and bench there was that the local gentlemen, the stipendiary magistrates, who had looked after the miners in early days and were gold commissioners as well during the rush there, were all laymen, that there was not a lawyer among them, and it was not thought satisfactory that they should have such large jurisdiction. I am not sure that they could not try capital cases, but at all events they had the jurisdiction of Superior Court Judges in their several sections, and it was not thought satisfactory. These gentlemen were pensioned off, I think, under the agreement with British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. No; it was agreed that they should be pensioned if they retired from office, but the pensioning arrangement was only carried out the other day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe nearly all the salaries of those who are pensioned are being saved. Judge O'Reilly is now the Commissioner for settling the Indian reserves, and he gets the salary of his predecessor, Mr. Sproat, and his pension is saved. I think Mr. Elliott, another of these gentlemen, is in the same position. He is employed otherwise, and therefore his salary is saved. Mr. Trutch never was a Stipendiary Magistrate, but he was one of the pensioners, and he is also an officer of the Government, and his pension is saved. I am not sure about the others. However that may be, here is the system which was adopted, and I fancy in the future it will be a good system. It is the system of the Province of Ontario that there should be a Supreme Court for superior jurisdiction, and County Court Judges. The Supreme Court consists of five Judges. Two of them are to act for the present, until the country increases still more than it has—and I am happy to believe that it is going to increase very rapidly in the future—three of the Judges will remain in Victoria and sit in banc; the other two Judges will be on the Mainland, and be District Judges, and in addition to these there will be this County Court Judge, to be stationed in Cariboo. I do not think there will be, I do not conceive that there can be, any objection to the granting of this proposal.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### SUMS PAID TO THE HON. JOHN O'CONNOR.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for a statement in detail of any sums paid to the Hon. John O'Connor since the period covered by the Address of last Session, with dates and particulars; also copies of Orders in Council and papers

Mr. BLAKE.

showing the arrangements under which such sums were paid, said: I asked the hon. gentleman last Session to give some information upon this subject, but no information was vouchsafed. It seems from the papers we have that these sums were paid to cover remuneration and expenses in connection with the boundaries dispute between Ontario and Manitoba, but we have had no return of what the particular services were, or what the expenses were. So far as one can judge it seems to be an arrangement by which a provision of about \$3,000 a year was made to a gentleman for whom the hon. gentleman thought it convenient to provide for otherwise than by placing him in the Administration.

Motion agreed to.

#### NOVA SCOTIA COAL IMPORTATIONS INTO THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of any despatches or correspondence concerning, or of any regulations or orders of the United States Government, under which Nova Scotia coal imported into the United States ports, is permitted to be used for ocean steamship purposes, without the payment of duty, and statement of any information in the possession of the Government on the subject, said: I have been informed there have been for the last twelve months, regulations made by the Government of the United States, or some of its Departments, under which coal imported from Nova Scotia into those ports for the purpose of being used on ocean steamboats abroad, is taken out of bond and exported—I cannot say, perhaps exported, but placed on board those steamships for fuel purposes in their trade. This is a very important step with reference to the Nova Scotia coal trade, and one in which we are interested. I ask that the Address may be ordered.

Motion agreed to.

#### IRON BOUNTIES.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe by the *Gazette* that the Act of last Session on the subject of a bounty on iron, has been put in force, and that must have been done on some Order in Council regulating the amount. I also observe that the hon. Finance Minister, being the other day in the city of Toronto, was kind enough to receive a deputation of iron manufacturers and persons interested in establishing in that city works for the manufacture of pig iron, who represented to him that his calculations were somewhat erroneous and that a larger encouragement was absolutely necessary in order to their establishing and carrying on in the public good, and for the public interest, that important manufacture. I observe that the hon. gentleman rather disputed the accuracy of the statements and calculations of the gentlemen forming the deputation, and declared, as the newspapers report, that he would, on his return to Ottawa, cause their calculations to be sifted by some of his own officers, and would communicate the result. I am anxious to know what the hon. gentleman's final calculations are upon that subject, and with a view to obtaining that correspondence as well as the Order in Council, &c., I move for copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, memorials and representations on the subject of the bounty on manufactures of iron.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Order in Council relative to the bounties, which has been passed under the action of Parliament last Session, will be brought down. With respect to the interview with the gentlemen at Toronto, the statements were not made in the exact terms which the hon. gentleman has stated. It was not asserted that the calculations of the Government were wrong.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all. I said the Minister declared that the calculations of those gentlemen were wrong.

Sir LEONARD TILLY. Exactly. The facts were these: Certain gentlemen were very anxious to establish iron works in the city of Toronto, and made certain statements to me, in order to show what it would cost to produce a ton of iron in that city; and I thought the calculations they submitted were of an exaggerated character. I asked them to give me the statements in order that they might be investigated, and said that if I found them erroneous I would report to them. They said they would have the statements prepared and forwarded; but they have not honoured me with them up to the present time, so I have not had an opportunity of enquiring into them or giving any answer.

Motion agreed to.

#### SEIZURES AT PORTS OF ENTRY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for a statement showing the number of seizures made at each port of entry in the Dominion during the last fiscal year; also during the six months ending the 31st December last; the amount of fines exacted at each port during each of the said periods; and the manner in which the said fines were disposed of, giving the names of the officers receiving any portion thereof, and the amount received by each of such officers of the said fund. He said: I am told this branch has been peculiarly active during the past season.

Motion agreed to.

#### FISHING IN ONTARIO WATERS.

Mr. MULOCK in moving for a return of all regulations now in force under the provisions of "The Fishery Act" prohibiting fishing in waters situate in the Province of Ontario, said: In making this motion I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a certain Order in Council which I am informed has been passed and in force for some years. I am told there is an Order in Council prohibiting fishing in any waters of the Province of Ontario without a license or a lease from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and that under this Order in Council certain convictions have been made, contrary to what is understood to be the true spirit of the regulations, and that parties have been put to the trouble of applying to the Department for a remission of the fines, great expense and delays at times occurring, and sometimes even their petitions were not favourably considered. I am informed that the Department do not intend to enforce that Order in Council to the full letter; but yet they have delegated the authority to abuse the privilege to persons probably not well informed as to the true policy of the Government in regard to the matter in question. From this it appears to me that it would be possible to modify such Order in Council, or, if thought advisable to preserve the sweeping character of the Order, it would at least be proper to instruct the fishery officers throughout the Province as to what acts the Department consider offences against the fishing interest.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of all applications for sales or leases, and all correspondence or reports touching, and also statement of all sales or leases made of coal lands in the North-West, not covered by the returns already ordered, and of the particulars of all conversions of leaseholds into freeholds of coal lands; and statement of the payments made under any leases, sales or conversions.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Imperial authorities, or with the Govern-

ment of Manitoba, or any other parties, on the subject of the navigation of the Hudson Bay, not already brought down.—(Mr. Watson.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 4:15 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 30th January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. COURSOL moved that, as the time for presenting Private Bills to this House will expire to-morrow, the same be extended to Saturday, the 9th of February next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company.—(Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Halifax Steam Navigation Company, limited.—(Mr. Stairs.)

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. HOUDE, in introducing Bill (No. 25) to repeal the Liquor License Act, 1883, said: A Bill for a similar purpose has been introduced by the hon. member for Huron; and as there are, in the preamble of that Bill, recitals that I prefer would not be there, I have, therefore, introduced another Bill repealing purely and simply the Act referred to.

Bill read the first time.

#### FRAUD IN THE SALE OF PATENT RIGHTS.

Mr. MULOCK, in introducing Bill (No. 26) for the better prevention of fraud in connection with the Sale of Patent Rights, said: The provisions of the Bill are similar to those of the Bill introduced last Session, and are not, I believe, at all obnoxious. I will explain them if the House desires.

Bill read the first time.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY AGREEMENT.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Which are the clauses of Statutes under the authority whereof the Government made the arrangements of 26th October and 7th November, and executed the agreement of 8th, 9th and 10th November, with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, laid on the Table?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will, perhaps, give a more complete answer to a portion of the hon. gentleman's question by reading the memorandum placed in my hands by the Deputy Minister of Finance:

"The powers possessed by the Government of Canada to borrow money are spread over several Acts, but for convenience of reference are brought down each year in the Supply Bill. The manner in which the Government shall borrow money is set forth by 35 Vic., cap. 6, as amended by 38 Vic., cap. 4, which manner is also set forth in the Supply Bill. Setting aside 38 Vic., cap. 4, which simply reduces the rate of

interest which the Government are authorized to pay on Dominion stock, the borrowing powers and the manner in which the money can be borrowed are contained in the Supply Bill of last Session and in the Act 35 Vic., cap. 6. By the Supply Bill of last Session (46 Vic., cap. 2) in addition to the powers possessed of borrowing for specific purposes, the Government of Canada had power to borrow for general purposes as on the 31st December, 1882, the sum of \$19,676,443.57. This amount on the 30th June, 1883, by increase of savings bank deposits and other causes, had been reduced to \$18,280,234.27 (*Vide* General Statements, Public Accounts, 1883, page lii.) The amount of principal money mentioned in the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to represent \$975,000 half-yearly for ten years, was \$15,942,645, and so far as that amount goes the Government of Canada were it appears to me within their borrowing powers. I find, on reference to 35 Vic., cap. 6, that, as I said before, the manner in which the Government can borrow money is detailed, and for convenience of reference I may recite the various modes as follows: *a.* By the issue of debentures. *b.* By the issue of Dominion stock. *c.* By direct terminable annuities. *d.* By the issue of Exchequer bills and bonds. On the debentures and stock a sinking fund may or may not be provided. In addition, the Governor in Council is empowered to raise loans in any of these ways I have mentioned, or partly in one and partly in another or others thereof. The Act in its preamble sets forth that it was expedient to amend and consolidate the enactments then in force respecting the public debt and the raising of loans authorized by Parliament, and so avoid the necessity of inserting any such provisions in the annual Bills of Supply; and up to the present time this Act has been taken as the basis on which all loans have been effected. I also find that in addition, by clause 3, the Governor in Council has power, as the exigencies of the public service require, to raise temporary loans in certain cases. It will be noted that nothing in the Act was to alter the provisions of the Act respecting Dominion notes or the priority or rank of the changes then in existence."

That covers one part of the hon. gentleman's enquiry. As regards the acceptance of securities from the Canadian Pacific Railway for deferred payments, the Government made the arrangement trusting to the support of Parliament, as the case was urgent.

#### ONTARIO AND QUEBEC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, What is the amount claimed as the balance due on the account between Ontario and Canada, and on which side? What is the amount claimed as the balance due on the account between Quebec and Canada, and on which side?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman has a notice among the Notices of Motions with reference to copies of the statements rendered to the authorities of Ontario and Quebec, as to their accounts with Canada, &c. There will be no opposition offered to that motion, and the documents will be brought down, showing exactly all the circumstances under which that statement was made. There is, therefore, no necessity to enter now into details which would not be as complete as the statement to which I refer, and which will be laid on the Table the moment the resolution passes.

#### THE CENSUS.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, When will the remaining volume of the Census of 1881 be distributed?

Mr. POPE. Next month.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC GUARANTEE.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether there has been any further correspondence with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the subject of the guaranty than that already laid on the Table; and if so, whether the same will be forthwith laid on the Table?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not aware of there being any other correspondence than that already brought down.

#### PAYMENT BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY TO THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any of its officers, have intimated to the Government that it cannot or will not meet, or that Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

it will find difficulty in meeting, its obligation under the recent arrangement to pay a sum in cash on the 1st of February; and whether the Government expects to receive that sum as agreed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, that I do not think it would be in the public interest to prematurely enter upon a subject that I intend to submit fully for the consideration of the House at a very early day.

#### THE ARRANGEMENT WITH THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether any understanding has been reached with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any of its officers, as to any modification of the arrangement lately made by the company; or as to any further concession to the company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to accept the answer which I have given to the last question as the answer to this.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY POSTAL SUBSIDY.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether any arrangement has been made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as to the sale or amount of their postal subsidy or remuneration for transport service? If so, when; and will the paper be laid on the Table forthwith?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, that subject will be fully submitted for the consideration of the House; but it is understood that the same postal subsidy and remuneration for transport service will be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as to other railways similarly situated.

#### REPORTS ON THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY GUARANTEE.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether there was any report or memorandum on the subject of the recent Canadian Pacific Railway guaranty other than those laid on the Table? And if so, whether the same will be laid on the Table forthwith?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, of there being any other report of that kind.

#### DEPOSIT OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY SECURITIES.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, On what day the sums of money and securities mentioned in the Order in Council of 7th November, 1883, were paid to and deposited with the Government and charged with the sums mentioned? In what bank or banks and to what amount in each bank was the money paid? With whom were the securities deposited? Where are they now? Was any instrument evidencing the terms of the deposit and charge executed; and when? Was an instrument creating a charge on the postal subsidy and transport service charges executed; and when? Will any such instrument be laid on the Table forthwith?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The deposit receipt of the Bank of Montreal, Ottawa, is dated the 16th November, 1883, and is for a sum of \$3,561,733, and a further sum of \$148,507, being the equivalent of interest at 4 per cent. upon \$15,942,645 for 85 days, from 17th August to 10th November. Although the deposit receipt is dated at Ottawa, the 16th November, the transfer to interest account was dated the 14th November, and the orders to purchase exchange for transmission to England were sent from

Montreal to New York on the 13th of November. We purchased at that time in New York Exchange to the amount of £825,000 sterling. When I was in England, owing to the large claims that were made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, from the expeditious manner in which the works were being constructed, which exceeded my estimate, I made arrangements for a temporary loan of about \$1,000,000 or £200,000 sterling. This £325,000 was to pay back that temporary loan, and to redeem \$196,200 of 6 per cent. debentures due on the 1st of January, and \$3,000,000 was deposited in the Bank of Montreal at 4 per cent. interest. In relation to the postal subsidy referred to in the latter paragraph, the company made a proposal to the Government on this subject, which proposal was accepted and embodied in the agreement.

#### CONSOLIDATION OF THE STATUTES.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, Whether the Government have appointed a French Canadian as a member of the Commission for the Consolidation of the Dominion Statutes; and if not, whether it is their intention to make such an appointment, and when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Alphonse Ouimet, who is, I believe, a French Canadian, has been appointed a member of the Commission.

#### SALE OF LAND OR TIMBER IN THE BOW RIVER DISTRICT.

Mr. JACKSON enquired, Has the Government sold to an American syndicate, or to any other syndicate, person or persons since the 1st of March last, a tract of land or timber limits in or convenient to the Bow River country in the North-West? If so, the date of such sale, the name or names of the purchaser, or purchasers, the number of square miles sold, and the prices or consideration received by the Government for the same?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There have been no such sales of timber lands, but the Government made leases of certain timber berths in the North-West during last summer for disposal by public tender, and awarded them to the highest bidder in each case. Some of those who acquired berths are American lumbermen doing business at Eau Claire, Wisconsin. As to the last part of the question, if the hon. gentleman will make a motion the information will be brought down.

#### DAILY MAIL FOR ST. GILLES.

Mr. RINFRET enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a daily mail to the Parish of St. Gilles, County of Lotbinière?

Mr. CARLING. I may say to the hon. gentleman, that the matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

#### ACCOUNTS BETWEEN THE DOMINION AND ONTARIO AND QUEBEC.

Mr. HESSON enquired, Whether the accounts standing between the Ontario and Quebec Governments with the Dominion Government have yet been finally settled? If not, why not?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will obtain the information he desires when we lay upon the Table of the House, in a day or two, a statement of the accounts between the two Governments.

#### PASTURE LAND LEASES.

Mr. CHARLTON moved, for a return showing the number of pasture land leases granted in the year 1883, the

name of each lessee, the estimated number of acres covered by each lease, the term of each lease, the sum received and to be received upon each lease, and the total number of acres leased, and total receipts from leases during the year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no objection to that, nor to the other motions of which my hon. friend has given notice. I have a communication from the Department of the Interior stating, with respect to all those motions, that the information called for is to be found in the annual report which is now being printed. At least, in respect to the public lands, there will be no difficulty in giving the returns at once if the hon. gentleman wants them.

Motion agreed to.

#### LICENSES FOR THE SALE OF LIQUORS IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all despatches and correspondence on the subject of the issue of licenses or permits for the importation of liquor into the North-West Territories; and particularly with reference to the tax or fee thereon lately imposed, and for copies of the forms of licenses; and statement of the number issued, with names, quantities and dates, and amounts collected, said: There are two points which require attention with reference to the subject of the motion I am about to move. First, I have read numerous accounts, and many circumstantial accounts, of what seem to be gross abuses of the power to issue these privileges or permits to parties entering the North-West Territories. I have no personal information on the subject, and speak only from the ordinary source of public information; but it is alleged very circumstantially that blank permits have been issued, permits for an indefinite quantity. A story was narrated in one of the papers of that country of an occasion on which the officers charged with the duty of searching the train found several persons in possession of moderate sized packages of prohibited liquors without permits; but after those persons were told to remain quiet, another gentleman on the train produced one of the blank or indefinite permits, and said all the liquor belonged to him, and the efforts of the officer to carry out the law were frustrated by that impudent declaration, under cover of a permit entirely indefinite as to quantity. The next clause in the resolution is with respect to the recent order or declaration—I do not understand by what authority it has been done—under which a tax or fee is charged, based upon the quantity and description of the liquor. I know not whether this has been done for revenue purposes or for the regulation of the traffic, with a view to paying the expense of the searchers, &c.; but it seems to me open to several considerations of no small magnitude in connection with this whole matter. I think, as I have taken occasion to express more than once in this House, that the power which has been granted and exercised by the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, as to granting permission to bring liquor into the Territory, is one which should be very carefully guarded indeed, and the exercise of which should be restricted within the narrowest possible limits, and in respect to which, instructions should be given as to the mode in which it is to be exercised; and returns in detail of the number of permits, the persons, the quantities, &c., should be furnished to the Executive here, and by them to Parliament, in order that the practical operation of the Act, which is supposed to secure the prohibition of intoxicating liquors in the North-West Territory, may be ascertained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All the papers on this subject, at the disposal of the Government, will be brought down. I believe there has been, in days gone by, a good deal of improper licensing in the North-West. One cause was that permits issued were not returned. A person who

held a permit used that permit to bring in several quantities. That practice has been stopped. There has been, I have ascertained, within a day or two, a further limitation in regard to the permits, and a tax has been imposed. I read only this morning a report on the North-West generally made by the Lieutenant-Governor, and it embraces this subject among others in connection with that territory. That report will be laid before the House at once. There is no objection to the motion being adopted.

Motion agreed to.

#### MATTERS OF ESCHEAT.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of the shorthand writers' notes of the proceedings before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Queen and Mercer, and of the judgment of the Court in that case. Also, copies of all correspondence in connection therewith, and a statement of the costs incurred by the Government in Canada and in England in connection therewith. Also, for a statement of any proceedings taken by the Government since Confederation, in the nature of inquisition or otherwise, in matters of escheat in any of the Provinces, giving the dates at which the Government first intervened in each of such matters; the nature of the intervention, and a statement of the action of the Government, with dates; and for copies of all petitions, correspondence, Orders in Council and papers connected with all applications to the Government as to escheated lands, since Confederation, not already brought down. He said: The first part of this motion is framed with a view to ascertaining the particulars with respect to this case of constitutional importance which has come before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and the latter part is inserted in consequence of a statement made some time ago, which I do not intend further to discuss now, but which I think will be sufficiently discussed when the return is brought down—from which it would appear, if my memory serves me, that during the early years after Confederation there were numerous proceedings on the subject of escheated lands taken by that Government, under the auspices of the hon. First Minister, who was then Attorney General, in which he claimed and asserted the authority of this Government to interfere with those lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

#### AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES.

Mr. GIGAULT (Translation) Moved that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the best means of encouraging and developing the agricultural industries of Canada, and to report thereon to this House; with power to send for persons, papers and records; the said Committee to consist of Messrs. Bain (Wentworth), Orton, Foster, Landry (Montmagny), Benoit, Fisher, Irvine McDougald and the mover.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will have no objection to indicate the precise object he proposes to accomplish by this Committee; whether it is in the direction of improving and developing the tariff, or in the way of protecting and developing the agricultural industries, or in some other way.

Mr. GIGAULT (Translation). My motion itself explains the object which I propose to attain. The Committee whose formation I now ask, will have occasion to study the operation of the various departments of agriculture in other countries, to enquire if the results accomplished by such departments have been satisfactory, and having completed these investigations they make such suggestions which may appear to them to be useful in the interest of the farming community, and with a view to pro-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

mote the improvement of agriculture in Canada. In Washington, the department was formerly organized on the same principle as ours; they simply dealt with the census and statistics, and it was not until after 1860 that it was thought expedient to make a change. A special Board of Agriculture was organized, a Commissioner was appointed, and from that time they commenced to distribute seeds imported from foreign countries. Works on the art of agriculture were also distributed, and the Commissioner on Agriculture, together with a great number of farmers, were perfectly enthusiastic in their appreciation of the usefulness and efficiency of the services rendered by the Department. Several new kinds of culture have been implanted in the United States, thanks to this organization, whose beneficial influence did a great deal towards improving the state of agriculture. A garden or experimental farm is also attached to the Department of Agriculture in Washington. These changes have wrought most satisfactory results, in the opinion of the officers of the Department and of a great number of persons. It will be the business of this Committee to enquire into the possibility, on the part of the Department of Agriculture in Ottawa, to adopt the system in part of the system followed in Washington. To improve the condition of those who till the land, it seems to me that it is impossible to make too many researches and enquiries, because our welfare and the future prospects of our commerce and industry both depend upon the increase of our agricultural production. Therefore, I hope that this House will favourably accept my motion and that the work of this Committee will be such as to promote the improvement of agriculture in our country.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I hope there will be no objection to adding the name of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Massue), President of the Agricultural Association of the Province of Quebec, to the Committee. I move that his name be added.

Mr. FOSTER. In seconding the motion of my hon. friend, I would only hope that the information which he has given has been satisfactory to the hon. gentleman who asked for it. Presuming that information has been sufficient, I shall not follow in the line of remarks made by my hon. friend, but shall trouble the House with only a very few words with reference to why I second this motion. It is not necessary to say that the agricultural interest is, if not the most important, among the most important interests of Canada. Not only is it a very important interest, but it is more nearly related in the way of supplying a stimulus to all the other great industries of Canada, than perhaps any other one we might mention. The Dominion of Canada has expended a great deal of money and a great deal of energy in developing these very great interests—the shipping interest, the interest of railways and canals, and the manufacturing interests of the country; and yet it is not too much to say that all these different interests have as their object, and look towards, the development of the agricultural interests of the country as a source of supply and feeder for the trade and traffic which shall pass over them and be carried by them. Although it cannot be denied that these different interests have an effect on the agricultural interests of the country, it is possible for a Government, and it is possible for our own Government more directly, to aid the development of our agricultural interests by the gathering and diffusing of certain information which can be gathered and diffused as well in no other way. Another consideration which leads me to favour the appointment of this Committee is this: We all know that the Dominion of Canada occupies a very different position to-day from the positions occupied by the different Provinces before the Union. Those Provinces had different interests, were under different commercial tariffs, had a certain trade rivalry with each other, and did not possess

that commercial standing in the markets of the world that they now possess after having been united in one Dominion. In addition, the Union has brought into play a keener competition. The United States have been spurred on to greater efforts to extend their trade and commerce in competition with the Dominion of Canada as a whole, than they were by any one or two of the Provinces taken separately. We find that the people of that country have taken very great pains to assist, by the collection and distribution of information, the agricultural development of the country. They have a well organized agricultural department, which has its various branches—agricultural, entomological, chemical, and others—each of which has its experts, whose knowledge and energy are devoted to the collection and dissemination of information in relation to those various branches. If, then, we are subjected to a keener competition with the United States as a Dominion than we were as several Provinces, it behoves us to do as much as we possibly can towards aiding our agricultural interests, by gathering and disseminating similar information. It must be borne in mind, also, that we possess singular facilities for carrying on this work. We have already a Department of Agriculture under the charge of a competent, able and practical Minister. We have all the methods for work organized and ready; and all that is necessary for us to do in order to arrive at what I am sure is the object of the mover of this resolution, is to have those methods brought into play for the collection of agricultural statistics, and for the dissemination of the information so collected for the benefit of our people. It may be said, Sir, that the agricultural interest, if left alone, can take care of itself. I do not believe, however, that such interests should be left to take care of themselves. The great difference between Governments at this age of the world's history, and Governments in former times, is that by the latter the great interests of the country were left to take care of themselves, while now they are not. Old Governments directed their attention chiefly to two objects—one to gather the taxes, and the other to carry on the wars. All the really great interests of the country were allowed to take care of themselves. Now-a-days, Governments take it as the rule of their conduct that all these interests should be gradually drawn within their purview, and should be assisted by all the talent and skill they demand for their fullest development. I think, therefore, that it cannot be urged, as a valid objection to this motion, that the agricultural interest can take care of itself. Neither do I think it fair to suggest that it should be left to Provincial supervision solely. In the first place, a great many of the Provinces do not possess Agricultural Bureaus. But even if all the Provinces had well organized Bureaus of Agriculture, yet we form a Dominion, and it would be highly desirable to get a view of the resources and capabilities of our country as a whole, and not simply of several Provinces in detail. It is from these considerations, Sir, that I am moved to support the motion of my hon. friend from Rouville; and I hope the Government will see fit to agree to it. I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Motion, as amended, adding the name of Mr. Massue, agreed to.

#### NORTH-WEST TERRITORIAL ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for copies of all Minutes or all Orders in Council, all resolutions or representations of the North-West Council sent to the Government of Canada, or the Minister of the Interior, on the subject of the administration of the affairs of the North-West Territories, and the complaints made by, and the grievances of, the inhabitants of such Territories; and all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the North-West Council, or the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, or any other person, on the same

subjects. He said: The North-West Council is composed of thirteen members—six nominees of the Crown, six representatives of the people, and the Lieutenant Governor; and this Council is invested with certain power and authority. It is said that these gentlemen are friends of the Government. I think there is no doubt but that three-fourths of the gentlemen, at all events, composing the North-West Council, are friends of the Government. Not long ago, the Council, after due deliberation, having sat in solemn conclave, passed certain resolutions, preferring certain charges or indictments against the Government with respect to the management of affairs in the North-West and the policy the Government have been pursuing in regard to the North-West. It is said the indictment contains sixteen distinct charges, every charge levelled against the Government. How far that is true or untrue, of course I do not know. I only know what has appeared in the newspapers. It is said in the newspapers that such an indictment has been preferred against, and transmitted to, the Government in Ottawa. I desire to know if such is the case; and, in common with the whole mass of the people, I desire to know distinctly the charges made by the North-West Council against their friends in Ottawa.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to bring down this indictment, or these indictments, which the hon. gentleman speaks of, and shall bring them down. The hon. gentleman says they have been preferred by friends of the Government. My hon. friend has no confidence in the Government, nor in those who have; and having no confidence in the friends of the Government, he cannot have much confidence in these complaints. No doubt, when these complaints are laid before the House, I shall have the support of my hon. friend against those attacks made on us by our own friends.

Motion agreed to.

#### LAND AND TOWN RESERVES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I make this motion more for the purpose of endeavouring to elicit from the Government a declaration of their policy with respect to the land and town reserves, than for the purpose of obtaining these returns, should they be very voluminous. The hon. First Minister knows that Moose Jaw, at all events, is not yet open for homestead or preemption. He may know that a large number of settlers from Ontario settled in Moose Jaw region, and, I believe, in the city or town reserve, before the railway was completed; that some of these people settled in good faith and have made valuable improvements; that owing to the lands not yet being open for homestead or preemption, these people are placed in a very difficult position. I know several young men from my own county—active, vigorous and intelligent—who went up two years ago for the purpose of settling in the North-West, and, having cast their eyes on the Moose Jaw district, settled down there in good faith, believing that their claims would be properly recognized, and that they would be dealt with in a liberal spirit. I know the cases of several young men whom I met while up there last fall, who have made valuable improvements on their property. One has fifty acres under cultivation, has built a valuable house, and has surrounded himself with all the comforts one could expect in a new region; but although he has been settled there two years, he has not yet been able to get his homestead or preemption. When I saw him, he consulted me, as an old friend of his father, as to whether it would not be advisable for him to give up all his improvements and leave the country altogether. I advised him strongly to remain, saying the Government could not fail to deal properly and fairly by him if his claim was represented to them. What I desire to know, as far as I can ascertain it from the hon. First

Minister, is how are men of that class to be dealt with? I saw, by an article in the *Mail*, which appeared shortly after the new regulations were issued, that it is the intention of the Government to charge \$5 an acre for the land in the town reserve. If this should be done, it will prove a great hardship and injustice to the early settlers, the pioneers, the men who went in there when there was not a soul in that section, and who have toiled there for a period of two years. If they will have to pay \$5 an acre, they are clearly in not as good a position as the men who went in at a more recent period. There was no idea in the minds of the young men of whom I have spoken that the Moose Jaw Creek was to be one of the termini of the Canadian Pacific Railway, nor could they have known that it was to be one of the Government towns, though any one with eyesight could see that Moose Jaw was destined ultimately to be of considerable importance. But, apart altogether from one's observations, there was no other information to lead these people to settle there, except that the country was good, that the land was good, and the situation was a favourable one. There was no railway, and the railway was not located there. These young men to whom I have referred were there in the month of April, 1882. Well, the railway was not located at Moose Jaw Creek, or at Thunder Creek, until away on in the fall of that year, in August or September of that year. When I was passing through that country in August, the railway was not then located across Thunder Creek. The surveyors were there, but it had not been finally located. These men from my county located there—some of them, I may tell the hon. gentleman, are friends of the Government, if that makes any difference in a matter of this kind, though I don't think it does—and have remained there since, and by my advice remain there still, in the hopes that a measure of justice will be dealt out to them; and that they will be able to make their entries for homestead and preemption within a very short period. I cannot understand why the Moose Jaw region should not have been opened for homestead and preemption long ago. It is said that there was some mistake in the surveys. That may be so, and that may have retarded it to some extent the right to get entry; but it should not have retarded it for a whole year. The Regina region has been opened for homestead some time ago; the Moose Jaw region is not yet opened for homestead and preemption, and these men are there in this uncertain and equivocal position. If the policy of the Government is to charge the people who have settled in good faith in the town reserve \$5 an acre, it is not a good policy. The railway passes to the north of the township on which Moose Jaw is located. If a man gets his land abutting on the railway for \$5 an acre, it is not fair to make a man five miles from the railway pay the same price for it. I cannot see the reason why those settlers who went in in good faith, and have made valuable improvements on their land, and built houses on their land, should not get their homestead entries as other people in Manitoba have got theirs, by paying a nominal fee, and should not get their preemption entries on the same terms as others. It may have been their fortune, it may have been their good fortune, to have got there in good time, but that is no reason why they should be cut out of that good fortune by the act or policy of the Government. I hope the hon. gentleman will see that the region of Moose Jaw is put in such a position that the settlers will be able to get their homesteads promptly before the spring opens for industrial pursuits, and upon the same terms as others who have gone up into the new region have been able to get their land. I move for this return, not, I say again, with a view to ask the Department to bring down voluminous returns, if they are voluminous, but rather with a view of letting the people in that section of the country know to some extent what course

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

the Government propose pursuing with respect to the land in the Moose Jaw region. I move for:

1. Copies of all Orders in Council or departmental orders, regulations and correspondence with the Land Commissioner or other Agents of the Government respecting the withdrawal from homestead and preemption of all lands in what is known as the Town Reserve at Regina, Moose Jaw, and other places in the North-West Territories on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and respecting the re-opening of said lands for homestead and preemption, and the terms and conditions on which so re-opened.
2. All Orders, regulations and correspondence as to the claim of settlers and squatters on such lands, the name of the claimant, the nature of his claim, and how disposed of, and what disposition was made of the land claimed.
3. All Orders in Council or departmental orders or regulations and correspondence respecting the sale by public auction or private sale of such lands, to whom, when, and for what price sold, and how paid or payable, the upset or fixed price for each section.
4. All regulations and decisions of the Department respecting the claims made by settlers or squatters on such lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. gentleman has explained what he wants under this motion. A return made in the terms of it would be, as the hon. gentleman will see, a very voluminous and expensive one, would take up a great deal of time, and perhaps defeat the object the hon. gentleman has in view; but I shall call the attention of the officers of the Department to the statement made by my hon. friend in the *Hansard*, and they will see exactly what he wants. I do not believe, in the first place, that any one person who has settled in any of these town sites or in the Mile Belt has been removed or evicted. The claims of every person there, will be examined and judged on their own merits. Of course it is a matter of no consequence to the Government or the Department of the Interior whether A or B gets any specified lot. If the party who settles there has a legal right, of course that legal right must be maintained. If any party has an equitable right—and I do not mean an equitable right in the technical sense, but a moral right, a right in justice—to hold this land, that right will be maintained. The Government policy was announced, and met the approval, I think, of the other side, that, while the homestead system was a beneficial one to settle the country, there was no ground for making a present of a town site to a person who happened to cross it, and that the Government should fairly get the profit of these town sites to meet the expenditure which Canada has made in that country. The claims of these parties will be fully considered and adjudged according to justice and according to equity. Of course there is an infinity of cases—the hon. gentleman has been in that country and he knows—there are an immense number of bogus claims, where persons who have gone on, looking around wherever they thought there would be a town site, or a water privilege, or a crossing, or a ford, or a trail, or any chance of a town, have made merely nominal settlements and set up claims. Well, these have got to be carefully considered. It is of very great importance that the *bona fide* settler, going in there with a real honest desire to become a settler, and settling down upon any one lot, and commencing to improve it, should get, and I think he deserves to get, every encouragement; and, if he happens to have the good luck to settle on a property which afterwards proves to be a valuable one, that is his good fortune. The Government, of course, do not grudge him that good fortune. But, if they find that a place that is really known to every one to be a town site is claimed by a party who goes there really to keep out the *bona fide* honest settler, that man must be dealt with accordingly. As regards the delays at Moose Jaw, I think the surveys were not finally approved—the hon. gentleman perhaps knows more about it than I do, as to when the survey was finally approved. It is of very great consequence that no settlement should be made under a survey until that survey is a legal one, because it is known to everyone

familiar with the old surveys in the Province of Ontario, what an immense amount of litigation and trouble and loss has been caused to various sections of the country by the existence of erroneous surveys, and by settlements under these erroneous surveys. The first thing is to have a correct survey, and then immediately afterwards, when the survey is approved, the patents should issue. I may say, Mr. Speaker, while I am on this subject, that the amended system of issuing patents which was introduced by the law of last year, has been perfectly successful. The previous process was a long, circuitous and expensive one—going from one Department to the other. Now, the Department has during the whole of this autumn been issuing patents at the rate of from 7 to 100 per day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman one or two questions if he would permit me. I am speaking under correction—I am not certain of the fact—It was stated to me, however, that a proclamation had been issued with reference to this same Mile Belt, stating that parties would be evicted from it some time ago. If I am correct, and that was actually done, I should like to know whether that proclamation has been also formally rescinded. The First Minister will understand the reasons why I ask, because, no doubt, although, as he has now explained, it is not, as I understand, the intention of the Department to evict any honest settlers, still, if I am rightly informed, it was claimed, or officially stated in some way, that all parties on the Mile Belt would be evicted at one time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no notice of the eviction, but there was a warning to the parties that the Mile Belt was reserved, and that they should not settle on it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They so construed it—I dare say they may have construed it wrongly. I would also like to ask whether he thinks these matters can be taken up within any reasonable time, and if so, what time? and who is specially charged with deciding those cases? Everything which lies along the Mile Belt, at any rate, is comparatively within easy access of the Commissioner, or his deputies. The hon. gentleman will understand it will be a matter of great importance to these people that they should know at an early moment what the policy is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That process is now going on and has been going on for some little time. All these matters are to be decided by the Land Boards—The Land Boards consisting of a commissioner and a surveyor, or inspector; Mr. Walsh and Mr. Pierce. These gentlemen are besides inspectors of homesteads, and travel, not only along the Mile Belt, but elsewhere, for the purpose of verifying the settlements of each person and seeing if they have really been residents for three years, and whether they have made such substantial improvements as to entitle them to their patents. The patents are now issuing very rapidly.

Motion agreed to.

#### SALES ON THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY BELT.

Mr. WRIGHT, in the absence of Mr. IVES, moved for a return showing the average price obtained by the Government (exclusive of town sites) for land sold within the limits of the Canadian Pacific Railway Belt.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to that motion, I understand that the great bulk of that land the hon. member refers to in his motion, is held for homestead and preemption. It would not be reasonable to take an average price on the whole acreage that has been disposed of by the Government under the homestead and preemption

system, and that which may have been actually sold by them during either period, while they were selling land in that quarter. The hon. gentleman stated, I think, the other day, that very few sales had been made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very few sales.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps it would not be much trouble, under those circumstances, to give the sales.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objections.

Motion agreed to.

#### SECTION B, CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. CASEY moved for copies of any agreement between the Government and the contractors for Section B, Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in regard to the transfer to the latter of the contract for said Section B, and of any Orders in Council giving effect to said agreement; also copy of report of the engineers appointed to re-measure the work on said contract previous to said transfer, and the report of the Engineer-in-Chief in regard thereto; also, copies of all correspondence and agreements with the said contractors in regard to measurement and classification of work on said contract; or to compensation for the transfer of said contract, or for the right to run the said portion of the railway during construction, and of all Orders in Council in relation to any of these matters; also for statement, in detail, with dates and amounts, of all payments made to said contractors or to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on account of the said contract. He said: The motion calls for some information suggested by the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways during the debate on the Supply for this item last Session. The hon. Minister then stated that that contract had been transferred from the original contractor to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—practically on the same terms—that a re-measurement had been made of the work, and a re-classification, as I understood. I suppose by this time the reports spoken of are made, and these arrangements must be concluded.

Motion agreed to.

#### FURTHER SUMS PAID TO CONTRACTORS FOR SECTION B.

Mr. CASEY moved for copies of estimates of further sums required to be paid to the contractors for Section B, Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on account of contract for construction, or of any subsequent agreement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was not present when the hon. gentleman moved the preceding resolution, or I would have stated to the House that I had already given instructions to have these papers prepared and laid on the Table.

Motion agreed to.

#### PULLMAN PALACE CARS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. WELDON, in moving for any correspondence, documents, contracts or agreements with the Pullman Palace Car Company in relation to the company's cars running over the Intercolonial Railway; also any contract or agreement with express companies as to conveyance of express matter over the said railway, said: I understand that the contract with the Pullman Palace Car Company will shortly expire, and I desire to know whether it is the intention of the Government to continue the agreement with that company or not. There are grave causes of complaint in regard to the manner in which passengers are treated on those cars. I can speak from my own experience. On one occasion I took a through passage in a Pullman car, and when we reached

Moncton I was told the car would go no further, and that I would have to go to Montreal to have the money refunded. A short time ago some passengers took passage on board one of these cars from St. John to Quebec. An accident occurred to that car, and they were refused accommodation in the other Pullman unless they again paid the full fare. These cars are, no doubt, outside the control of the Department; but I think in making any further arrangements some control over them should be given to the Department of Railways, so that improved accommodation and better attention may be paid to passengers. The same remark applies to express companies. If a company has a monopoly of the carrying of express matter over the Intercolonial Railway, the Government should have some control over the tariff of rates, because complaints have been made in regard to irregular charges imposed on such express matter. I, therefore, make this motion with a view to call the hon. Minister's attention to the subject.

Motion agreed to.

#### MAIL CONVEYANCE IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. GILLMOR, in moving for any correspondence, memorial or other documents from the Board of Trade in the city of St. John or other parties, in relation to the conveyance of mails on the night train on the St. John and Maine Railway to St. Stephen and Woodstock; also, as to conveyance of mails over the Grand Southern Railway to St. George, said: I make this motion in order to bring before the notice of the Postmaster General the inconvenience which arises from the mode in which the mails are carried through a part of St. John county and Charlotte county. The Postmaster General is, no doubt, aware that the Grand Southern Railway runs from St. John to St. Stephen, in the county of Charlotte, a distance of eighty miles, and that this railway passes through several centres of population in both counties. The Postmaster General will perceive the inconvenience occasioned when I state the manner in which the mails are carried. The mail leaves St. John for St. George by stage at 8 a.m., arriving in St. George at 6 or 7 p.m., if the weather is fine. If the mails were sent by railway they would leave at the same hour, 8 a.m., and arrive at 11 a.m., being three hours instead of ten or twelve hours. So with respect to the correspondence of commercial men, which is very important, with another commercial centre, St. Stephen. The mails now leave St. George, go to St. Andrews, twenty miles distant, lie over at night and arrive at St. Stephen next day at 8 or 10 a.m. If they were sent by train, they would go to St. Stephen in an hour and a-half, instead of from twenty to twenty-four hours. The mails from St. Stephen to St. George leave St. Stephen at 2 p.m., go to St. Andrew, remain all night, and arrive the next day at 9 or 10 o'clock. If sent by railway they would reach St. George in an hour and a-half. The mails leave St. George for St. John at 8 a.m., and arrive there at 6 p.m. If sent by train they would leave St. George at 11 a.m., and arrive at St. John at 1 p.m., being two hours on the way, instead of ten hours. I am sure the Postmaster General, when he looks into the matter, will see that he will confer a great favour on a large population in both counties by having the mails carried by railway instead of by stage. I do not think the cost will be much increased to the Department, while at the same time the public would be accommodated. The railway could accommodate some dozen offices right along the line—St. John, Spruce Lake, Prince of Wales, Musquash, Leanprean, Pennfield, St. George, Upper Mills, Dyers, Dumbarton, Oakbury and St. Stephen. The mails by stage to Dyers, Dumbarton, Upper Mills and Pennfield, which involve considerable expense to the Department, could then be dispensed with. This change would be a great convenience to merchants who get supplies at St. Stephen and St. John,

Mr. WELDON.

and even now the railway is utilized for the sending of letters by parties who desire to get freight the next morning. I am quite satisfied that if the Postmaster General will look into the matter, he will find that the carriage of the mails by railway will be in the public interest, and will afford improved accommodation to a large population, and that, practically, without additional cost. I am confident the hon. gentleman will consider the subject, and I hope he will see that it will be in the interest of the public generally to make the arrangement I have suggested.

Mr. WELDON. I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the carriage of mails to Woodstock and St. Stephen by the St. John and Maine Railway. There is at present only a day mail, and yet there is a night train. I understood there was an arrangement to carry a night mail. This is a very important matter to those corresponding with people on the upper part of the river. I also direct the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that complaints are made that while there is a railway running into Richibucto, the mails are carried by stage. At this season of the year particularly, the mails are very irregular and much time is wasted on account of the roads being blocked. I submit that the mails on that section should be carried by the branch railway running from the Intercolonial into Richibucto.

Mr. CARLING. Arrangements have already been made to carry mails on the night train from St. John to St. Stephen and Woodstock. With regard to the mail on the Grand Southern Railway to St. George, an officer of the Department is now making an enquiry and will shortly make a report.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Return showing the total number of acres of public lands entered as homesteads during the year 1883. The number of such entries, and the number of entries cancelled during the same period, with the total number of acres covered by such cancelled entries. Also, a return showing the number of preemption entries in the year 1883, and the total number of acres covered by such entries.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing the number of acres of public lands surveyed in Manitoba and the North-West Territory, in the year 1883, and the cost per acre of such survey.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing the total number of acres of public lands sold in the year 1883, the average price per acre received and the total amount received from such sales. Also, a return showing the number of applications under colonization plans numbers one and two, under regulations of December 23, 1881, the number of acres granted under each application, the amount received under each application, the total number of applications granted, the total number of acres granted, and the total amount received.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all regulations or orders issued by the Department of the Interior concerning the sale or management of agricultural lands, timber lands, pasture lands, mineral lands and town sites, not covered by the order of last Session.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing: 1st. The total number of timber licenses or permits applied for and granted or refused, since 1st February, 1883; the estimated area covered by each license or application, and the total number of square miles estimated to be covered by the timber licenses issued during the period named. 2nd. The amount of bonuses or premiums per square mile, and on the aggregate paid to and received by the Government on each such license, and the total amount of bonuses or premiums received. 3rd.

The name and residence of each applicant for a license. 4th. The date of application for each license and the number of years each license is granted for. 5th. The Crown dues or stumpage charged or chargeable on each license, and the kind and estimated quantity and quality of timber on each area so licensed. 6th. Whether in each case, where a license or permit was granted, the berth was put up at public auction after public notice inviting tenders was given, and was sold to the highest bidder, or whether granted upon application or tender from the grantee, without inviting public competition. 7th. Copies of all claims made on the Government for any such area or timber by any persons, and all petitions, remonstrances, or communications sent or made to the Government respecting such areas, licenses or timber, and all correspondence had with the Government respecting such claims, or in any way respecting such areas, lands, licenses or timber, and the action of the Government therein; also, a copy of all maps and plans showing the location or areas of such licenses or permits.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Government of Quebec, in relation to the claims of the Province of Quebec against the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Coursol.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, despatches, correspondence and telegrams relating to the negotiations between Canada and British Columbia, not already brought down; and for a statement of the estimated net cost to Canada of the dry dock in British Columbia.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of the statements rendered to the authorities of Ontario and Quebec as to their accounts with Canada, and all Orders in Council and correspondence in connection therewith.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all letters, correspondence, reports, memoranda, Orders in Council and other documents not laid on the Table respecting the guarantee for the Canada Pacific Railway Company; and respecting any proposed modification of that arrangement; and any proposed further concession to the company; and of all papers relating to the postal subsidies and remuneration for transport services of the railway.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies: 1. Of the oath or oaths required to be taken by Governors General of Canada, and taken by them before entering upon the exercise of their office as Governor. 2. Of the oath or oaths required to be taken by Lieutenant Governors of the Province of Quebec, and taken by them before entering upon the discharge of their duties as such.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)

Return of casualties to trains on the Intercolonial Railway arising from collision, broken rails, or otherwise, from March 1st, 1883, to January 1st, 1884; the respective causes and dates; the amount of damage (if any) in each case to property; the amount of compensation paid to owners of property destroyed or damaged, as well as amount of claims for loss or damage to property (if any) unsettled.—(Mr. We'don.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, regulations and correspondence, with the agents of the Department, respecting the withdrawal from homestead and preemption of the lands south of the Canadian Pacific Railway. 2. All Orders in Council, regulations and correspondence, as to the claims of settlers or squatters on such lands. 3. All Orders, regulations and correspondence respecting the sales of such lands by auction, the quantity so sold, the terms on which sold and the price per acre obtained therefor. 4. All sales effected by private sale up to the 1st January, 1884, the conditions of sales, the price obtained. 5. All Orders in Council or Departmental orders, regulations and correspondence respecting the re opening of said lands for homestead and preemption.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Copies: 1. Of all Orders in Council, or departmental orders and correspondence with the Land

Commissioner at Winnipeg or other Land Agent respecting the withdrawal of lands in the Mile Belt from homestead and preemption, and respecting the opening of said lands for homestead and preemption. 2. All orders, regulations and correspondence as to the claims of settlers and squatters on such lands; the name of the claimant, the nature of the claim and how disposed of, and what disposition was made of the land claimed. 3. All Orders in Council or Departmental orders or regulations and correspondence respecting the sale by public auction or private sale of such lands; the quantity of such lands sold; to whom, when, and for what price, and how paid or payable. 4. All regulations and decisions of the Department respecting the claims made by settlers or squatters on such land.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 5:15 o'clock, p. m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 31st January, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY TARIFF OF RATES.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether any tariff of rates to be charged on any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been proposed by the company since that laid before the House last Session; and if so, when? Whether any tariff has since that so laid before the House been approved by the Government; and if so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have been requested by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Railways, to say that no tariff of rates has been proposed by the company since the tariff that was laid before the House.

### AMHERSTBURG PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Has the Government let the contract for the erection of public buildings at Amherstburg? If so, were tenders for the work invited? Who were the tenderers and what was the amount of each tender? Whose tender was accepted? What is the price to be paid for the work? Has the successful tenderer given security for the performance of the work? If so, what is the name of his surety and the amount of the liability?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract for the erection of public buildings at Amherstburg has been let. Tenders were invited for that work; five tenders were received. The names of the tenderers are: Patrick Navin, Wm. Toms, J. E. Askwith, C. J. O'Doherty, and Henry Lindock. The amount of each tender is as follows, in the same order in which I have read the names: The lowest, \$17,909; the next lowest, \$18,790; the next, \$20,000; the next, \$22,973; and the highest, \$25,000. The tender which was accepted was that of Patrick Navin, of Amherstburg, Ontario, for \$17,909, that tender being the lowest. The price to be paid for the work is the price mentioned. The successful tenderer has given the security required. He has deposited a certified and accepted cheque, amounting to five per cent. of the amount of his tender.

### CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Criminal Law, and to

extend the provisions of the Act respecting Offences against the Person, said: I propose to move the second reading now, for this reason—this is precisely the same Bill that was up last Session and the Session before. On both occasions the First Minister gave his assent to the principle of the Bill, so that I propose to take the second reading to-day, and leave it for Committee of the Whole at a subsequent day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I thought my colleague, the First Minister, would have been here, and I know that he wished to ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to postpone the second reading of the Bill to another day, Monday or Wednesday, as he thought proper, in order that the First Minister might have the opportunity of seeing the Minister of Justice in relation to the Bill. It may be the same Bill, nevertheless I know the First Minister wishes that, and I hope the hon. gentleman will consent to postpone the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON. Of course I have no objection; but the Minister of Justice himself in the Senate last Session assented to the principle of the Bill.

Order allowed to stand.

#### FRAUD IN RELATION TO PUBLIC CONTRACTS.

On the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 12) to amend the Act for the prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys, being read,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) said: That Bill stands in my name. I approve of the principle of the Bill, but it is not my Bill. It should be changed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; it is Mr. Casgrain's Bill.

Mr. CAMERON. I moved the first reading in Mr. Casgrain's absence.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. gentleman moved the introduction of the Bill, it must stand in his name.

Mr. CAMERON. I stated to the House that I was only doing it in the absence of Mr. Casgrain.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman moved the introduction of the Bill. Mr. Casgrain has not been in his place since then, and it could not be put in the name of an absent member.

Mr. CAMERON. Cannot it be put in the name of Mr. Casgrain now?

Mr. SPEAKER. He is not here.

Mr. CAMERON. Let it stand.

Order allowed to stand.

#### INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES EXHIBITION.

Mr. FORTIN, in moving for copies of the reports on the London International Fisheries Exhibition by the Commissioners of Canada who attended the said exhibition; with a list of the exhibits from Canada and the prizes obtained at said exhibition, and for all papers or correspondence relating to the said exhibition, said: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I should like to address some remarks to this House. The London International Fisheries Exhibition may be said to have been worthy of the great nation which organized it, worthy of the nations which sent exhibits to it, and worthy of the object for which it was got up, which was to put in a central place, where they could be seen and studied by persons who are in the fishing business, and by commissioners and representatives of different Governments, articles of all kinds relating to the fisheries, relating to the preparation of fish, and all that

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

with a view to advance the fishing interest, or, in other words, to render fishing prosperous and abundant, and to improve the preparation of fish. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the fishing industry cannot be overrated, and, in a country like Canada, where the agricultural element predominates, and will always predominate, I think it is not useless to make known the opinions of great thinkers and writers on the subject; and the following words of one of the greatest men of the age, Mr. Lacépède, I hope will not be found out of place here:

"The prosecution of fishing," said Lacépède, "preceded the culture of the fields. It is contemporary with hunting, but there is this difference between hunting and fishing, that the latter is natural to a civilized people, and that, far from being opposed to the progress of agriculture and of commerce, it assisted in multiplying their happy results. If, during the infancy of society, the prosecution of fishing furnished to a half-civilized people a means of subsistence at once sufficient and nourishing, if it accustomed them not to dread the dangers of the sea, if it made them sailors, it gives to a cultivated nation abundant homes for the poor, various tributes for the luxurious livers, preparations for the necessities of distant commerce, rich manures for less fertile lands; it leads men to cross the seas, to brave the ices of the Poles, and bear the fires of the Equator, to battle with tempests, it launches on the seas forests of masts, experienced mariners, foreign trading, and intrepid genius."

I will also read a citation from P. L. Simmond, of London, also a great writer. He says:

"It is not our purpose to speak of the inhabitants of the ocean generally, but only to restrict ourselves to the investigation of those which are of some use to man. Pliny enumerated ninety-four species of fish. Linnaeus increased the number to 478; but recent naturalists have described over 13,000 species, one-tenth of which confine themselves to the fresh waters. The human race derives almost incalculable benefits from them as is evidenced by the extent and value of the river, coast, and sea fisheries of the world."

And, Sir, may we not hope that at present, in this House and in the country, there is a proper appreciation of the value of the fisheries of Canada and of the trade to which they give rise? According to all accounts this London International Fisheries Exhibition was a great success, and we Canadians should be proud to know that Canada figured there with such preeminent honour. Thanks to our Government, thanks to the hon. Minister of Marine, and to the Commissioners who were sent there, the exhibits from Canada were numerous and very interesting, and enabled us to show the variety and quality of the fish we possess. We showed how the fisheries are carried on in this country, and we showed how we prepare fish for home consumption and for exportation. We also showed the world the extent of our trade, and our processes of preparing fish, and we know that many visitors at that exhibition made enquiries as to our method of preparing fish, and especially in reference to our pickled fish. But I wish to say that one of the principal objects of this fishery exhibition is to enable persons engaged in the fishing business to study it in all its details, to observe the exhibits of other countries, and to discover what individuals and what nations practise the best mode of fishing and the best mode of preparing fish, so that our merchants and our fishermen might adopt all the improvements that have been made, in so far as the circumstances of the country would allow. But in order that we might benefit by this great show, our Government should place within reach of our fishermen, and fish merchants, and of the public in general, all the information that could be gathered at that show by the hon. Minister himself, and by the Commissioners who were sent there, and that is the reason why I make this motion. To oversee the Canadian exhibit the Government appointed three Commissioners—one, Mr. Honeyman, a well known scientific man, who was to conduct the scientific part of our exhibition; Mr. Wilmot, who was entrusted with the part relating to pisciculture, and to river and lake fisheries; and Mr. Joncas, who was commissioned to look after the maritime fisheries, their organization, and the trade to which they might give rise, &c. I must not omit one fact, which is very creditable to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. While at

London he contributed to the organization of conferences, which were given in the hall of the great exhibition, on subjects relating to fisheries and the fish trade of the world. On the 2nd of July he presided at one of those confederate conferences, and I will read the following extract of a report thereof published in the London *Canadian Gazette* of the 5th July:—

"At a conference held on Monday, the 2nd July, at the Fisheries Exhibition, under the presidency of the Hon. A. W. McLelan, Minister of Marine and Fisheries of Canada, a remarkably comprehensive and interesting paper upon the various fisheries of British North America was then read by Mr. L. Z. Joncas, one of the Canadian Commissioners at the exhibition.

"The subject is a large one, but Mr. Joncas' practical knowledge of it enabled him to do justice to all of its branches, and he concentrated in his paper much information of great value upon all sections of the trade."

I hold in my hand a copy of this conference, which is well worth reading by all Canadians. I do not think I should do justice to the hon. Minister if I did not read to the House some of his remarks at that conference. He said:

"In commencing the proceedings, the chairman said Canada was comparatively a young country, and might not be supposed to be as much interested in fisheries as some of the older countries; and some persons who had heard of Canada, and the extent of the country, and the diversity of employments, would wonder why, with so sparse a population, there were any fisheries or fishermen to speak of, when fishing, as had been already shown, was so much more dangerous and involved so much greater risk to human life than any other occupation. It was true that they have a large extent of country, and there was employment for all those who were there, and for all the millions who might come upon the land, but it was also true that, although they had mining industries, and although in the North there were vast forests from which lumber was sent to various parts of the world. Although it was true that only a small portion of the soil was cultivated, yet it yielded abundance of the choicest food in its harvests, and flocks and herds for all the people of Canada, and a large surplus to export; and the men who lived by the sea side, and on the banks of the rivers, and by the lakes, found so great a temptation to engage in fishing that they could not withstand it. He believed they had as large a proportion of their people engaged in that occupation as any other country in the world. In the British Isles where population was teeming, and every pursuit was crowded by people desiring to work that they might have bread, a large number were engaged in fisheries, but yet in Canada with their sparse population there were four times the percentage engaged in fisheries as were found here in the British Isles."

Those are the patriotic words of our hon. Minister at that great exhibition, where Canada figured with such high honour. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I ought to say also that this great London Fishery Exhibition was not the first exhibition of the kind. There was one held at Havre in 1868, which lasted six months, and which was patronized by the French Government. All civilized nations sent exhibits to this great exhibition with the exception, I am sorry to say, of Canada, which took no interest in it. The only Canadian who sent exhibits there was the hon. member for Montmorency, hon. Mr. Valin, who, of course, sent models of vessels, as that hon. gentleman is a shipbuilder and shipowner. Well, I attended that exhibition myself, where I learned a great deal; and I must say that it was there I learned for the first time of the extent and importance of the Norwegian fisheries, and of the extent and importance of the competition they were making to us in foreign markets where we send our fish; a competition that has increased even to this day, and that is threatening our foreign trade. I hope that the hon. Minister and the Commissioners who have reported will treat that question and other similar questions, especially the trade question, so that our merchants may be able to export to foreign countries and carry on a trade which will be profitable to them and profitable also to the fishermen. I think I have touched on every topic relating to that great exhibition, and in conclusion, I hope the Government will give to the House and the public copies of the report.

Mr. KAULBACH. For the information of this House, the country and myself—I representing the largest fishing constituency in the Dominion—I am desirous of seeing all

papers in connection with the great International Fisheries Exhibition, held in London in July last, laid on the Table of this House, as I believe an invaluable amount of very serviceable information can be obtained from them. Little comparatively has been known to the world, up to the time of holding this exhibition, of the value and extent of the fisheries of Canada, and of the class of men who prosecute this industry. Happily can I state that in no part of the world is there to be found a class of men more zealous, persevering and courageous, than the fishermen of Canada. Men of undaunted courage, ready to buffet storms, suffer privations and face all difficulties. And whilst referring with pleasure to the fishermen of Canada, I can with equal delight and pride refer to our fishing fleet—a class of vessels unrivalled in style of architecture and beauty, presenting in fact at a distance the appearance of American pleasure yachts rather than vessels for profitable service, ranging in size from 60 to 120 tons, with all comforts on board pertaining to health that are required. One grand feature that I must not omit to mention is that the fishermen not only sail these vessels during the fishing season, but they assist during the winter months in the construction of them, thus enabling them to have an idea of, and a supervision over, the entire work, and a confidence that they need fear no difficulties as to their safety in the event of a storm. Our fleet in the Port of Lunenburg has grown so enormous within the last few years, that I was compelled last autumn, through the want of harbour accommodation, to ask for the use of a dredge to deepen its waters, which is now doing the work, and I hope it may remain till it is completed. The encouragement given by the Government to the ship building industry, and more particularly to this class of shipping, is invaluable not only to ship-builders, but to lumbermen, farmers, fishermen, traders and mechanics; and I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will see the necessity of allowing the dredge to remain for the purpose mentioned, otherwise we will have to lessen or stop altogether the building of this class of vessels for the want of harbour room. The Canadians have made rapid strides during the past few years in building up our commercial greatness, we ranking at present fourth amongst the maritime nations of the world; and to whom is due in a great measure the praise? To our Canadian fishermen. Review the history of England and enquire the cause of her greatness, and we will find that the source of her unrivalled success is her commerce, and the basis of this success, the fisheries. Then, England owes her present naval greatness to her hardy fishermen employed in her fisheries. We have in this country 60,000 hardy men (one half of whom are Nova Scotians) who devote their time and their labour to the development of our fisheries, and as a result of their labours, spend millions of dollars of their hard earnings annually in our midst—a medium of ready cash—building up our merchant marine, and advancing our trade. Then we may reasonably look to the fisheries as the cradle for our future commercial strength. While speaking on the fishing and shipping industries, I would refer to a matter which would tend very much to the interests of the fishermen, and that is the opening up of a reciprocal trade between this country and the Brazils and West Indies—a matter which has been long talked of, and which, if carried out, would give a larger price to the fishermen for their fish, and a reduction in the price of sugar, molasses, &c. I have made some remarks on the same subject on a previous occasion, and I hope and trust that the Government will take such measures as will bring about its accomplishment. Canada took a deep interest in this exhibition and feels satisfied that owing to the active efforts put forth by this Government in sending the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. McLelan) to advance our ends, and whose services were invaluable, she is better known this day to the world than she ever

was before, and the people will be glad to obtain an amount of knowledge in fishing matters from the exhibition papers to be brought down, which will probably be of great value to the fishermen of this country in developing this great industry.

Mr. McLELAN. The papers called for by the motion of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) will be brought down at as early a date as possible. I may state that owing to the ill health of the chairman of the Commission he has been unable to complete his portion of the report, and some time may elapse before it will be handed in. It is very gratifying indeed to me to know that the exhibition which Canada made has been satisfactory to her people, and especially to those who had opportunities of seeing the specimens that were prepared and sent to the exhibition. We had very grave doubts, on undertaking the work, as to whether it would prove successful. The mover of the resolution has referred to other exhibitions, but in those Canada did not take part; and we felt we were at a disadvantage with the United States, England, and many other countries as they had large quantities of exhibits on hand from old exhibitions which needed only to be added to in order to make large and beautiful collections, while our time would be occupied in getting up an entirely new collection. Our efforts were mainly directed to making an exhibition of the food fishes of the Dominion, of which we have a great abundance and variety. I am happy to say that we presented a collection of food fishes which has not been excelled in the world, and obtained for that collection the highest prize given, and it was stated that if any higher prize could be given we were entitled to receive it for that collection. We were enabled to make this display by the labours of the various officers of the Department in different portions of the Dominion, and we had also the aid of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution (Mr. Fortin) in collecting some of the commercial fishes of the gulf, and the fishes thus collected under his guidance obtained the gold medal and first prize. I was sorry that we could not have had the hon. gentleman's services to a further extent, as one of the honorary Commissioners, as I know that his attention has been much given to matters of that kind. I think he would have found that we had not a very great deal to learn at that gathering, for in my opinion and in the opinion of others who were connected with the exhibition, we are fully up to the rest of the world and up to the time. The papers will be brought down at as early a day as possible, though perhaps not so soon as the hon. gentleman might desire on account of the illness of the chairman.

Motion agreed to.

#### EXTRA CLERKS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. LISTER moved for a statement giving the names of all persons in the Public Works Department, as extra or copying clerks, whose salaries are or have been charged to particular works, since 1881.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to this motion. The return to this Address will be brought down at the same time as a return which is being prepared in reply to an Address moved for by the leader of the Opposition, and another moved immediately after. The answers to the three are all on the same subject and will be given at the same time.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE PROPOSED FACTORY BILL.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all representations by and correspondence with the Manufacturers' Association, or the Trades and Labour Council, or any one on their behalf, or any other individuals or organizations on the

Mr. KAULBACH.

subject of the provisions of the proposed Factory Bill, said: I observe from the reports of a late meeting of the Manufacturers' Association that there had been some correspondence with the hon. gentleman on the subject of the Factory Bill before or during the last Session of Parliament. I also observe from the reports of the Trades and Labour Council that there had been a communication by that body on the same subject. For these reasons I make the motion.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think there was a communication from the first named association during last Session, either in writing or by a representative from the Association—I am not quite sure which, but I think in the latter way, but if so we have a memorandum or statement of the subject. About ten days or a fortnight since the members of the Trades and Labour Council asked me for copies of the Bill, but I have had no communication from them since. If I should receive any within the next few days I will bring it down with the representations from the Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. BLAKE. I know there was a communication either oral or written from the other organization last Session, because one of the gentlemen was good enough to call on me at the same time.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I recollect their calling at my house—I was ill at the time—and I think they had verbal communication with me but none in writing.

Motion agreed to.

#### DUTY ON FREIGHT CHARGES.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of all Orders in Council, departmental regulations, circulars and correspondence with reference to the question of duty on freight charges.

Mr. BOWELL. Would the hon. gentleman state for what period he would like this correspondence, because I can assure him there is a very large quantity of it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will understand that I do not ask for correspondence with reference to isolated or individual cases of duty on freight charges. The hon. gentleman knows, however, that a difficulty has been raised—a circular has been issued from the Department on the general question. There were representations made, I think, by the Toronto Board of Trade, or by some one on their behalf, with reference to circulars which have been issued from the Department, or instructions understood to be conveyed different from those which the collectors at the different ports were subsequently told to act upon. The hon. gentleman, I think, had the pleasure of passing an afternoon with the Board of Trade of Toronto, and this was amongst the subjects discussed.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's motion is certainly much wider than his interpretation of it. I am very much afraid that had I brought down simply the circular issued by the Government, without accompanying it with the correspondence, he would have called me to account. I have had correspondence during the last three years, with Manchester, Liverpool, Montreal, and every port in the Dominion with reference to this matter. If the hon. gentleman will define what he wants, I shall be glad to lay it before him.

Mr. BLAKE. I endeavoured to explain that I was not anxious that the hon. Minister should bring down letters or complaints of particular grievances relating to duty on freight charges, but such correspondence as would elucidate the general principle on which the Department was acting. I presume that some of the correspondence the hon. gentleman has referred to might be important as elucidating that. But it is not a question as to the quantity in any particular case or package of goods, but rather as to the principle

pursued in reference to those clauses in the laws which deal with the subject of freight charges.

Mr. BOWELL. I will endeavour to bring down such information as is indicated by the hon. leader of the Opposition; but almost all the correspondence, whether from individual importers, or importers collectively, or Boards of Trade, has treated on this question. I will include the memorial presented to the Government from the Board of Trade, if the hon. gentleman desires; but that has more particular reference, I can assure him, to modifications in the Tariff and to changes in some clauses of the Customs Act, than to this particular question. I will, however, bring down the circulars, together with the reasons why they were issued.

Motion agreed to.

#### EXPENDITURE FOR SESSIONAL RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for a statement of the sum expended in each year, since the change of the system, by each Department, out of the lump vote for sessional returns, such statement to be under the same sub-headings under which previous to the change such cost was included, said: It would be convenient, I think the House will agree, for the purpose of comparison with former years, that the charges for preparation of sessional returns should not appear in such a form as to make the comparison inaccurate. For a great many years—I think until two years ago—the mode was to charge each Department with the cost of preparing sessional returns therein; but after that it was charged in a lump sum. The object of this motion is to obtain a statement, under sub-headings, of the expenditure in each Department.

Motion agreed to.

#### COST OF HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for a statement for each year, since the change in the system, of the cost connected with the heating of public buildings (including wages as well as fuel) now paid under a lump vote, such statement to show the cost under the same sub-headings as those in which it was formerly included in the Public Accounts before the change of the system, said: This motion is for the same purpose, and I think there is reason to justify it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The change in the system was only, I think, for the present year, and that is most likely the reason why the statement which the hon. gentleman wishes has not been laid before the House; but certainly the intention is that such a statement should appear every year in the Report of the Minister of Public Works. Still, the motion may pass, and any information I can give up to this period will be brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the change in the system has been gradual. I think the hon. gentleman the Session before last had charge of the fuel, and last Session he took charge of the engineers. He is progressive, but he progresses by degrees, according to my memory.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, it is a good thing to progress, even by degrees. But I think my hon. friend is mistaken. The engineers were, to a great extent, in my Department, and were appointed by my recommendation; but with reference to the fuel, the change only took place since last Session.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Return giving the name of the person or persons who offered to sell lands at Amherstburg to the Government for Custom House and Post Office Buildings, the quantity of land offered and price asked by each. The name or names of the person or persons from whom the Government bought, the quantity of land bought and price paid.—(Mr. Lister.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Superintendent of Indian Affairs in British Columbia, or any other person, and the Dominion Government, respecting the recent troubles with the Indians at Metlakatla.—(Mr. Shakespeare.)

Copies of all correspondence and agreements between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on the subject of immigration to Manitoba and the North-West, together with a statement showing the amount expended by the company in promoting such immigration, giving amounts paid, with dates, to whom paid, and nature of service rendered; also, estimate of the company of number of persons from foreign countries who have actually settled there in each year since date of charter.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

#### MONTREAL CARNIVAL.

Mr. GAULT. Is it the intention to adjourn for two or three days during next week to enable us to attend the carnival in Montreal? I know many hon. members whose intention it is to be present at the carnival, and as in England the custom is to adjourn for the Derby, I do not see why the House should not adjourn for the carnival.

Motion agreed to; and (at 4:25 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 1st February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Halifax Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Canada Temperance and General Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Middlesex.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 30) to extend to the Dominion of Canada the powers of the corporation called De Nederlandsch-Americaansche Land Maatschappij (The Netherlands-American Land Company).—(Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 32) to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Pictou Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(Mr. McDougald.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Provincial Bank.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

THE NORTH-WEST COAL AND NAVIGATION COMPANY (LIMITED.)

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 33) empowering the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (limited) to construct and operate a railway from Medicine Hat.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says to construct and operate a railway from Medicine Hat. May I ask the hon. gentleman where to?

Mr. CAMERON. To a point named in the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All around the hat.

Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Tuesday next, to take into consideration that portion of the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the present Session, in which His Excellency informs us that His Government has thought it of the greatest importance, for the settlement of the North-West and the development of our trade, that the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from sea to sea should be hastened, and the Company enabled to open the line throughout by the spring of 1886; that with this view, and in order to aid the Company in procuring sufficient capital for the purpose by the disposal of its unsold shares, the Government agreed to receive a deposit of money and securities sufficient to pay a minimum 3 per cent. dividend for ten years on sixty-five millions of the stock, that arrangement being made in the belief that it would give steadiness and increased value to the shares on the market; that a combination of unfavourable circumstances has prevented the fulfilment of these expectations, and the Company has not been able to obtain the required capital by a sale of its stock; and that the best means of preventing any delay in the great object of the early completion of the railway demands our earnest consideration: And to consider the following Resolutions:—

1. That the Government may return to the Company the securities now held under the third section of the Act 44 Victoria, Chapter 1, intitled: "An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway," and under the second section of the construction contract referred to in the said Act.

2. That the money subsidy hereafter payable to the Company, may be paid as the work on either the Central or Eastern Section of the railway proceeds, in the proportion which the value of the work done on such section, and for which payment is demanded, bears to the value of the whole work now remaining to be done, under the contract, on such section.

3. That the time for the payment by the Company of the sum of two million eight hundred and fifty-three thousand nine hundred and twelve dollars (\$2,853,912) agreed by the said Company to be paid on or before the 1st day of February, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-four (1884) as part of the fund referred to in their agreement with the Government of the 7th day of November last, shall be extended to the 7th day of November, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight (1888), when the sum of four million five hundred and twenty-seven thousand dollars (\$4,527,000) being the last instalment of the said fund payable by the Company to the Government will fall due, the whole with interest payable half yearly at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum as agreed upon at the time of the execution of the said agreement, and that the same shall then be paid to the Government, together with the said last mentioned amount; forming together the sum of seven million three hundred and eighty thousand nine hundred and twelve dollars (\$7,380,912), bearing interest at the said last mentioned rate until paid.

4. That the Government may, out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, make a loan to the said Company of an amount in money, not exceeding twenty-two million five hundred thousand dollars (\$22,500,000) to be repaid to the Government on or before the 1st day of May, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-one (1891), with interest at the rate of 5 per centum per annum, payable half yearly, until full payment of the principal; and that as part of the said loan the Government may pay to the Company forthwith, such amount not exceeding seven million five hundred thousand dollars (\$7,500,000), as shall be required by the Company to extinguish its present floating debt, the amount of such debt to be established to the satisfaction of the Government: and that the remainder of the said loan shall be paid to the Company as the work

of construction proceeds, in the same proportion as that which is hereby provided for the payment of the balance of the money subsidy.

5. That as security for the repayment of the said loan, with interest as aforesaid, and as additional security for the payment of the said sum of seven million three hundred and eighty thousand nine hundred and twelve dollars (\$7,380,912) and interest, falling due on the 7th day of November, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight (1888), the Government shall have a first lien and charge upon the entire property of the Company, real and personal, now owned or hereafter to be acquired or owned by them, including their main line of Railway, the extensions thereof, their branch lines of railway, the whole of their equipment, rolling stock and plant, and including all steamers and vessels; and also upon the land grant of the Company, earned and to be hereafter earned; saving always, however, the rights of the holders of the existing mortgages on the extensions of the line of the railway from Callander to Brockville and Montreal, as security for the unpaid balances of the purchase money of the lines constituting the said extensions; and subject to the mortgage upon the land grant, executed by the Company to secure their issue of land grant bonds. That the Government shall continue to hold and retain the entire amount of land grant bonds now in its custody or possession, subject to redemption under the terms of the said land grant mortgage, and with all remedies as to interest, voting power and all other matters in respect thereof, which would be held or possessed, or could be exercised by any purchaser of the said bonds: That all moneys received by the Government from the Trustees of the land grant bonds in redemption of such bonds shall be applied as follows, that is to say: All moneys so received in respect of ten million dollars of the said bonds shall be applied: Firstly, in extinction of the interest accrued and due upon the said loan, and upon the said sum of seven million three hundred and eighty thousand nine hundred and twelve dollars (\$7,380,912); Secondly, on account of the capital of the said sum of seven million three hundred and eighty thousand nine hundred and twelve dollars (\$7,380,912), and Thirdly, on account of the capital of the said loan:—And that the Government may make such arrangements as it shall deem expedient, for securing the payment to it, after the redemption of the land grant bonds, of the proceeds of all sales of lands granted or to be granted to the Company under the contract, to be applied to the purposes and in the order aforesaid. And that the remaining five million dollars of land grant bonds and money received from the said Trustees in redemption thereof, shall continue to be held on the conditions and for the purposes mentioned in the said contract.

6. That the Government shall cause a deed of agreement to be executed by the Company, and on behalf of the Government, providing for such remedies, terms and conditions for securing the application of the said loan to the purposes for which the same is hereby authorized, and the repayment of the said loan, and of the said sum of seven million three hundred and eighty thousand nine hundred and twelve dollars (\$7,380,912) the whole with interest (including interest on any interest in default); for the release of the said lien and charge upon such repayment; for continuing the sale and realization of the value of the said lands, after the redemption of the land grant bonds,—the payment to the Government of the proceeds of such sales, and the discharge of such lands from the said charge upon payment of the price of sale thereof; as the Government shall deem expedient, such price not to be less than \$1.25 per acre:—

Provided always that, among such remedies, terms and conditions, it shall be agreed and provided that upon default for twelve months in the payment of any half yearly instalment of interest upon the said loan, or upon the said sum of \$7,380,912, or either of them, or in the payment of the principal of either of the said sums, when the same shall become due, in accordance with the provisions hereof, the right of the Company under their contract hereinbefore mentioned, to demand or receive any further cash or land subsidy shall cease and determine, and the said railway and extensions thereof, branches, equipment, rolling stock, plant, including steamers, and all lands and property of the Company, and all land grant bonds then in the possession of the Government, shall upon the occurrence and continuance for the said period of twelve months of such default, *ipso facto*, and without any notice or proceeding whatsoever, vest in Her Majesty, and shall forthwith, thereupon, be taken possession of by the Minister of Railways and Canals, on behalf of the Government of Canada, and each and every employee of the Company shall, from and after the expiry of the said period of twelve months, become and be the employee of the Government during pleasure, and shall hold and possess any matter or thing appertaining to the said Company then in his custody, as and for the Government; and the rates of interest, and the terms of payment hereby fixed, shall not be disturbed or altered by the terms of such agreement.

7. That the said Company be authorized to execute an agreement of the nature and purport hereinbefore provided for, and to charge its entire property and assets, in manner and form as hereinbefore described; and in such agreement to agree upon such further and other conditions as the Government may prescribe; provided that authority to accept the provisions of the Act to be passed in this behalf, and to the Board of Directors of the Company to execute an agreement containing the charges upon the said railway and property and the other conditions required or authorized by such Act, shall be granted by the shareholders of the Company, either by a resolution passed at a special general meeting of such shareholders, called for the purpose, by a vote of at least two-thirds in value of such of the shareholders as shall be present or represented at such meeting, or by an instrument or instruments executed by at least two-thirds in value of the whole of the shareholders of the Company, in person or represented by their attorneys or proxies respectively duly authorized in that behalf.

8. That until the payment in full of the indebtedness of the Company to the Government with interest, all moneys earned and to be earned by the Company as postal subsidy and for transport service shall be retained by the Government and shall be applied on account of the interest to become due from time to time upon the loan hereby authorized, and then to the payment of the principal.

9. That the stock of the Company, amounting to thirty-five million dollars (\$35,000,000), now in the hands of the Government, shall be held by the Minister of Finance, and may be sold by the Company, with the consent of the Government, on condition that the proceeds of such sale, less the amount required to be paid to the Government to secure a half-yearly dividend thereon, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum, up to the seventeenth (17th) day of August, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-three (1893) inclusive, shall be applied, under the direction of the Government, either to the improvement or extension of the railway, or its equipment, or to the repayment of the indebtedness of the Company to the Government; and that if at any time the stock of the Company should reach a price which, in the opinion of the Government, would render it expedient to sell the said stock, or any part thereof, then and thereupon, on notice being given to the Company by the Government, requiring that the said stock, or any part thereof, be sold, and specifying the minimum price at which the same shall be sold, the Company shall cause the same to be offered for sale, and sold in conformity with such notice; and in default of their doing so, within a reasonable delay (which delay shall be in the discretion of the Government) the Government shall have the right to sell the same or any part thereof at or above such minimum price, and shall apply the proceeds thereof as it is herein provided such proceeds shall be applied in the event of the sale of such stock by the Company.

10. That so long as the said several sums of money loaned as aforesaid or any part thereof, or the interest thereon remain unpaid, no mortgage, lien, or charge of any description shall be created upon the railway, property or assets of the Company, or any part thereof; nor shall any stock be issued by the Company, pending such repayment, above or beyond the amount one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) to which the same is now limited.

11. That legislative provision be made for giving effect to the said Resolutions, and that the mover thereof have leave to bring in a Bill for that purpose.

Motion agreed to.

#### MANITOBA PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolution with respect to advance to the Province of Manitoba in aid of the public schools therein, be received.

Motion agreed to; Resolution reported, and concurred in.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 36) to authorize a further advance to the Province of Manitoba in aid of the public schools therein.

Bill read the first time.

#### SALARY OF CARIBOO COUNTY COURT JUDGE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 69) respecting the salary and travelling allowances of the Judge of the County Court of Cariboo, in the Province of British Columbia.

Motion agreed to; resolution considered in Committee, reported, and concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 37) to provide for the salary and travelling allowances of the Judge of the County Court of Cariboo, in the Province of British Columbia.

Bill read the first time.

#### PETROLEUM IN MASKINONGE AND ST. MAURICE.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, Whether the Government has given orders to the Geological Survey to make borings in the various localities of the Counties of Maskinongé and St. Maurice where considerable disengagements of natural gas have been detected? If it has done so, have its labours resulted in the discovery of petroleum? If nothing has been done, is it the intention of the Government to charge the Geological Survey with the making of borings during the present year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Last summer, at a depth of some 48 feet, a ridge of limestone was struck, from the fissures of which, as in some other localities, an inflammable gas, carburetted hydrogen, issued. This is a local rather than a strictly public matter, but the subject is referred to in the Geological Branch of the report of the Department of the Interior.

#### ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY.

Mr. GORDON enquired, Whether advertisements were published either in the Dominion or Great Britain, inviting tenders for the construction of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway; if so, whether the attention of capitalists was called, either to the quantity of land to be given in aid of said railway, or to the reports of the late Mr. Richardson, of the Dominion Geological Survey, as to the value of said lands, especially as to the reported value of the productive coal measures of that portion of the railway reservation extending from Nanaimo to Seymour Narrows, and why the system of alternate sections in aid of railways has been departed from in the contract entered into by the Government with Messrs. Dunsmuir, Huntingdon, and others?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No advertisement has been published by the Government or any Department thereof, inviting tenders for the construction of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway. We are not aware whether any advertisements were published by the British Columbia Government, under the authority of the Legislature, or otherwise, for this purpose; nor whether they have called the attention of capitalists to the quantity of land to be given in aid of said railway.

#### NON-ENFORCEMENT OF PROVISIONS OF THE INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether any, and if so, which of the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act of 1883 have been directed to be left in abeyance, or not to be enforced? And if so, under what authority of law has this step been taken?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am not aware that any of the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act of 1883 have been directed to be left in abeyance.

#### CERTIFICATES TO OFFICERS OF COASTING AND INLAND VESSELS.

Mr. BLAKE enquired under what authority of law were Collectors of Customs recently instructed not to enforce the provisions of the 7th and 8th sections of 46 Victoria, Chapter 28, respecting certificates to masters and mates of coasting and inland vessels?

Mr. McLELAN. The regulations required to be provided under the Act were adopted by Order in Council in July last, and were placed in the Customs houses, and the necessary officers for examinations were also appointed. In the Maritime Provinces it was found, towards the close of the season, that very few had applied for examination, and that very few certificates had been issued. It was represented by memorials from St. John particularly, and Halifax, that there was a liability of blocking the whole coasting trade unless some little extension were given; and, under the necessities of the case, I directed that an extension of three months should be given. In the meantime certificates have begun to come in for signature, and a large number have been signed and furnished to the parties who have gone for examination, so that very few will require to go without a certificate. We have no authority for acting as we did, but the law of necessity.

## TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. LESAGE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision, as respects the translation of the Debates, that the translation may be as little delayed as possible, and may be completed within one week after the Prorogation?

Mr. BOWELL. This question is one which belongs altogether to the Committee appointed by the House to supervise the publication of *The Debates*. The attention of the Chairman has been called to this matter, and he has assured me that he will take every means possible to ensure the translation of *The Debates* into French at the earliest possible moment after the House rises.

## SAMUEL E. ST. ONGE CHAPLEAU.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) enquired, Is Samuel E. St. Onge Chapleau, who has recently been appointed by the Government a Sheriff in the North-West Territories, the same person who was formerly an employé in the Department of Railways and Canals? If so, was he relieved of his duties as such employé, or was it intimated to him that he should resign? What salary or allowance does he now receive as such Sheriff?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This gentleman, who has recently been appointed a Sheriff in the North-West Territories, is the same person who was formerly an employé in the Department of Railways and Canals. He voluntarily resigned his office in the Department on his own mere motion. The salary and allowances he now receives are those provided by the Statute for Sheriffs in the North-West Territories.

## KINGSVILLE HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Has the contract for the Kingsville harbour works been let? If so, who are the contractors? What is the contract price? Have the contractors given security for the due performance of the work? If so, who are the sureties, where do they live, and what is the amount of their liability?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract has been let; the contractor is Mr. Geo. J. Wilson; the contract price is \$33,500. There are no sureties except the ordinary deposit, which is 5 per cent. of the contract price.

## COLCHESTER REEF LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Has the contract for the Colchester Reef Lighthouse been let? If so, were tenders invited for the work? Who tendered? What was the amount of each tender? Whose tender was accepted? What is the contract price? When is the work to be completed? Has security been given for the due performance of the work? If so, who is the surety, and what is the amount of the liability?

Mr. McLELAN. Tenders for this work were publicly invited and received up to the 11th March, 1882. There were in all seventeen tenders, ranging from \$15,500 up to \$37,555. The lowest tender, that of James Moore, was accepted, and the contract awarded to him at \$15,500. Mr. Moore was notified to accept, but declined, and the contract was then awarded to Mr. Frederick Thomas, Civil Engineer, of Ottawa, who had tendered for the work at the same amount as Mr. Moore. He accepted, and entered into bonds with the Department for the due fulfilment of the work. The sureties were Charles Magee and Edward Perkins, both of Ottawa, who are bound with Mr. Thomas for the sum of \$31,000. The contract was afterwards assigned by Mr. Thomas to Mr. George Wilson, of Ottawa, who proceeded with the work, which, by the terms of the

Mr. McLELAN.

contract, was to be completed by the 15th of November, 1882; but owing to difficulties, caused by a storm, it is not yet completed.

## THE CITY OF QUEBEC AND THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to give this year to the City of Quebec, the Capital of the Province of that name, the advantage of having an office of the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have already been in communication with the hon. members for Quebec Centre and Quebec West on this subject, and the matter is engaging the attention of the department.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps, either by the construction of a bridge at Quebec, or by building ferry boats, to connect the Intercolonial Railway with the general railway system of the West, *via* Quebec?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject is receiving the consideration of the Government.

## PORPOISE FISHING.

Mr. BLONDEAU (Translation) moved for copies of the reports, correspondence or papers respecting the porpoise fishery at Rivière Ouelle, county of Kamouraska.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I will take the liberty to ask my hon. friend why he makes this motion. I have already heard of this affair, and I believe I might help him in his demand. If he would explain, in a few words, the object of his motion, I believe I would concur in the object he aims at. Therefore, I beg of him to give some explanations to the House on this subject.

Mr. BLONDEAU. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), I must say that as soon as I will have seen the documents asked for by this motion, I shall give him the explanations he desires. Until then, I could not say anything, as I have no information.

Motion agreed to.

## UNITED STATES DESERTERS.

Mr. GUILLET moved for copies of all papers, Orders in Council and correspondence relating to the arrest, in Canadian territory, by a detachment of United States soldiers, of Henry Watson, said to be formerly a resident of the Province of Nova Scotia, and Franklin Switzer, said to be formerly a resident of Kingston, Ontario, and a person surnamed Ellsworth, who were alleged to have deserted from the United States Army.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We shall have very great pleasure in bringing down the papers and correspondence as regards the case of Watson and Switzer. As regards the case of Ellsworth I know nothing about that. I am glad these papers have been moved for because they will show that these two men were taken on British territory as deserters, and that upon representation to the American Government they were most properly surrendered by the American Government to the British Ambassador.

Motion agreed to.

## MISSION OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for papers or correspondence relative to the mission of the Minister of Finance to England, in 1883, for the purpose of making

arrangements for the issue of a new loan, together with his report thereon to Council, if any were made.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Order in Council bearing on this subject will be brought down; but there was nothing in writing with reference to what has taken place on the other side of the Atlantic. It was arranged with our agents at that time to place on the market, in November or December, which was considered a favourable time, £2,000,000 sterling, a portion to be used in the redemption of the debt which falls due January 1st, 1885, and the balance as might be required, for the payment of subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway or on Public Works chargeable to revenue. A subsequent arrangement made with the Canadian Pacific Railway rendered this loan then unnecessary, and it was considered desirable to defer it for the present. In making my financial statement, I will enter fully into explanations with reference to this matter.

Motion agreed to.

#### POSTAGE REDUCTION.

Mr. CHARLTON, in moving for copies of all correspondence and papers relating to any proposed or suggested reduction in letter postage in the Dominion of Canada, said: In reference to this matter I may say that although a three cent postage rate is undoubtedly a moderate rate for a country situated as Canada is, yet the reduction of letter postage in the United States to two cents renders it desirable, if not expedient, that we should adopt the same rate in Canada. It will be interesting to compare the postal returns to the United States prior to the reduction of the postage rate with those after the reduction; and if the circumstances here be similar to those there, the loss to our revenue by such reduction would not be so great as one would be inclined to imagine. The law went into operation in the United States in October, 1883—or it was in operation one full quarter of that year. Comparing the last quarter of 1883, from October, with the last quarter of 1882, in the United States, I find that the revenue of the latter was \$5,837,000 against \$5,654,000 for the former, or a reduction in revenue, under the new law, of \$183,000, almost 3¼ per cent.—this in the face of a reduction of 33⅓ reduction in the rate. If the same circumstances would hold good in Canada—namely a reduction of 3¼ per cent. in the revenue upon a reduction of 33⅓ per cent. in the rate—as in the United States, the loss to our revenue would be a matter of small consequence to the hon. Finance Minister. The expenses of the Postal Department for the fiscal year 1883, amounted to \$2,176,000, and the receipts to \$1,801,000, showing a deficiency of \$375,000. If the reduction of a three cent to a two cent postage rate would bring about here, as in the United States, a reduction of only 3¼ per cent. in the gross receipts of the Department, the deficiency would be increased by the sum of \$58,500; making a deficiency of \$435,000 instead of \$375,000. No boon the Government would give the people of Canada would be more widely appreciated and generally distributed than a reduction in the rate of postage; and I am firmly convinced such reduction would not bear heavily on the revenue—the loss to the revenue being nearly compensated for by the largely increased amount of correspondence. I lay these figures before the Government; and I believe that upon full consideration of the matter they will find it expedient that the rate should be made similar to that in the United States.

Motion agreed to.

#### INDIAN ISLANDS IN LAKE ONTARIO.

Mr. PLATT moved for a return showing name and location of such islands in Lake Ontario, and other inland waters, as are held by the Government of Canada as Indian lands, together with a statement showing the area and valuation of each island, name of present lessee, amount of annual rental paid, and date of expiration of lease in every case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say to the hon. mover of this resolution that a return of this general kind will involve a great deal of labour and expense; that is, if we are to give all the islands included in the Thousand Islands, and the name and valuation of each. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would desire this. If he has any specific desire in making this motion, if he desires that it should embrace any particular islands in any particular sections, I would prefer it, for the reason that this would be a laborious compilation, and a somewhat expensive one.

Mr. PLATT. I would be satisfied to add "such islands as are occupied by tenants or lessees," or, if the hon. gentleman prefers, I would be satisfied with such as are in Lake Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the River St. Lawrence, perhaps.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, there are a good many islands in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Not many leased, are there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A good many. However, I have no objection, if it is pressed.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that is really a matter of public interest, the St. Lawrence islands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad to know from the hon. gentleman what he proposes, as head of the Indian Department, to do with the Thousand Islands that belong to the Indians. If I am rightly informed, the Indians preferred claims more or less valid to all the Thousand Islands that belong to Canada, and two or three years ago the Indian Department undertook to lease these islands. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman was responsible for it; but in one case, to my own knowledge, advertisements were made, then withdrawn, then very suddenly renewed again, and then some of these islands were disposed of, which was not a desirable thing, because I know of several persons who had been disposed to bid for them, and who, when the advertisement was withdrawn, naturally lost sight of them, and the public, or the Indians, were to a certain extent deprived of good customers. If the hon. gentleman could state briefly what his policy is, or what the policy of the Department is, in respect to these Thousand Islands, it would be satisfactory to those members at any rate who reside in the neighbourhood. I do not object myself to the policy of the Department, because I have seen, with great regret, that many of the most beautiful of those islands have been stripped, utterly stripped, of the timber which grew upon them, and afterwards fires lit upon them which converted them into heaps of charred rock, which for hundreds of years to come will not bear a shrub or a tree, I believe. Therefore, I approve of the principle on which the Government has acted, but I think the hon. Minister will agree with me, that, if these islands are to be leased, full notice should be given, for the sake of the Indians and for the sake of the public at large. There is quite a competition springing up for the possession of the best of these islands, and under proper restrictions it would be as well to get something for them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will be much obliged to the hon. gentleman if he will give me a memorandum on this subject. He says he is aware of advertisements being issued, and then recalled, and then re-issued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was about three years ago, in the months of August and September.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will look that up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will endeavour to get the detailed particulars.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The policy of the Government was, and is now, to offer annually a certain number of these islands for lease. As the hon. gentleman says, our islands are often stripped of their timber. People land—boatmen, and fishermen, and raftsmen—and there is no means of protecting these five or six hundred islands, little rockeries some of them, with one single tree perhaps, very picturesque, and adding a great deal, no doubt, to the beauty of the river. We had some local opposition, at Brockville and Gananoque and other places, to the disposal of these islands, but we have come to a pretty good understanding. For instance, the town of Brockville will have a certain number of these islands under lease for a sort of marine park attached to the town, and they will pay a rental to the Indians, and look after the adornment of the islands, perhaps erect picturesque buildings, cottages and chalets, as on the American side. The policy of the Government has been to offer a certain number of these islands for lease every year by auction. We tried it some three years ago for the first time, and, much to my surprise, because I had heard that there would be keen competition, there was scarcely any competition, and two or three islands were leased at a very small rate. I do not remember as to the results in detail, but I will look into it, and give a full answer to the hon. gentleman; and, if it is satisfactory to the House, the Government will continue the policy of leasing a certain number of these islands every year, so that those who desire to obtain a summer residence can bid for them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With the permission of the House, I would like to make another suggestion to the hon. gentleman. As well as myself, he knows the character of these islands. There are some of them still, I think, in the hands of the Government, of pretty considerable extent. Now, it is the habit of almost all the people from Brockville, and lower down, and from Kingston, and considerably above it, to make frequent summer excursions to these islands. Camping parties are continually going out there, and it would, I think, be quite in accord with the policy usually followed to reserve a reasonable portion of the islands, under supervision of the Fishery Inspectors or other suitable parties, as a sort of public park, or public camping ground, if the hon. gentleman likes to call it so. That would be much appreciated by many persons who are in the habit of using these islands as a place of summer resort. It is not desirable that all these islands should be leased to private parties, who will naturally exclude all stray excursionists, or stray campers, of the kind I have mentioned. I do not know exactly how matters are on the American side, but I think the islands there have been mostly disposed of, and so no camping or excursion parties are permitted to land at all. I think it would be much to be regretted to put an end to them on this side. By exacting some trifling fee, the hon. gentleman might reimburse the public for the cost of one or two caretakers to look after them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the larger islands, I think the remarks of the hon. gentleman are worthy of every consideration. There are many excursions there—some educational, some religious, some without either education or religion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Health excursions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And it would be well perhaps, in the larger islands at all events, to give them a camping ground. In regard to the smaller islands, that would not do at all. The spirit of proprietorship must be roused before you can get any price for them. A person who wishes to lease an island and make it a summer resort does not want persons to land and camp on it, and make

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

fires there; as to the larger islands, I perfectly agree with the hon. gentleman.

Motion, amended by the addition of the words "such islands as are leased in Lake Ontario and the River St. Lawrence," agreed to.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS.

Mr. PLATT moved for a return showing the names of public health officers appointed in the various cities of Canada, the salary paid to each, copy of instruction issued to such officers by the Government, and all or any reports made by such officers to the Department.

Mr. POPE. There is no objection to the motion. I may say, however, that the health officers are named by the city corporations and appointed by us.

Motion agreed to.

#### AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS.

Mr. MASSUE moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to pass an Act to prevent fraud in the Manufacture and Sale of Agricultural Fertilizers.

Motion agreed to; resolution considered in Committee, reported, and concurred in.

Mr. MASSUE introduced Bill (No. 33) to prevent fraud in the Manufacture and Sale of Agricultural Fertilizers.

Bill read the first time.

#### SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 10) further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 14) to amalgamate the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, and the Corn Exchange Association.—(Mr. Beaty.)

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of all Orders in Council, reports, correspondence and papers respecting the grant or payment of any subsidies to railways, not already brought down; and statements in detail of all such payments to h t d.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all correspondence, despatches and Orders in Council in reference to subsidies or grants for the Province of Manitoba, the extension of its boundaries, the territory disputed between it and the Province of Ontario; its school lands; the public lands within the Province, and railway questions affecting the Province.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of the claims of Eustache Dorion, of the village of Lauzon, pilot, and Moise Leclerc, of the village of Lauzon, bailiff, presented to the Dominion Arbitrators, in December last, of all papers, documents and evidence forming part of the record in the cases, with a copy of the awards rendered by the said arbitrators.—(Mr. Belleau.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 4:40 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 4th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 40) to amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Saskatoon and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Commercial Bank of Manitoba.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Union Trust Corporation of Canada.—(Mr. Hesson.)

Bill (No. 44) to authorize the transfer of the Welland Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Bergin.)

## SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 11) respecting the Union of certain Methodist Churches therein named.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 18) to incorporate the Pilots serving between Montreal and Quebec.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Bill (No. 19) to grant certain powers to the Commercial Cable Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 20) to amend the Act incorporating the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company.—(Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Halifax Steam Navigation Company, limited.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 33) empowering the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, limited, to construct and operate a Railway from Medicine Hat.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Provincial Bank.—(Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex.)

## PORT OF LANDING FOR EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. LANDRY, in the absence of Mr. BELLEAU, enquired, Whether the Government has made, or is on the point of making, any arrangements whatsoever for the transport to Montreal of European immigrants; and whether, in accordance with the said arrangements, the immigrants will be landed at Lévis or at Montreal?

Mr. POPE. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I would say that some of the steamships, usually the smaller class of steamships, have for some years brought immigrants to Montreal. The Government have not made any arrangement of that kind; but, as I have said, some of the steamships do it. I presume the great part of European immigrants who arrive in this country will be landed at Point Lévis as usual.

## OVERSEER OF FISHERIES FOR DIGBY COUNTY.

Mr. VAIL enquired, Whether an additional overseer of fisheries has recently been appointed for the county of Digby? If so, what is the name of the person appointed? What is his salary? By whom was he recommended, and what are the bounds of his district?

Mr. McLELAN. An additional overseer of fisheries has been appointed for the county of Digby. His name is James A. Collins, of Westport, and his salary is \$120 per annum. He was recommended by the Inspector of Fisheries for Nova Scotia, and the bounds of his district are the western division of Digby county, including Long and Brier Islands.

## LETTER POSTAGE RATES.

Mr. THOMPSON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to amend the Postal Law by providing that letters not exceeding one ounce may be carried at single postage rate?

Mr. CARLING. The matter is under consideration.

## MAILS ON THE GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY.

Mr. LANDERKIN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, this season, to give two mails daily to those post offices north of Palmerston, on the line of the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway?

Mr. CARLING. The matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

## SURVIVING VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38.

Mr. TYRWHITT moved, that it is expedient that the Government take steps to ascertain the number of the Volunteers of 1837 and 1838 still living, their names, ages, and corps in which they served during said time, and their respective places of residence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume that if this information is obtained and brought down, it would be to found a subsequent motion upon it, something like the motion which stands next to it on the paper, proposing to recognize the services of those volunteers. The volunteers of 1837-38 served some in Upper Canada and some in Lower Canada, and in both Upper and Lower Canada there were volunteers on both sides. I do not think, unless the House considers that there should be a grant made by the Dominion Parliament, or a recognition in some way of the services of the volunteers, that a case has been made out for the expenditure which would be incurred in collecting this information. It occurs to me, and to the Government, that the recognition, if it comes at all, should come from the several Provinces—that is to say, the Province of Ontario, formerly Upper Canada, should recognize the services of its volunteers, and the Province of Quebec, formerly Lower Canada, should recognize the services of its volunteers. I do not think the Dominion Parliament can be called upon to recognize the services of men who served, not only before Confederation, but before there was a United Canada, when there was an Upper and Lower Canada and no prospect or idea of their ever being one Province. This is a disappointment to myself, as I was one of the volunteers, and carried my musket, and I suppose I fought as bravely as most of my *confreeres*.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that this is entirely a Provincial matter—a matter for old Canada or the Provinces of which it was composed. In the Legislature of Ontario in former days, during the *régime* of the first Government, a question connected with this matter came up, and the only person whose services were recognized, was one named Montgomery.

Motion withdrawn.

## INGONISH BREAKWATER.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Victoria), in moving for all correspondence and all engineers' reports for the past two years,

regarding the Ingonish breakwater, said: I think it a matter to be much regretted, for the sake of the locality in which it is situated, that this breakwater should have been carried away. I think this occurred once when my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Vail) had something to do with it; and I believe the same fatality occurred since my hon. friend beside me (Sir Hector Langevin) has had charge of the Department. At all events, between them they have made a bad job of it. It is only right that those who were connected with it should be hauled over the coals, whether they are on this side of the House, or on the other. Besides, it is necessary to consider whether it is worth while to replace the work or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, these papers will be brought down. I must say, however, to my hon. friend, that it is true that the storms which partly destroyed the breakwater when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power have continued to destroy it, and that my intention was to drop the work altogether. It is evident that the breakwater cannot be maintained there without an expenditure so large as to be entirely out of the question.

Mr. VAIL. I rise to correct a misapprehension into which the House might fall from the remarks of my hon. friend from Victoria. The grant for this work was first made by the Government, of which my hon. friend opposite (Sir Hector Langevin) was a member, in 1873, and was merely continued by the Government of Mr. Mackenzie up to the time they left office.

Motion agreed to.

#### TIMBER LIMITS IN THE BOW RIVER DISTRICT.

Mr. JACKSON moved for a return showing the number of acres of square miles of timbered lands or timber limits sold by the Government since the 1st of March last, in or convenient to the Bow River country in the North-West, giving the name or names of the parties sold to, and the prices per acre received by the Government for the same. He said: I read in an American paper not long ago that a syndicate of American lumbermen have acquired a large tract of timbered land, or timber limits, containing a total of about 500,000 acres, in the Bow River district, in the North-West Territories. The same article stated that these gentlemen were very jubilant over their purchase, saying that they had bought those timber limits for very much less than their value. I desire to know who have been obtaining timber limits in this way; and, therefore, I make this motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to bringing down this return; but I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to add the words, "and the manner of sale," whether by public auction, or by private sale.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### EMIGRANT BUILDINGS AT LEVIS.

Mr. LAURIER, in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government for the removal of the emigrant building and quarantine station at Lévis from Lévis to Montreal, said: Rumors have been circulated of late that negotiations are pending between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the removal of the emigrant buildings from Lévis to Montreal, with the view of gradually forcing all immigrants to land at Montreal instead of Quebec. These rumours have found their way into the press, and have caused constant uneasiness. I hope the Government will be able to say that they are absolutely without foundation.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Victoria).

Mr. POPE. I may say to the hon. gentleman, that the Government do not wish to force immigrants either to go away from Quebec, or to remain there. There is not, and has not been, any correspondence with the Pacific Railway Company, or any one else, respecting the removal of the emigrant buildings or the cattle quarantine from Quebec. It is, however, to be stated that steamships, that is the steamships of some of the lines, have landed immigrants at Montreal, instead of leaving them at Point Lévis. It is most important that we should have a cattle quarantine that is appreciated, not only by our own people, but in foreign countries. The importance will be understood when I say that whereas five years ago 900 cattle were brought there annually, the number now is 2,400. We have expended a large amount of money on these buildings, and no place in Canada can be more suitable for them than the place where they now stand, at Point Lévis. Never, with my consent, will they be removed.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with the hon. gentleman's statement, and I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

#### POSTAL STATISTICS.

Mr. HESSON moved for a statement showing the total number of post offices in operation in the Provinces now comprised in the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1867, the miles of mail route and total number of miles of travel, the number of letters and postal cards, the gross revenue and expenditure, with a similar statement for the years 1878 and '79, with the percentage of increase or decrease in each year, as the case may be. He said: In making this motion, I desire to make some observations. Through the kindness of some of the officers of the Post Office Department, I have been put in possession of some of the information I required, as tending to show what effect on the revenue we might expect from a further reduction in the rate of postage. After some careful enquiry, I have obtained a few particulars with reference to the revenue and expenditure of the Post Office Department in the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada previous to Confederation. In 1859 the rate was fixed at three pence currency per half ounce, and at Confederation it was further reduced to three cents. So far as the Public Accounts show, the total receipts from post offices in 1866—after deducting a grant of \$64,000 that had been made by Order in Council to cover the cost of legislative and departmental postage that had formerly been free—amounted to \$313,726; the expenditure was \$834,561, leaving a deficiency of \$20,835. Coming to the first full year after Confederation, and after the introduction of the three cent rate, I find, from the Public Accounts, that the mileage was 21,920,000 miles, that the revenue was \$973,056, and the expenditure \$1,097,828, leaving a deficiency of \$106,772. To get a fair idea as to the actual loss arising from the reduction of the postal rate during the first full year of its operation, we must take into account the deficiency that existed in the operation of the Department during the last full year ending 1866 prior to the reduction. That amount of \$20,000 deducted from the \$106,772, left \$85,973 of a deficiency for the first four years after the reduction, representing about 10 per cent. of a loss accruing from that reduction. In addition to this it will be very interesting to note what the Postmaster-General said on the subject in his report of 1869-70:—

"The postal revenue for Ontario and Quebec for the quarter ending 30th September, 1869, was \$215,036 as compared with \$204,841 in the corresponding year of 1868—both under the reduced rates of postage—and if a continuance of this rate of improvement in collections could be counted on, the loss temporarily sustained in reducing the domestic postage charges would be soon recovered."

We have also to take into account a further reduction made in parcel postage which, in 1869, was reduced from 12½ cents per eight ounces to 6 cents per four ounces; and it will be found that this accounts for a large portion of the deficit I have mentioned. Glancing over the results of the last five years, we can safely conclude, I think, that it is quite within the power of the Government to go still further towards meeting the wants of the people of Canada by a still further reduction from a three cent to a two-cent postage rate per half ounce. In 1875, the number of post offices was 5,606; in 1883 it was 6,395, an increase of 689. In 1879 the mileage amounted to 39,598; in 1883 the postal route covered 44,643 miles, an increase of 5,045 miles, or about 1,000 miles a year for five years. The total miles of travel on all these routes was, in 1879, 16,56,034, and, in 1883, 19,465,121, an increase of 3,309,034. Again, in 1879, the total number of letters and postal cards carried was 21,930,000; in 1882, the last year for which we have published returns, it was 69,950,000; at the same rate of increase, the total, in 1883, should amount to 75,000,000, or an increase over 1879 of 23,120,000. These are very gratifying figures, showing, as they do, the very rapid growth of that very important Department. But when we look at the returns of revenue and expenditure, we find the comparison still more interesting. In 1879 the revenue was \$1,534,363; in 1883, \$2,264,384, or an increased revenue for five years of \$730,000. Hon. gentlemen may say that the deficiency is very large, and may quote this deficiency as showing the undesirability of perhaps still further increasing it by a reduction of the present rate. But any hon. gentleman who will look at the Public Accounts will see that the expenditure, in 1879, was \$2,167,266 and, in 1883, \$2,687,391. While, however, the deficiency in 1879 was \$632,903, in 1883 it was but \$423,006. It will, therefore, be observed that while the growth of mileage of travel and the consequent increase of expenditure has been very large, we have still more than overtaken this increase of expenditure by our increasing revenue. Thus, while the deficit in 1879 was \$632,903, in 1883 it was only \$423,006, showing a reduction in deficit, caused by the increase of revenue in five years, of \$209,896; or at the rate of \$42,000 a year. Taking this into consideration, it seems to me that the Postmaster General would be justified in undertaking to bear this additional burden, if we can call it so, of reducing still further the postal rate. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that the celebrated Sir Rowland Hill estimated the cost of carrying a letter from London to Glasgow to be 1½d. If that is the case there is no reason why two cents may not be sufficient to carry a letter from one end of the Dominion to another, and still leave a fair income to the Department. It is not in the carrying of mail matter of that description that any loss is sustained; and besides, post offices are not established for the purpose of providing a revenue, but for the convenience of the people. They have been established on the same principle as that which has guided us in undertaking public works, not with the hope of obtaining a revenue, but in the view that the general business of the country would be so promoted by them that indirect advantages would ensue which could not be expected from a direct revenue. The necessity of a postal reduction is not probably felt so much in the towns and cities as in the country districts. No one who has had any experience of the early years, the pioneer life of Canada, can fail to remember how cheering it was to hear the sound of the postman's horn, how it seemed to revive in his heart memories and recollections of home, and how dearly he appreciated this means of communication with his friends in bygone years. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Postmaster General would favour this move, and if his colleagues will only sustain him in it, as I hope they will, the people will receive the advantage which I think they ought to receive from

this reduction. I may observe in passing that, although a very large reduction was made by the remission of the tax upon newspapers posted from the place of publication, which amounted to something like \$60,000, still we find the deficiency has been very materially lessened by the operations of the past year. If you deduct the \$60,000—which was allowed, I might say, to the press of Canada, because it was a tax more directly upon them than upon the readers of the papers—from the surplus amount of \$43,000, you get about \$350,000, or \$360,000 in round numbers; consequently, I do not think we have anything to apprehend from a reduction. I might just refer for a brief moment to some figures that I was enabled to obtain from the American reports, which show that the deficiency in the working of the Post Office branch of their Government was no less than \$10,582,543 for the year 1860. Sir, in the face of that, we find that the service has since grown up to such an extent that it has produced a surplus revenue for them, and they have now been enabled to reduce the rate of postage for the people of that country to two cents. As we express a willingness to reciprocate with the Americans in other ways, I hope hon. Ministers will not be behind in meeting them on the same ground; and that it will not be said that it costs three cents to send a letter to the Americans when they can send one to us for two. In reference to the expense of operating the Post Office Department of the United States, I have gone into a calculation, and I find that it costs them eighty cents per head to manage their Post Office Department, whereas the cost to us here in Canada is only about sixty cents. I think that is a very favourable showing, and we have to congratulate ourselves upon it. I do not presume that it would be at all necessary for the Postmaster General, even in view of the reduction which is asked for, I believe, by this House and by the country, to starve the postmasters in the country; it will not be necessary for him to withhold a liberal increase in the Post Office staff in the great North-West which we are opening up so rapidly; and it will not be necessary to withhold the addition of a number of miles of postal travel during the coming year. The gradual increase will cover all that; and, taking the very worst view—and I have taken the worst view which is possible, keeping at all near the mark—the outside loss to the Department will not be more than \$175,000 in the first year; and in three years it will disappear altogether. I think, then, that the House and the country will accept such a departure on the part of the Government as a great boon. They have given other remissions. They gave a remission of the duties on tea and coffee, articles which enter into every household; and that has been recognized by the people as a liberal movement on the part of the Government. Although our revenue has, perhaps, in consequence, been somewhat less than it was, I do not look upon that unfavourably. We know this has been a disastrous year; but we know things will revive again, and better crops and better times will come soon. I desire for a moment to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this fact: that, although it may be said that we have a great North-West to supply with postal facilities, and that the probability is that the revenue there will be very much less than the expenditure, and a large loss will fall upon the country in consequence, I have tabulated a statement from the Public Accounts of 1882, showing that Manitoba and the North West Territories in that year were, I might almost say, self-sustaining in their postal service, the deficiency being only \$22,868 for the postal year—a very small item indeed; and I am glad to learn, from information I have obtained and believe to be correct, that that country is so largely settled with an enterprising people, an educated people, a business people, that they have a large correspondence, and the more it is settled the more that correspondence must be increased; and I have every confidence that within five years the

revenue from that part of the country will equal the expenditure, if not exceed it. I understand that the city of Winnipeg takes only the third place to-day—I question if it does not take the second place—in the postal service of the Dominion of Canada. That is a favourable showing. The Province of Ontario, for 1882, shows a deficiency of only \$31,773. I might give some of the others which are less favourable, but it is not necessary to weary the House. I trust I have said enough on this matter to show that it is within the power of the Government to do this without very much affecting the general revenues of the country. I have tried to impress hon. members with this fact: that there is nothing which more goes home to the settlers occupying different parts of Canada than the postal service of the country. I observe that a reduction was made on postage between Canada and the United States in 1869 from ten cents to six cents, or at the rate of 40 per cent., and yet would it be believed that the revenue only fell short \$41,653 for the year following? Now, we ask a reduction of 33½ per cent. as against 40 per cent., and in my estimate, I have given the worst feature of the case when I said it could not exceed 10 per cent. of the gross revenue from the postal service.

Motion agreed to.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT ST. THOMAS.

Mr. WILSON, in moving for copies of all tenders, reports and correspondence relating to the construction of the Post Office and Custom house at St. Thomas, giving the amount expended to date, also the names of all persons to whom any portion of the expenditure has been paid, together with the amount paid to each, and for what, said: In making this motion I desire to ask the Government the reasons why the work on these buildings at St. Thomas has progressed so slowly. I may say that during the last Session of the last Parliament the work on these buildings was commenced at St. Thomas. During the subsequent election campaign we were given to understand by the Government that they intended to prosecute the work as rapidly as possible, and that in a year or two we might expect to see a beautiful building erected there. During the campaign, however, a rumour obtained circulation—without, however, any foundation, so far as we could ascertain—that if the constituency was so unwise as to send an Opposition member to represent them in Parliament, we would very likely not have a Post Office and Custom house built there. The hon. First Minister, when appealed to on the subject, stated that of course the amount voted for that purpose would be expended, and that the buildings would be erected. Well, the constituency did return a member opposed to the present Government; and we find at the present time that the work is not progressing as rapidly as we think it ought. It may be, and I have no doubt of it in my own mind, that the Government is doing everything they can consistently do. I think the contractor, perhaps, is doing everything in his power to prosecute the work as rapidly as he can conveniently do so, though he complains that he found a great deal of difficulty last summer in engaging skilled labourers, for the reason that whenever the Government found any good workmen they were careful to engage them and pay them larger wages than we could afford to pay, and employ them on Government works elsewhere. It is with a view to obtain information on the subject, that I make this motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was sure the hon. gentleman would attach no importance to those sinister rumours that the Government would only erect those buildings at St. Thomas, on condition of that Riding returning a supporter of the Government. Of course, we would never do anything of that kind. The hon. gentleman himself gives the reason why the works have not been carried on with Mr. Hesson.

the same vigour that he could have wished, and that is, that the best workmen were engaged elsewhere, and the contractor was not able to proceed faster. I hope the contractor will be able hereafter to find better workmen, and to fulfil his contract. The intention of the Department is that the contractor shall go on with his work with all due expedition. Of course, it is useless to drive a contractor to the point of causing him either to throw up his contract or lose a large sum of money. We must exercise a reasonable forbearance, but we must require him to use such diligence as will secure the work being completed within a reasonable time. The intention of my Department is that the contractor shall fulfil his contract, and I have no doubt that when the building is erected, the hon. gentleman will find it a credit to his county as well as to the Government.

Motion agreed to.

#### OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Criminal Law and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting offences against the person, said: This is substantially the same Bill as was before Parliament in the Session of 1882, and again in the Session of 1883. The Bill was last year assented to by the First Minister, who thought it was a proper Bill, and that it ought to pass the House and become the law of the land, and that the offence mentioned in the Bill should be punished as a criminal offence. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee composed of several lawyers of both sides of the House, who reported in favour of it. It was referred to a Committee of the Whole, passed with some slight amendments, and finally received its third reading. The Bill was then sent up to the Senate. It was introduced, received the second reading without opposition, referred to a Committee of the Whole, and passed without any opposition, and without any amendment; but on the third reading, the Bill was rejected—and rejected, as I understand, because the hon. Minister of Justice, although assenting to the principle of the Bill, intimated that it would be better to let it stand over, because it might be consolidated with the criminal law that is now undergoing consolidation. That would be quite satisfactory if the clauses of this Bill could be made to form part of the criminal law, but I do not see very well how it is going to be consolidated with the Criminal Statutes that are now undergoing consolidation, unless it first becomes law by Act of Parliament, and it is for that reason that I introduce this Bill for the third time. I know there was considerable objections taken to the Bill last Session, especially upon the third reading. There were no objections upon the second reading; there was some slight ones in the Committee of the Whole; but on the third reading, considerable objections were raised by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Now, I am not going to enter into the details of the Bill. As I stated upon that occasion, I believe the Bill ought to become law. I believe it is not creditable to us that this offence has not been made a criminal offence long ago. The offence is one that does not bear a detailed discussion in the House, and therefore I do not propose to discuss it in detail. We know, Sir, that in almost every State of the Union the offence mentioned in this Bill is made a criminal offence, punishable by terms of imprisonment, varying, according to the law of the State, from one to ten years. In some cases there is fine and imprisonment; in others, imprisonment alone. We know that in England, although there is no Statute Law prohibiting the offence and that it is not an offence under the common law, still it is an ecclesiastical offence so to speak, and is taken cognizance of by ecclesiastical courts. In Scotland it is a criminal offence—it is there made a serious offence—it is a capital felony, the punishment for which

has been reduced within the last few years to banishment for life. Now, I see no reason why it should not be made a criminal offence in this country. It is said, and was said last Session by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) that this Bill should not be placed on the Statute Book because we cannot assume that any person will be guilty of the offence. All I know is, that such offences are committed. One cannot travel a circuit, I believe in either Province, without having cases of this kind occasionally coming up; and you, Mr. Speaker, know perfectly well from your own experience as a lawyer, that such cases do occur in the courts, that offences of this kind are committed, and that, with a view to punish the guilty parties, cases do come before the courts. At present, however, there is no way of punishing such parties unless the offence is committed by force, unless in fact it amounts to rape. I propose making the parties guilty of a crime if the offence is committed. I do not think we should be satisfied with the law as it stands; that is, that the person committing the offence of which I have spoken, unless rape is committed, shall go unwhipped of justice altogether. I see no reason, I say, why this should not be made a criminal offence. It is also said that we ought not to spread out this Bill on the Statute Book because it is, to a large extent, pandering to a sort of prurient curiosity which very often arises when investigations of this kind take place. If that were so, and if it were a good answer to a Bill of this kind becoming part of the law of the land, there are half a dozen offences which have been made such by Statute, the laws in regard to which should not appear on the Statute Book. It is impossible to deal with cases of the kind to which I have referred unless there is exposure in the courts, which, of course, one does not want; but it is far better to have the exposure than that criminals should escape justice altogether. As I have already said, I do not care about discussing the matter at length. The First Minister, than whom no one is better able to judge of the propriety of a law, from his long experience in Parliament, has given his assent to the principle of the Bill, and I content myself by moving that the Bill be now read the second time.

Bill read the second time.

#### EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 3) to further amend the Law of Evidence in criminal cases, said: This Bill, which was also introduced during the last Session of Parliament, is substantially the same as that introduced last year. The provisions of it are simple and brief. It provides that in all cases of misdemeanor the defendant and his wife shall be competent witnesses, under certain restrictions and conditions specified in the Bill. Last Session the Bill received the assent of the First Minister, was referred to a Select Committee, which reported it with some slight amendments. I now propose to have the Bill read the second time, and referred to a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Cameron (Victoria), Ives, Wood (Brockville), Fleming, Hall, and the mover.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to the Bill going to the Committee, the names of which were shown to me by the hon. gentleman. I suggest, however, the addition of Mr. Ouimet.

Mr. TUPPER. I desire to oppose the second reading of this Bill. I do not intend to delay the deliberations of the House for any considerable time in speaking on it, and the only reason that prompts me in asking the House to refuse to pass this motion is, that during last Session, when the principle of the Bill came before us, there was a very decided expression of opinion given in regard to it. The Bill went into the Committee and never came out. Subsequently,

the hon. gentleman who had charge of the Bill then, as he has now, made a separate motion in order to restore the Bill to the Order Paper. The expression of the opinion of the House was as pronounced then as it had been before; and my point is, without going into the question again, because on that occasion hon. members from Quebec and myself discussed the principle of the Bill and the whole question. We shall be losing time in further considering the Bill, if the opinions of hon. members are the same as they were last year. In addition to the matter discussed then, I took the opportunity of alluding to the fact that this Bill was, if anything, in favour of unduly assisting prisoners to obtain their acquittal. I contended then, and I contend now, that the advantages which surround prisoners are such as to completely secure for them justice in any court in the Dominion, and in any court where British laws are in force, and there was no reason, and no reason has been shown, for changing the present system which has so long prevailed in England and here. In that opinion I am borne out, to a certain extent, by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill. In 1880 he shared that opinion, and if his opinions then were correct, there is no necessity to pass this Bill. In opposing the introduction of the Bill to give prisoners certain advantages in calling witnesses before a magistrate in preliminary examinations, he said:

"We know well, at all events, those of us who have had any experience in the administration of the Criminal Law, that as a general rule it is a difficult matter to obtain the conviction of accused parties now, and we should not, by experimental legislation, enhance the difficulties of obtaining convictions."

Again, he said:

"It is well known to the practitioners in Criminal Courts that the chances are all in favour of the prisoner, and that for one innocent man convicted, 999 guilty men escape. As a general thing, the prisoner is tried by his peers, and he has the advantage of every technicality of the law that is open to him."

Now, of course, the hon. gentleman might contend that his object is not to give the prisoner any additional chance, but to enable the Crown more speedily to secure justice. But I contend, and any hon. gentleman who will look at the Bill must see, that it is a measure in the prisoner's favour, and, as I believe, unduly in his favour; that under the administration of such a law, an additional and improper chance is given to the guilty man to escape. I rose simply for the purpose of calling attention to the character of the Bill, and I shall conclude by moving in amendment: that the said Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just moved the six months' hoist gives as one reason why his amendment should be accepted, that a certain number of members last Session voted against the principle of the Bill; but he seems to have entirely forgotten the possibility that between last Session and this, hon. members may have changed their minds. I do not agree with the reasons which the hon. gentleman has given for declining to support the Bill. On the contrary, I think the Bill should become law and that in this age it would be well if its principles were enforced. We find that, in the United States, a precisely similar Act is in force in nearly all the States of the Union. We find that in England, within the last few years, parties to civil suits have been admitted as competent witnesses, and precedents set in England have become the law of this country. Only a few years ago a party to a suit, who was possibly the only person who was able to give any information upon the subject-matter in dispute, was excluded from the witness box, and, perhaps, his rights were thereby entirely ignored. The injustice of such a law was discovered and it was changed so that at present parties in civil suits are competent witnesses in their own behalf. I need only refer the hon. gentleman to the Scott Act, and to many other Acts of a semi-criminal nature, in which the parties charged

are competent and compellable witnesses. As I said before, a similar law has been in force in the United States for many a year, and I assert without fear of successful contradiction, that criminal law is as well administered in the United States as in our own country. The hon. gentleman, I think, takes a narrow, contracted view of the case; he fears that some man who should be punished will escape. All who have had experience in criminal cases know that it frequently happens that the very man who could throw most light on a case is excluded from giving his evidence. I contend that there would be no difficulty in a cross-examination, in showing whether or not the prisoner had perjured himself. I think the Bill should at least receive a second reading, so that it might be calmly and dispassionately considered by members of this House.

Mr. IVES. As I understand, this Bill proposes to extend still further a principle which, for the last two or three years, has been acted upon in cases of common assault: that is, the examination of the defendant. I think it would be pertinent if some hon. members of this House, who have large experience as criminal lawyers, would state what has been their observation with respect to the working of the Law which we now have on the Statute Book, and in which we have admitted the principle of this Act. If this Bill applied, as I think last year's did, to all offences, both felonies and misdemeanors, I certainly would not vote for its second reading; not for the reason mentioned by the hon. gentleman, that it would give the prisoner a better chance to escape, but because I believe it would be a serious injury to a prisoner charged with a capital offence. The second section provides that if the prisoner does not ask to be examined, that fact shall not be commented upon either by the prosecution or the judge; but it would be utterly impossible, by any legislation, to prevent a jury drawing their own conclusion if a prisoner declined to offer his evidence under such circumstances. I think it would be very dangerous to extend this principle to felony; but so far from agreeing with the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, that it would be an additional means of escape for the guilty, I believe it would be much more likely to operate in the other direction, and that a prisoner stepping out of a dock into a witness box would be much more likely to injure his case than to help it. In my own experience, the present law, permitting defendants in common assault to testify in their own behalf, is practically inoperative; but I should like to hear the opinion of lawyers who have large experience in criminal matters.

Mr. OUMET. It is admitted that it would be dangerous for a prisoner not to give evidence when the law allowed him to do it; and though the law may say that the jury and the court should not be prejudiced by that fact, it is quite certain that there always will be juries who are sure to be prejudiced by it. And here comes in a higher consideration which should be taken into account by this House: you force a man practically to give his own evidence in his favour, and, consequently, you will force him, in a great many instances, to perjure himself. Is not perjury something which should be carefully avoided in the community. I say that the sanctity of the oath is the very basis of our society. If you make perjury a common thing, an every day occurrence, the sanctity of the oath will be gone, and the whole administration of justice will suffer. What will be the consequence if perjury comes to be regarded by most people as of no particular consequence, more especially if we proclaim that a man must perjure himself if he does not want to be sent to gaol? This law will not aid a prisoner if he is not guilty; but if he is guilty, he will be induced to perjure himself, and that is a greater evil than the conviction of one innocent man out of a large number of guilty ones. I say that this Bill contains a very unsound principle, and

Mr. LISTER.

one which we ought not to put on our Statute Books without careful consideration. For these reasons, I will vote for the six months' hoist.

Mr. WOODWORTH. My hon. friend lays great stress upon the theory that, if the person accused does not go on the witness stand and give evidence, his refusal will prejudice him in the eyes of the court. He, therefore, argues that the Bill would operate unfavourably to the prisoner. On the other hand, my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) enlarged on the idea that it would be undoubtedly in a prisoner's favour to allow him to testify in his own behalf. The two arguments hardly agree, and yet both hon. gentlemen intend to vote on the same side. I tell my hon. friends that they are both wrong. The practice would not be unduly in the prisoner's favour by any means; neither would it prejudice him if he did not go on the stand, because the second clause of this Bill provides:

"In case an accused person, tried before a jury, does not tender himself or herself as a witness, or become a witness on the trial, no observations shall be allowed to be made at the trial by the prosecutor or by the counsel for the prosecution, as to his or her not so tendering himself or herself as a witness, or not being a witness, nor shall the judge presiding at the said trial make any observations respecting the same."

Therefore, a prisoner's refusal would not prejudice him in the least. But how would the Bill operate unduly in favour of the accused? Every man is supposed to be innocent until he is proven guilty; but many a man is placed in a dock and tried for a crime of which he is not guilty, is environed by a lot of evidence got up for the occasion and untrue in many particulars, while he stands there with his lips closed, unable to tell the jury all he knows, and thereby relieve their minds of much doubt and difficulty, and enable them to arrive at a verdict according to the truth of the matter involved. Go into any court room, hear the evidence against a prisoner, and look at the prisoner. The natural mind of man tends to assume that a person who is placed in a dock and accused of a certain crime, is guilty of it. I have seen instances of this over and over again. But take that man from the dock, and place him on the witness stand, where the jury can see his demeanor, the play of his features, the light of his eye, and he is at once relieved from the imputation that would have rested upon him if he had remained in the dock. Cannot everybody who has attended our courts of justice confirm what I say? And certainly there can be nothing unduly prejudicial to the Crown in allowing a man to testify, when he is subjected to the most rigid cross-examination possible. If his evidence breaks down under it, the interests of justice are served. But would you have a man convicted when, by simply allowing him to open his mouth and testify, he could prove himself to be innocent. The object of the law is not to convict a man if he is innocent, but to convict him if he is guilty, and to find out the truth; and it is not possible for a guilty man to get free if he goes into the witness box to testify, under the cross-examination of experienced counsel. But my hon. friend says: oh, you are going to put a premium on perjury. Does not everybody know that in cases involving large amounts of money, people are now allowed to testify on their own behalf? And in such cases the incentive to avaricious people to perjure themselves is nearly as great as in cases of misdemeanor—in some cases greater; and no man of any sagacity or good sense dare go on the witness stand to testify falsely when he knows that he is going to be subjected to a rigid cross-examination. You cannot put down perjury in that way. Why, there is more perjury committed in making up the electoral lists of the various Provinces in one year than there would be in ten years under this law; and yet my hon. friend, who has been long in political life and seen all this, has a great horror of perjury. It is only a phantom raised by hon. gentlemen who are opposed to this Bill. We are not here, proposing this Bill as an experiment.

The same practice has been pursued in the United States courts, and yet in nine cases out of ten there is no suspicion of perjury. Of course, a man would give the best evidence he could for himself—he has a right to do that; but if he goes beyond that, he is liable to be convicted of perjury. If the only objection my hon. friends can urge against this Bill is that it will be provocative of perjury, they have a very small case to rely on. It applies only to misdemeanors, not to felonies. I know of cases now pending in the courts of Canada, in which, I believe, men are indicted for offences they never committed, who, if allowed to testify, under this Act, would sweep away the cobwebs of falsehood surrounding them and vindicate their innocence. I was not present last Session when this Bill was before the House; but I shall now have great pleasure in voting for it, in order that it may have a trial.

Mr. DALY. I take an entirely different view of the question from that expressed by the last speaker. The sympathies of a judge and jury, and of those in court are generally, I believe, directed in favour of, rather than against the prisoner, when he is seen at the bar. Such is the nature of most people, that when they see a man placed in that unfortunate position, their sympathies naturally go out towards him, and they are far from being inclined to condemn him unheard. This Bill should not become law, because it is the introduction of the thin edge of a wedge which, if driven home, will render impossible the proper administration of our criminal jurisprudence. The English practice, which we have followed for years, has stood the test of time, and I can see no reason now for altering it. If we admit the principle, that a prisoner under charge for misdemeanor can be permitted to give evidence in his own behalf, why should we stop there? Why should we not extend the same privilege to a man who is under charge for having committed felony? The principle is an erroneous one and should not be put on the Statute Books. I agree with the hon. member for Laval, that it will give a direct premium and an undue incentive to the commission of the crime of perjury. A prisoner charged with misdemeanor has, I consider, in spite of what has been said, a greater inducement to withhold the truth, or to state what is false, than one who is interested in a civil suit. His right to give evidence in a civil suit is, I consider, a totally different affair. While I believe the latter is right and proper, I do not believe that a man charged with misdemeanor should be allowed to testify in his own behalf. It must also be remembered that in every case the prisoner at the bar is asked to state what reasons he has to give, so that, although he is not allowed to give evidence, he can generally state his own case; and if he tells his tale with the appearance of truth, the judge will give to it all proper weight, although the statement is not given under the sanction of an oath. He has, therefore, the opportunity of showing to the judge his innocence, fully as much as he would have were he permitted to give evidence under oath. I think the criminal administration of justice would be better served by allowing this Bill to stand over for six months than by permitting it to pass.

Mr. BRECKEN. One of the arguments the hon. member for Halifax brings forward against this Bill is, that the old rule declaring a criminal not competent to be a witness in his own case, is found to work well. We know that the law of evidence is being continually improved. Not more than thirty years ago, before the passage of Lord Campbell's Act, the parties to a civil suit could not be competent witnesses, nor could any one in any way interested in the suit be heard. Every objection urged against this Bill, was urged against Lord Campbell's Act. In the first case tried at Westminster under that Act, I am not sure whether the Lord Chief Baron Pollock was not presiding judge, one of the

parties to the suit was committed for perjury, and I believe the practice of committing such witnesses for perjury was continued for some short time. We might as well say that Lord Campbell's Act was a premium on perjury, because it furnished inducement to parties interested to deviate from the truth, and therefore should be repealed, as urge the same objection to this Bill. This Bill confines itself to misdemeanors. I have had, as Crown prosecutor in the Province I have come from, during many years, many opportunities of judging, and my experience is that this proposed law will lead to and conduce to the better administration of justice, by admitting parties tried for misdemeanor to be competent witnesses. The first thing to which we should direct our minds is the most efficient way of eliciting the truth. Whenever you have witnesses brought into a court of justice, no doubt perjury is committed; and I venture to say that in prosecutions under the Scott Act, scarcely a case comes before a court of justice in which perhaps there is not some deviation, more or less, from the truth, on the part of witnesses. If any line is to be drawn, we would have to be very careful and select in determining what men are competent to give testimony in a court of justice. As far as the person on trial for misdemeanor is concerned, it is obvious the prosecutor cannot compel him to be called as witness. The hon. member for Laval has stated that if, in the course of defence, a prisoner declined to be examined, though the counsel and judge are prohibited by this Act from making comments, still his refusal would have a prejudicial effect on the minds of the jury. Probably it would. I cannot conceive a case in which a man placed on his trial and competent to give evidence in his own behalf would decline to do so, thereby admitting that he has nothing to say in his own defence and no doubt such refusal would go against him. I can very readily understand that, where the evidence is very finely balanced and it is a difficult matter for the jury to make up their minds as to the credibility of witnesses on either side, if the prisoner declined to go into the box he would create an impression in the minds of the jury hostile to his case, but I do not think such an impression will run counter to justice. It is impossible to conceive that a man would sit quietly at the bar and decline to give evidence in his own behalf, if it were in his power to say anything in extenuation of or in answer to the charge for which he was indicted. If in a civil case, where a man's property and reputation may be at stake, he is considered competent to be a witness, I do not see why his mouth should be closed when a charge of misdemeanor is made against him. It will not do for us to go back to the venerable processes of law, as the law was administered in former days, in the conduct of criminal procedure. Not many years ago a criminal was denied the privilege of having counsel to defend him, and there are many other rules of law which have been applicable to the conduct of criminal prosecution, that, to-day, we almost blush to acknowledge. True, it is possible this may, in some cases, be an inducement to a man to deviate from the truth—to perjure himself; but that is a thing which legislation has not been able to guard against, and I do not see how this proposed law can injuriously affect the prosecution, since the prosecuting examiner has the power of cross-examining the prisoner. I remember once, and once only, seeing an instance of it. I was in a court of criminal justice in the State of Maine, listening to the trial of a young man for robbery. The prisoner stepped from the dock into the witness box and was examined, and, after his examination was through, if I had been on the jury, I would not have hesitated for a moment to give a verdict of guilty against him. I think it would not be detrimental to the administration of criminal justice if this Bill were placed upon our Statute Book.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I want to say one or two words in reply to what has been said in this debate. I

would have discussed the question more fully had I not expected that the Bill would receive a second reading, would have been referred to a Select Committee, would have been reported by that Committee, and that, upon the report of that Committee, when we knew the shape the Bill would assume, we would be better able to deal with the whole question. The hon. gentleman who moved the six months' hoist based his opposition to the Bill upon two grounds. He said that last Session the same Bill was rejected by the House—that is, the Committee rose without reporting, and therefore the Bill was rejected by the House; that I moved to reinstate the Bill and the motion was lost, and that, therefore, Parliament having pronounced upon the Bill, it was losing time to discuss it again. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The House never pronounced upon this Bill. It was an entirely different Bill. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that I moved the second reading of the Bill last Session, that the Bill was then referred to a Select Committee at the suggestion of the First Minister, and that upon that suggestion five other Bills, two of the same kind and three of an entirely different kind, were referred to the same Committee. One of them, which was objected to by several hon. members of this House, was a Bill to enable Agnostics to give evidence in Courts of Justice. The Committee met on these Bills, and, though I think it was not wise of us to do it, we consolidated them into one Bill. When that Bill came before the House, some were opposed to the provision to give Agnostics the right to give evidence; some were opposed to allowing the defendants in cases of misdemeanor to give evidence, and some were opposed to other provisions of the Bill. The result was that all the opposition was combined, and the Bill was defeated. That it was ever before the House in the form in which it is now presented, I utterly deny; so that ground entirely falls from under the hon. gentleman's feet. It is said by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) that the Bill should not pass because it will offer a premium to perjury. That was always the argument when changes in the law of evidence were proposed. In the Province of Ontario and in England, when the law was changed to enable the defendant and the plaintiff, the parties to the suit, in civil actions, to give evidence, wiseacres like the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) and the hon. member for Laval rose and said the tendency would be that every single man put into the witness box, plaintiff or defendant, would commit perjury; that it was giving a premium for perjury—giving them a certain amount of cash to swear away their immortal souls. The Legislature was not influenced by that argument; and now, after so many years' experience, I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would go back to the old law, which existed before he was called to the bar, nay, were in existence before he was born, and prevent plaintiffs and defendants, in civil suits, from giving testimony. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, with your extensive experience at the bar, if you would go back to the practice of old days, when the men who could tell all about the case had their mouths shut and could not say a word. The cases I have provided for are of a *quasi* civil kind. They are not felonies, though I think it would not be ill to extend the provision to felonies; but I believe in progressing slowly, and that first we should try how the Bill will work in the case of misdemeanors. It is not a new principle in England or in Canada. The hon. gentleman knows, as my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) stated, that we have it in the case of assaults and batteries, that the defendant can go into the witness box and testify and tell his story, and, when the jury have heard his story, they can judge whether or not it is a true story; whether or not he himself has been able to do away with the impression formed by the evidence given on the part of the Crown. We have it also in the Election Law, passed in 1874 by hon. gentlemen

Mr. BRECKEN.

on this side when they were on the other side of the House. We know that, in penal actions, under the Election Law, a defendant has a perfect right to go into the witness box and tell his story, and the jury then have to judge whether or not the story is a correct one. The House assented to the principle of the Bill last Session. My hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) introduced a Bill which contained stringent clauses and imposed severe penalties, but allowed the defendant to go into the witness box and tell his own story. It has been recognized by Parliament over and over again. It has been recognized in England, where in certain cases the defendant is enabled to go into the witness box and tell his own story. If we have recognized it in civil proceedings and in criminal proceedings, if it is recognized in England to a limited extent and here to a limited extent, what reason has been urged against its extension to all cases coming within the technical class of misdemeanor? I know of none. As my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Woodworth) stated, a defendant is put into the dock, is tried before his peers for a criminal offence; a story is told by the witnesses for the Crown; it is a circumstantial story, perhaps clearly circumstantial; perhaps not a link is missing in the whole chain of evidence, and the evidence is sufficient to satisfy any reasonable man; but the man who can tell the whole facts is not allowed to do so; his mouth is closed. He desires to call himself, and tell his own story, and corroborate his statement by the evidence of his wife. What is the answer? The answer of common sense is, let them tell their story; but the answer of the law is that you cannot tell your story because, no matter how trivial the offence may be, you cannot say a word in your own behalf. Counsel may suggest doubts and raise difficulties and point out discrepancies, but the man who can tell all about it cannot say a word in his own behalf. I ask, I appeal to hon. members, if that is fair or just to a man who is perhaps being tried for a trifling offence that might be followed, if he were convicted, by a fine of \$10 or twenty-four hours in gaol. Yet the law now says that man cannot tell his own story. In the Session of 1880, I gave some instances of the extreme hardship under which prisoners tried for these trifling offences laboured. I stated a case of an English Church clergyman, who kept a boarding school for young ladies. A conspiracy was formed by two or three of them to charge the gentleman with a criminal offence. Some of them went into the box and told a plain story, and all the ingenuity of counsel could not shake their evidence in the slightest degree. The unfortunate clergyman was convicted, and sentenced to a long term of imprisonment. Circumstances arose afterwards which led him to believe he could fasten the charge of conspiracy upon them. A charge of perjury was made against them, and evidence was given which showed, as the judge stated, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the evidence given against him was false. The sentence was commuted, but the harm had been done. The clergyman's reputation was ruined. He had been in the common prison for six months, and, although he went there upon perjured testimony, he ought not to have been there at all. If he could have given his evidence in the first instance, that would never have occurred. He would have told a story which the jury, perhaps, would have believed, and he would not have been placed in that unfortunate position. I remember another case which occurred some twenty years ago, the subject of which was an unfortunate lawyer, and perhaps my hon. friends on the other side, when they hear the story, will change their opinions as to the propriety of calling the defendant in a case in his own behalf. In London, England, two persons went to an eminent solicitor and consulted him about obtaining letters of administration to a large and valuable estate. The lawyer gave his advice, relying on the plain and apparently honest story they told him, and the

parties obtained the administration of this intestate estate. But after they got possession of the property, they absconded with it—at all events, they got out of London where they could not be discovered; and it turned out shortly afterwards that they were not entitled to the estate at all; that it was an entire fraud in their behalf. The owners of the estate, the real heirs at law, the men who were really entitled to it, instituted a prosecution against these two men and against the unfortunate lawyer. They were tried, evidence was heard, and they were convicted, and the lawyer was sentenced to ten years' transportation. An investigation subsequently took place, and the Home Secretary was entirely satisfied that in so far as the lawyer was concerned he acted, as all lawyers do, with perfect honesty and uprightness; that he ought not have been joined in the prosecution at all, and ought not to have been convicted. The Home Secretary at once ordered the release of the unfortunate lawyer. But he had already served six months of his banishment; his character was blasted, his reputation was ruined, and his professional prospects destroyed. The man's whole life was blighted and blasted because he had been convicted by false testimony, which he could have disproved if he had been allowed to go into the witness box. Now, Sir, if that man had been allowed to go into the witness box and tell his own story, as he was entitled to do, there could have been no conviction against him, for he would have been able to satisfy the jury, as he was able to satisfy the Home Secretary, that he was innocent of fraud. Therefore, I say that upon every principle of fair play, upon every principle of justice, we ought to carry the principle we have already incorporated into our Statute Law a little further, and allow defendants, at all events in cases of misdemeanor—those that are not of a felonious character—to go into the witness box and tell their own story. It is only simple justice that they should do so, and there is no danger to be apprehended from it. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) fears that every man who goes into the witness box, when he is a defendant in the case, will commit wilful and corrupt perjury. As I said before, the same argument was adduced by men such as my hon. friend from Laval, when it was proposed to make men competent to testify on their own behalf in civil actions. The same argument is always used, no matter what changes are proposed in the law. You will always find men who are fifty years behind the age—twenty-five years at all events—Rip Van Winkles, who are asleep while the world is progressing. But, Sir, the world will go on in spite of them, and will accept the principle that it is only fair and just that men should be allowed to give evidence in their own behalf in such cases as I have pointed out—that it is only fair and just that we should legislate in that direction. And, Sir, I ask this House to-day to do justice in the premises; I ask them to take only one step further in the same direction we have already gone. I could cite dozens of similar cases that have come under my notice in reading, where it was of the utmost possible importance that the defendants in these *quasi* civil cases should be allowed to tell their own story. I think, however, I have given enough to satisfy reasonable men that this Bill is not a dangerous one; that it contains no vicious provisions, and that there is no more danger to be apprehended of men committing wilful and corrupt perjury under this Bill than under the Bill that enables them to give their evidence in civil cases. Will my hon. friend tell this House that a man is more liable to commit wilful and corrupt perjury if he is charged on indictment with having obtained, perhaps, a dollar's worth of goods by fraud, when, if convicted, he would get twenty-four hours in jail, than another man is who commits fraud and in a civil action involving a million of money, and who, if convicted, would lose every dollar he has in the world? Surely there is just as much reason to apprehend that a man

would commit perjury in the one case as in the other; so that I say there is nothing to be apprehended from the argument advanced by my hon. friend in extending the principle that is already laid down. I, therefore, trust that this Bill will be allowed to go to its second reading, and when it gets into Committee, if there are any objectionable clauses in it, they can be eliminated.

Mr. OUIMET. My hon. friend does not seem to be aware that in the Province of Quebec, a party is not allowed to give evidence in his own behalf, even in civil cases.

Mr. CAMERON. He ought to be allowed.

Mr. TUPPER. Before the question is put, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that when he charges with being Rip Van Winkles, those who object to this legislation—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot make a second speech. Only the mover of the motion can do that.

Amendment (Mr. Tupper) six months' hoist, negatived on the following division:—

## YEAS:

## Messieurs

Abbott,	Dawson,	Landry (Montmagny),
Amyot,	Desaulniers,	Langevin,
Bell,	Dugas,	McDonald (C. Breton),
Bergin,	Dupont,	McDougald,
Billy,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Blondeau,	Fréchette,	Orton,
Bolduc,	Gagné,	Ouimet,
Bryson,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,
Burns,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Cambell (Victoria),	Guilbault,	Royal,
Carling,	Guillet,	Stair,
Chapleau,	Haggart,	Tupper (Pictou),
Costigan,	Hesson,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Hurteau,	White (Cardwell),
Coursol,	Jamieson,	Williams,
Cuthbert,	Kaulbach,	Wood (Brockville),
Daly,	Labrosse,	Wood (West'land).—53.
Daoust,	Landry (Kent),	

## NAYS:

## Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	McCraney,
Allison (Hants),	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Allison (Lennox),	Foster,	McIsaac,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	McNeil,
Auger,	Gillmor,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Girouard,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gordon,	Paint,
Baker (Victoria),	Gunn,	Paterson (Brent),
Beaioit,	Hackett,	Platt,
Benson,	Hall,	Ray,
Bernier,	Harley,	Reid,
Blake,	Hickey,	Robertson (Hastings).
Bourassa,	Hilliard,	Scott,
Brecken,	Homer,	Shakespeare,
Burnham,	Innes,	Small,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Ives,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Inverness),	Jackson,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kilvert,	Sproule,
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Kinney,	Taylor,
Casey,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Kranz,	Trow,
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Cochrane,	Laurier,	Vanasse,
Cockburn,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Davies,	Lister,	Wallace (York),
De St. Georges,	Livingstone,	Watson,
Dodd,	Macdonald (King's),	Wheler,
Dundas,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Fairbank,	Mackintosh,	Wigle,
Farrow,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wilson,
Ferguson (Welland),	McCallum,	Woodworth.—100.
Fisher,		

Bill read the second time.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, consisting of Messrs. Girouard,

Ives, Cameron (Middlesex), Hall, Lister, Fleming, and the mover.

Motion agreed to, on a division.

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

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman say what business he proposes to take up to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions.

Mr. BLAKE. I have pointed out to the hon. gentleman that much of the information ordered with reference to that railway has not been brought down, and what has been brought down has not been distributed; so it is extremely unreasonable to press those resolutions now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Railways has given notice of his resolutions, and I believe he intends to proceed to-morrow.

Motion agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 5th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

The following Report was laid upon the Table:

The Annual Report on the State of the Militia and Defense of the Dominion of Canada, for the year ending 31st December, 1883.—(Mr. Caron.)

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on certain proposed Resolutions (page 16) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, I desire to make a general statement as to the position of that great work. I am deeply impressed with the importance of the decision at which the House may arrive in regard to the Resolutions that I now have the honour to propose. A year ago, when discharging a somewhat similar duty, making a statement to the House in regard to the position that the Canadian Pacific Railway then occupied, I ventured to say that the most sanguine expectations of the promoters of that great enterprise in Parliament had been more than realized; that the work performed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had been unprecedented in regard to the vigour with which it had been prosecuted, and the success that had attended their efforts. I am glad, Sir, to be able on the present occasion to reiterate that statement, and to say that the position occupied in respect to the progress of that great work is still stronger, still greater, to-day, than it was when I made that statement a year ago. At that time I ventured to affirm that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made the same progress in the future that they had made in the past, we had every reason to believe that the line would be open from ocean to ocean by the end of 1886. I am now glad to be able to say that, in consequence of the vigour, the unabated vigour, the increased energy, with which that work has been pushed, we are able to say that if in the future the same progress is made as in the past, we will be able to shorten the period for its completion by something like a year; that it is now believed to be quite practicable to complete the whole of that great enterprise by the end of the year 1885, and open the line

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

for travel and traffic in the spring of 1886. I need not say, Sir, to the House that those who have watched the progress of that work, as I am sure every hon. member of this House has done, will feel the immense importance to this country of that which is practicable being realized at the earliest possible day. The contract entered into less than three years ago—because it is not quite three years since Parliament ratified the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—provided that the Government should complete 428 miles of road from Port Arthur to Red River, and 213 miles from Port Moody to Kamloops, a total of 641 miles, by the time stated in the contracts for their completion, which was July, 1885. I am glad to be able to say that that which the Government undertook to do in relation to the portions of the work that still remained under construction by the Government will be fully realized. As I stated to the House when last addressing it upon this subject, in order to open the line for traffic in the spring of last year, it became necessary to transfer to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a portion of the work which remained to be done on contracts 41 and 42, and work required to be performed on contracts 13 and 25, the first contract from Port Arthur, and on which a considerable amount of work remained to be done, in consequence of the long period that had elapsed after it was completed, the work required to be performed being necessary to place it in the condition in which the Government agreed to hand it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I stated to the House that it was intended to transfer those works to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in order that the road might be operated at the same time that the works of completion were in progress, and as the only practical means by which that important result could be attained. Those arrangements, as you, Sir, are aware from the contract which I have laid on the Table, were carried out. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company took over all the works requiring to be done by the contractors of section 42 at the prices contained in their contract, less 15 per cent. on the train work that the former contractors had undertaken and proposed to do, and to which, as it lessened the cost of the work which was to be done, the Government and the Company both agreed the contractors were entitled as a matter of justice. That work has consequently been completed, or is being completed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company upon the same terms as it would have been completed, and at the same cost to the country, under the contracts that had been made with the contractors for section 42. The portion of the work that remained to be performed on sections 13, 25 and 41 was also agreed to be done by that Company upon the lowest terms, and at prices which similar work had cost in connection with those contracts. The sum of \$286,000 had been paid in relation to that work performed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company entirely outside of their contract for the whole line. I may mention here that I do not take that question into consideration at all, because that contract with the Company is precisely in the same position as contracts with any other private individuals or contractors, and has no relation to the question we are now about to discuss. I may say in reference to the works upon the 213 miles from Port Moody to Kamloops, that the progress has been of the most satisfactory character. As the House is well aware, the contractors for those 213 miles were Mr. Mills and Mr. Onderdonk, the latter being engaged in both. Of something over \$9,000,000 of an estimate for the work on that section over \$7,000,000 have already been executed, and with the force at their command and the progress they are making, we have every assurance that the work will be completed within the time stated in the contract; in fact the track will be laid from Port Moody to Kamloops, through the whole distance in September next; and within the time—and I think I might say considerably before the time—named in the con-

tract the entire works will be completed. I am glad, Sir, to be able to say that the further information which we have acquired, down to the present time, when, as I have already stated, over \$7,000,000 of the \$9,000,000 proposed expenditure has been completed, shows that the cost of that work will not exceed the estimate which I have already given to the House. Then, Sir, the Company were bound under the terms of the contract to construct 650 miles from Callander to Port Arthur, and also to construct a line from Red River to Kamloops, a distance which by the present line is ascertained to be about 1,250 miles, making 1,900 miles in all, as nearly as possible. Trains are now running on 1,131 miles, although it is not yet three years since Parliament ratified the contract under which they are working. These facts have reference to the main line; but the Company have also constructed 239 miles of branches on which trains are running, making now in operation of main line and branches no less than 1,370 miles. A large amount of work has also been executed upon 160 miles of the line (in addition to the 1,131 miles) of the very heavy works north of Lake Superior. The Company have at this moment over 9,000 men employed in the construction of the portion of the line that remains to be completed in that region; and, as I have already stated, with the force at their command, and the appliances with which they are prepared to execute the work, we have every reason to believe that it is entirely practicable to complete that road from end to end by the close of the year 1885. Now, Sir, I may say with reference to the character of the work, that when the contract was entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it was feared by some gentlemen in this House that a sufficiently high standard was not created whereby the Government would secure the construction of that work in as perfect and thorough a manner as it was desirable it should be constructed. My answer to those criticisms was that as they were constructing it for themselves, and as the cost of operating the line for all time to come would depend on the mode in which the work was performed, we had in these facts a better guarantee than any possible standard of construction, that the work would be well executed. I think, Sir, it is not necessary for me to say to this House that the manner in which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have executed the work which they have performed is so satisfactory as to command, as it has commanded, the unqualified approval and admiration of every person who has visited and inspected this road and who knows anything of railway construction either in the adjoining States or in Canada. A great number of gentlemen, thoroughly qualified to judge of the quality of railway works, have gone over the line, and from them there has been but one opinion, and that opinion is that not only has the contract been fully and faithfully carried out but that it has been exceeded in every particular, and that on any part of this continent there is not to be found a finer road running through a similar country. The Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway has visited the works from time to time, and he affirms, in the fullest possible manner, as also does Mr. Sandford Fleming, formerly Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that it would be impossible to find a work executed in a more satisfactory manner than this work has been by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It might, perhaps, be desirable for me to give a slight glance at the character of the work which remains to be done. From Sudbury Junction to Michipicoton the work is said to be light, the grading for the greater part is of a sandy nature; this distance is 210 miles. On the 140 miles from Michipicoton to Pic, the work is said to be moderately light, the cuttings generally of clay or sand with some rock. From Pic to within 35 miles of Nepigon, the work is excessively heavy,

the grading being composed chiefly of hard rock; distance 95 miles. It is upon this heavy work, to a very large extent, that the strong force which I mentioned are now concentrating their efforts. The work for the remaining 35 miles to Nepigon is moderately light; the grading is about completed. Then, as regards the work in the Rocky Mountains, from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to the foot of the Mountains, the work may be classed as generally heavy, with some short distances very heavy; distance, 45 miles. From the foot of the Rocky Mountains to the foot of Selkirk Mountain the work is described as being light, the country being flat; distance, 30 miles. From the eastern foot of the Selkirk Mountain to the mouth of Eagle Pass, the work may be considered moderate for mountain work, the grading being largely through gravel; distance, 64 miles. The remaining distance from the mouth of Eagle Pass to Kamloops, 161 miles, is described as medium, the cuttings being rock, clay and gravel. This makes in all 780 miles remaining to be constructed north of Lake Superior and the part to connect the end of the track at the summit of the Rocky Mountains with the works which are in progress by the Government at Kamloops. The summit of the Rocky Mountains is 5,300 feet, and of the Selkirk Mountain, 4,316 feet. I may say, Sir, that down to the present hour the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have prosecuted their work with unabated vigour, and have, so far as carrying out the contract into which they entered with the Government is concerned, left no ground of complaint as to the mode in which they have proceeded. It is well known, Sir, to the House that in October last the Company applied to the Government for the purpose of obtaining their support to guarantee the interest on the outstanding stock of the Company—some \$65,000,000. The first proposal, as the House is aware, was to obtain a guarantee on the whole \$100,000,000 of stock issued, and it was supposed by the Company at that time—in fact, I believe they had reason to suppose—that no difficulty would be experienced in obtaining the amount of money necessary to guarantee the payment of a 3 per cent. dividend on the whole of their stock, the entire \$100,000,000. That was subsequently found to be impracticable, and an amended proposition was submitted to limit the guarantee to all the outstanding stock, the \$65,000,000, and to provide that the remaining \$35,000,000 should be deposited with the Government, and no more stock issued except as the Company deposited the money necessary to furnish the guarantee of 3 per cent. It will not be necessary for me to discuss at any length the reasons which obliged the Company to adopt the course they did. It is perfectly familiar to the House that a demoralization in railway stocks occurred in New York in regard to all the trans-continental lines of railway, and everything connected with them, which rendered it impossible for the Company to sell the remaining stock—upon which they depended to obtain the money to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway with the promptness and vigour with which they were performing that work—except at a ruinous sacrifice. I do not intend, Sir, on the present occasion, to go at length into the causes that especially affected the Canadian Pacific Railway. I want, in making a calm, dispassionate, business statement of the position of that great work, and of the question as it now stands before this House—I want to avoid, as far as possible, raising any matter of a controversial character. But, Sir, I may say to the House, what is very well known, that in the United States, parties connected with the Northern Pacific Railway, the Central Pacific Railway, and the Union Pacific Railway—in fact, all the trans-continental lines of railway—parties, who a few years ago regarded the proposal to construct a Canadian Pacific Railway by the people of the Dominion as entirely illusory, and as a matter that need give them little concern—have gradually, but latterly very

rapidly, been changing their opinions with regard to that great work. They have found that the vigour with which the work has been prosecuted has rendered the early completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway a question far removed from the region of the merely theoretical; and, Sir, they have learned, upon enquiry and examination, when their attention was drawn to the subject, that Canada possesses advantages with respect to a trans-continental railway that would render it a formidable rival, either of the Northern Pacific, or the Union Pacific and Central Pacific Railway. And the result of the discovery of the greater advantages which a Canadian Pacific line of railway would possess, has been a great increase in the active hostility of all the trans-continental lines of railway—and, I may say, of all the lines in the United States connected with those trans-continental lines—towards the Canadian project. And, Sir, I wish I was able to say that the hostility to this great national work—for national work it is—was confined to those lines of railway that might be considered rival lines in a foreign country. I say, I wish I was able to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and this great national enterprise had not suffered from any hostility within, as well as without, our borders. But, Sir, it is well known that attempts to decry this great work, attempts to break down this great enterprise—aye, Sir, even if it involved breaking Canada down, as far as possible, along with it—have been entered upon, not only in the New York, but in the London markets, with very determined vigour; but, as I said before—and I do not intend to detain the House longer on that subject—the result is well known—the value of the Canadian Pacific Railway stock became so impaired and weakened as to render it impossible for the Company to obtain money from that source sufficient to enable them to prosecute to rapid completion their great enterprise. Now, Sir, the House will remember that when Parliament was providing for the means of constructing this great work, the Government who submitted the proposition to the House were told that we were granting an unduly large subsidy for its accomplishment. We were told that, in addition to the work we were performing to cost \$28,000,000, we were giving \$25,000,000 in money, and an inordinate quantity of land, when we added a grant of 25,000,000 acres, as so great a subvention was not necessary in order to provide fully for the completion of the work. Well, Sir, that land was estimated—I think I may say without much controversy—as worth about \$2 an acre. Assuming, therefore, that that was all true, it would involve to the people of Canada, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a cost of \$103,000,000. But our answer was this—and it has been thoroughly established by subsequent experience—that great as was the quantity, valuable as was the character of those lands, valuable as they would be rendered by the construction of this great line of railway and the branches which the Company proposed to construct in connection with it, it would not be possible for them to realize from those lands the money that would be required to carry on the work. That, Sir, has been abundantly borne out by the facts. With every effort that was possible being made to realize on the lands, the time came when it was apparent that, great as was the value of the property of the Company, it would be impossible alone by issuing the stock of the Company, to obtain the means to carry on the work. As I stated before, the resources of the Company became impaired, and if they threw the additional \$35,000,000 of their stock on the market, it would be sacrificed without their obtaining the means expected. Now, Sir, it will not be necessary, with the papers before you, for me to refer to the mode in which the dividends guaranteed on the stock were provided. You are aware that the Company provided over \$3,000,000 in cash, and you are aware that they provided for the payment of all the remaining money required to warrant the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Government in giving the guarantee, by securities of the most ample description. I do not think there is any person in this House or out of it, who will be disposed to question the desirability, on the part of the Government, of securing the prompt completion of this great work, by giving their assistance in the form that was proposed. The Government has scarcely transcended the usual borrowing powers of a Government. So far as the \$8,710,240 providing a guarantee for five years was concerned, of course no question can arise. That was entirely within the borrowing powers of the Government, and it was but a slight excess of that power—although certainly one requiring the approval of this House, and one which the Government felt every confidence in asking this House to approve—to accept undoubted securities for the payment of a portion of that money at a deferred period; thus enabling, as was to be desired, this work to be prosecuted with the same vigour as that which had hitherto characterized its construction. There is another point to which I might be expected to draw the attention of the House for a few moments in connection with the guarantee, and that is that in addition to the land grant bonds that were deposited to secure payment of the entire amount required to provide the guarantee for the whole ten years for which the Government became responsible, a postal subsidy estimated at \$3,000,000 was taken as a part security. I am quite certain those who will take the trouble to look into that question will find that the Government were amply warranted in doing this—that in fact it was no novelty to use a postal subsidy in that way. It was known that we were now paying at the same rate to the Canadian Pacific Railway, as to other railways, a large postal subsidy; and that in a very short time, assuming the work to be completed, and even in the absence of the completion of the work, we should be paying over \$120,000 a year for postal subsidy, which would represent the \$3,000,000 that were taken as a security, without regard to the transport service they would perform for the Department of the Interior in connection with the management of Indian Affairs and the Mounted Police. But, I say, altogether apart from that, it is known that, at the same rate paid to other railways, they will become entitled to a subsidy of no less than \$204,000 a year for the transmission of mails on the completion of the road, representing at an early day a much greater amount than the \$3,000,000 that was estimated to be covered. Taking the second lien upon the \$5,000,000 of bonds deposited with the Government to secure the operation of the line for ten years—and as I shall show by-and-by a security that certainly we now know never will be required to be called into operation, a first lien upon a further sum of \$5,250,000 in bonds—abundant security was taken, independently of the postal subsidy, for the entire amount that the Government were required to guarantee. It thus became a question with the Government whether for the purpose, not of enabling the Canadian Pacific Railway to complete their contract—I wish the House to understand at the very outset that no change is proposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in regard to their contract—that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, taking into account the property they own, the lands that they possess—putting a more moderate estimate of value upon them than that of hon. gentlemen opposite, and one in which I think the House will be prepared to concur—putting the most moderate estimate on the value of their lands, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company feel that they are able to carry their contract to completion without the alteration of a letter. There is no proposal now submitted to the House to change a single line of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is to stand now as it stood on the first day when we laid it on the Table of the House. Instead of its value having decreased, every one knows that with every succeeding year the Canadian Pacific Railway has

established itself in a stronger and stronger position. Every one knows that the experience in the sale of a portion of their lands—between three and four millions of acres already sold by the Company—leaves no room to doubt that in that subvention they have ample means for the completion of the work, with the additional means which they themselves have already provided in connection with its progress and construction. But the question that was submitted for the consideration of the House, and that was submitted for the consideration of the Government when the Company asked for this guarantee by the Government, upon depositing money and securities to represent every dollar of it, was whether that step should be taken, not to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to fulfil their obligations and to carry out the contract they had made with the Government, but for the purpose of anticipating the time provided in that contract by over five years; and the Government believed they were consulting the best interests of Canada in adopting measures which, without cost and risk to the country, would accomplish so great and desirable an object as that of opening to the people of this country all that trans-continental line of communication from end to end in that brief period. It is well known that the Northern Pacific Railway Company, by making a great effort, have completed their line running from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean. It is well known that traffic once established in a groove is very difficult to be drawn from it and placed upon another line: and we regarded it, therefore, as the first consideration in the interests of the country—looking at this as a great trans-continental line of railway—that at the earliest possible moment there should be a line of communication for travel and traffic extending across this Continent on Canadian territory, and enabled to draw to its support all that travel and all that traffic which could possibly be drawn to it from our own country and the country which lies to the south of us. Under these circumstances, the Government adopted, with some modifications, the proposals made by the Company and provided for the guarantee. I need not tell the House that it resulted in failure—that all the expectations that the Company had formed, and that the Government had formed—and I am able to say capitalists without exception in Canada, in the United States and in England, had formed—to the effect that the result of that guarantee would be to give all the means required to the Company to enable them to carry on their work with such vigour and promptness as would secure its completion by the end of 1885, signally failed. They were found to be erroneous. But if the Company were wrong, if the Government were wrong, the error was one in which financial men and capitalists without exception on both sides of the Atlantic shared, because no doubt was entertained as to what the result would be. The war, however, against trans-continental railway stock was intensified, the efforts to bear the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway were intensified, and then the result was that the project ended in signal failure—not only in failure but in disaster. Because, as it will be readily seen, the Company found themselves in this position: that having failed to obtain such increased value for their stock, as every person supposed they would obtain, they were left without the \$8,710,240 of their cash deposited with the Government, an amount locked up which otherwise they would have had at their command for the purpose of going on with the construction of the line. So that instead of obtaining the object expected, the very contrary occurred, and the embarrassment and difficulty that had before been experienced by them in providing for a rapid and vigorous completion of the line was intensified. Under these circumstances, the Government submit the Resolutions that are now on the Table for the consideration of this House. And I think, after I have had an opportunity of placing in the most frank and open manner before the House all the questions connected with this Company,

every transaction so far as I am able to judge that is interesting to this House in regard to their position, that the House will come to the conclusion that the Government are not only warranted in submitting, but that they would fail in their duty to the House and to the country if they did not submit the propositions that are now placed before you, not with a view to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to derive advantage, or to realize larger returns for the property that they possess, but for the purpose of enabling the people of Canada to have finished within two years this great trans-continental line of railway, and to derive all the advantages that are calculated to flow from the prompt and vigorous completion of this work. Now, Sir, the Company ask that we should postpone, or rather I should say that the Resolutions before you ask that the Company may postpone, the payment of \$7,380,912 for the guarantee for five years. But they leave with the Government ample security, as provided for under the original arrangement, for that postponement. Practically the proposal before the House is only a change of the payment of the \$2,853,912 that was to be paid on the first day of this month. That is the change from the arrangement already made in relation to the guarantee. It is proposed to postpone the payment of that guarantee for five years, and to loan the Company \$22,500,000, to be repaid on the first day of May, 1891. The conditions of that advance may briefly be stated as follows: In the first place, it is proposed that in future the payment for work done shall be placed upon a different basis from that which was contained in the contract. That is not a real but simply a nominal change in the terms of the contract. When the contract was made, it was provided that, upon the completion of every 20 miles, the Company should receive payment, according to the terms of the contract, on the 20 miles completed; but it is now found that, owing to the character of the work which remains to be done, it would be impossible, with any justice to the Company or to the Government, to carry on that mode of payment. Take the country north of Lake Superior, the whole distance is easy until you come to the 95 miles of enormously heavy work, and, if you paid them *pro rata* according to the contract for the number of miles done, you would not have left the money that would be required to perform the work on the 95 miles where it is inordinately heavy. So, in the Rocky Mountains, the 30 miles that is comparatively easy would not bear any proportion to the other work that remained to be done; and it is only proposed to make a change that is based upon the principle upon which payments are made by the Government in relation to almost all the other contracts—I think I may say to all the other contracts, on the canals, on railways, and on everything of the kind—which is to pay for the amount of work done. The whole section from Sudbury Junction, to which the line is now completed, to Nepigon, north of Lake Superior, it is provided shall be covered by a certain sum of money, and, instead of paying for each 20 miles as it proceeds, which, as I say, would leave you without the means of completing the 95 miles of the heaviest portion of the work, it is proposed to adopt the same principle that is adopted in relation to the payments on all similar contracts and almost all the works under the charge of the Government, to pay them *pro rata* as the work proceeds, according to the value of the whole work. In the whole distance there is a certain sum of money to be paid. The Chief Engineer makes his estimate of the cost of the work in order that payment be made for the work done in proportion to its value to the whole; and, having arrived at that conclusion, he gives his certificate that the work done, in regard to that which remains to be done, warrants the payment of a certain sum of money. As I have said, it was indispensable, in the interests of the Government as well as in the interests of the

Company, that that change should be made, in order to provide *pro rata*, as was the intention, for the work performed by the Company for the Government. Then, Sir, it is proposed to advance this \$22,500,000, not to pay a dollar of it to the Company except as the work is performed, in relation to the whole work remaining to be done; and so that, when the \$22,500,000 is exhausted, together with the \$12,710,788 of cash subsidy remaining in the hands of the Government, the Government shall have the certainty of the work being completed from end to end. The conditions on which it is proposed to give that advance may be briefly stated in this way. First, there is the charge already described for securing the payment of the guarantee at the end of the five years. Then, there is the forfeiture, upon default of the interest or principal for twelve months, of the entire property of the Company. There is the prohibition of any further charge upon the property, except for the sole purpose of repaying the advances. It is quite possible—and it may be necessary more specifically to provide for that, to enable the Company to realize the means of promptly paying the Government, when the opportunity may present itself—it may be found, in fact, quite desirable to provide that they shall have the authority to establish a charge upon the land grant, for the purpose of providing the means of wiping out their indebtedness to the Government, whenever a suitable opportunity may present itself. Then, there is the removal from the market of the balance of the \$35,000,000 of stock remaining to be issued. That remains in the hands of the Government, and, with this entirely under its control, not a dollar of that stock, even if they provided the amount as arranged in the first agreement for the guarantee of 3 per cent., can be issued until such time as the Government agree, and then it can only be issued with the consent of the Government, for the purposes of the road, or for the purpose of repaying the loan to the Government. In order to take entire control of that matter, in order to place the Government in the position that if the value of the stock rose to a point where we thought it ought to be sold, and the money returned to the treasury by the Company that had been advanced, we have power to secure the sale of that stock and thus recover the amount of indebtedness to the Government. I need not refer to the proposal to relinquish the security of \$1,000,000 for construction; because, Sir, I need not remind hon. gentlemen opposite that the object of taking \$1,000,000 security for the construction of \$100,000,000 worth of work could only be of one kind, and that was for the purpose of getting an effective guarantee of the *bond fides* of the Company, and securing ourselves against the possibility of their failing to go on with the work. The House knows that in every contract that we make, as the work advances, it is customary to give up the security that has been deposited for the construction of the work—5 per cent. the security deposited is given up to the contractors as the progress of the work warrants the Government in the conviction that the work will be carried to completion. So in this case, seeing that a large amount of money not received from Government sources has gone into this work, the Government feel that it would only be unnecessarily hampering the Company to lock up, without the slightest cause or necessity, this \$1,000,000 that, to a very large extent, they are already entitled to receive back according to the principle we have adopted in the contracts of all kinds with the Government. Now, Sir, I may say that is the proposal—to postpone with ample security for its payment already placed in the hands of the Government by the Company, to postpone the payment of the \$7,300,912 for the guarantee, and to advance, as the work proceeds, \$22,500,000. Now, Sir, I will, no doubt, be asked if the Company have shown the Government that they have a fair and a legitimate right to ask for that assistance in order to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ensure the completion of this work within two years. And, Sir, in regard to that matter I will lay before the House a frank statement of the affairs of the Company, as given by themselves, which, I think, will remove all doubt as to the position they have placed themselves in so as to entitle them to the confidence of the Government in regard to this application. I propose to give a statement of expenditures made by the Company, and the source from which they have obtained their money and receipts, which, I think, will satisfy every hon. member in this House how baseless are the statements that have been made broadcast over this country, that the moneys received from the Government, and from Government sources, have been used by the Company outside the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and that, instead of taking the large, liberal, and generous subvention that this Government asked Parliament to provide for the construction of that road, and putting it into this great work, they have used those means derived from the Government for the purpose of engaging in outside enterprises apart from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and are thus not entitled to come to the Government and seek for any assistance, even for so desirable a purpose as that of securing the construction of this great work five and a half years before the time provided in the contract. The statement placed in my hands by the Company shows as follows:—

## EXPENDITURE.

Works of construction on main line, west of Callander embracing 1,131 miles of completed road .....	\$23,078,929
Works of construction on Branch Lines, west of Callander, embracing 269 miles of completed road—295 .....	3,759,793
Improvements of Government Lines, west of Cross Lake ..	353,606
Materials, rails and supplies .....	\$4,364,839
Less advance on rails .....	339,235
	<hr/>
Rolling stock .....	\$6,130,792
Lake steamers .....	552,251
Plant tools and outfit for construction .....	187,002
	<hr/>
Five per cent. dividend on stock .....	6,870,045
Interest, &c., on land grant bonds .....	2,128,800
Deposit with Government on guarantee .....	372,880
Extension from Callander to Montreal and Brockville .....	8,710,240
Rolling stock for above .....	3,270,351
Shops .....	900,000
Tools and machinery .....	516,032
Real estate for termini .....	352,230
	<hr/>
	390,790
	<hr/>
Total expenditure from Montreal to Kamloops and Brockville .....	\$54,728,500
<i>Advances and Accounts Receivable for Extension to the Seaboard, &amp;c.</i>	
South-Eastern Railway .....	1,582,327
St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway .....	69,900
Atlantic and North Western do .....	156,646
Canada North-West Land Company .....	600,097
Advances to contractors in construction .....	600,000
Sundry advances and carriers back charges and other matters incidental .....	473,281
Paid in respect of securities deposited with the Government in lieu of \$1,000,000 cash .....	484,614
	<hr/>
	58,695,363
	<hr/>
RECEIPTS.	
Net receipts from sale of stock .....	\$25,356,828
Loan on \$10,000,000 of stock .....	4,950,000
Cash subsidy .....	12,289,212
Land grant bonds .....	9,029,012
Sale of town sites .....	477,775
Net revenue \$1,115,574 received .....	891,875
	<hr/>
	52,991,702
	<hr/>
Excess of expenditure over receipts .....	\$5,700,663
Deduct advances, &c., as above .....	3,966,865
	<hr/>
	\$1,733,798

Now, Sir, I propose for a moment to review the character of those expenditures. But before doing so I may be asked: what evidence I have that this is an accurate statement of the expenditures and receipts of the Company? And anticipating this question, although of course I was bound to accept the statement of the Company as a fair and honour-

able exhibit of their actual receipts and expenditure, I felt it was right, on a matter of so much importance, to be in a position to give Parliament the most abundant and accurate information, and to show beyond the possibility of question that there was no doubt as to the accuracy of the statements placed in my hands as to the expenditure and revenue of the Company. And for that purpose the Government nominated one of the ablest accountants in the public service, a gentleman who had been employed by the late Government on financial questions of the gravest importance, as one of the ablest gentlemen whose services they could command—Mr. Miall, Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, was asked by the Government to go to Montreal in connection with Mr. Schreiber, the Chief Engineer, whose familiarity with the whole question would be of great value in an investigation of that kind, for the purpose of making such an investigation of the books and statements of the Company as would assure beyond question the accuracy of the statements they had placed in my hands. I will read an extract from the report of those gentlemen, which, I think, will be found to be entirely satisfactory on that point.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to lay that report on the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do; I will lay the paper on the Table. I think, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, as this is an important paper, I may as well read the correspondence. The following is the letter addressed by me to those gentlemen:—

“OTTAWA, 28th January, 1884.

“DEAR SIRS,—I have to request that you will, with all convenient speed, proceed to Montreal, with a view to investigate the books and accounts of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company so far as such examination may be necessary to enable you to verify certain statements of revenue and expenditure which have been laid before my colleagues and myself by that corporation.

“I am aware that an exhaustive and detailed audit would entail the labour of weeks, if not months. This is not expected. But you are required to make such examination as a prudent business man would desire to make before lending capital to or entering into terms of co-partnership with a respectable commercial firm. A copy of the Company's statements is transmitted herewith.

“I am, yours faithfully,  
“CHARLES TUPPER.”

The following is the report made by those gentlemen on their return:—

“OTTAWA, 2nd February, 1884.

“To the Hon. Sir CHARLES TUPPER, C.B., K.C.M.G.,  
“Minister of Railways and Canals.

“SIR,—In obedience to your letter of instruction (bearing date the 28th ult.) we proceeded to Montreal on the morning of the 28th ult.

“On arriving at the offices of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company we were informed that the President was temporarily absent from the city; but upon communicating to Mr. Drinkwater the nature of our errand, he at once placed a room at our disposal, and stated that all the books, accounts and vouchers would be cheerfully produced for our inspection.

“He then summoned the Chief Accountant of the Company (Mr. Ogden) and requested him to hold himself and staff in readiness to furnish any assistance or information required, when we forthwith proceeded with our investigation. We found the books of the Company under Mr. Ogden's able supervision, to be faultlessly kept, both as to system and detail; so that far less difficulty than we anticipated was experienced in establishing an independent trial balance as the basis of further operations.

“Working backwards from this point by a process of analysis familiar to accountants, sufficient detail was obtained not only to check the figures presented by Mr. Stephen, but also to examine into the details of each sub-head, where such examination was deemed to be necessary, and to prove that the general results were arrived at without the aid of any improper manipulation of accounts, directly from the original entries made in proper chronological order from the various subsidiary books.

“We do not wish to convey the impression that the nature of the expenditure under each sub-head has to any considerable extent challenged our attention. Such an examination would, necessarily, occupy a considerable longer time than was at our disposal and would have transgressed the limits of our instructions. Neither did we examine into the matter of the distribution of stock.

“As the result of our investigation, however, we have no hesitation whatever in submitting our opinion that the statements furnished by the President and placed in our hands for verification, represent truthfully the actual condition of the Company's affairs as portrayed by the books of the Company.

“It is understood that if any further information is required in respect of specific items, the books are still open to our further scrutiny, whenever you may so determine or require.

“The books of the land grant bond trustees were also placed before us, for investigation, and were found practically to agree with the statement made by the President.

“We have the honour to be, Sir,  
“Your obedient servants,  
“COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,  
(Signed) “E. MIALL.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, having shown to the House the steps that have been taken to verify the Company's statement, I may ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I draw attention to the character of those expenditures. In the first instance, there can be no question as to the expenditure, \$23,078,929, on the main line from Callander to the crest of the Rocky Mountains. Then we come to the expenditure of \$3,759,793, being for Algoma Branch and Western Division branches, 295 miles being under construction in all. I think, Sir, that there is no hon. member who will not say that in the interests of Canada it would be impossible to find any expenditure to which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company could apply their money more important to the success of the enterprise, more important to the character of the work itself, or of more vital importance to the settlement and development of the great North-West. Every mile of those branches, constructed without any aid whatever from the Government, is calculated, I say, to serve the purpose that the Government had in view in making the contract—the development and advancement of the country, perhaps to a still greater degree in many instances, than a portion of the trunk line itself. I need not detain the House upon this item of \$4,025,604 for supplies. These supplies are rails and other materials for the purpose of carrying on the construction of the work. Rolling stock, \$6,130,792, is, of course, part of the contract on the main line between Callander and Port Moody, demanded under the contract, and every dollar is expended directly for the purposes for which the contract was made. The expenditure of \$552,251 for lake steamers is also an expenditure made for the purpose of facilitating the development of the work of carrying on the traffic and business of the country; and of, at the same time, promoting the construction of the portion which remains to be completed. The plant, tools, and outfit for construction are, of course, incidental to the construction, \$187,000, making for that service \$6,870,045, upon which, I think, no possible question will arise. Then, we have dividend on stock, \$2,128,000, which was, of course, incidental to the sale of the stock, and necessary to enable them to realize the \$2,535,628 obtained by the sale of the stock, for the purpose of constructing the road. The interest, &c., paid on land grant bonds, \$372,000, was, of course, a necessary expenditure to realize the money they received from the land. The deposit of \$8,710,240 with the Government on the guarantee was an expenditure also made directly for the same object as the payment of the dividend on the stock—the object of furnishing money for the completion of the contract. The extension from Callander to Montreal and Brockville, \$3,270,351; rolling stock, \$900,000; shops, \$516,032; tools and machinery, \$352,230, and real estate for termini, \$390,790, will be admitted, I think, by every person familiar with this question, to be expenditures of the most valuable character to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Every person is aware, Sir, that in the construction of a great trans-continental line, it was of the greatest importance to the character of the undertaking and to its standing, its position, and its success, that instead of commencing at an unknown point, such as Callander—which it would be impossible to make the financial men of the world understand; it was of the most vital consequence to the success of the work, in order to obtain the confidence of the public to carry it on

to completion and to make it successful after it was completed—that they should bring that terminus at Callander down to the city of Montreal, where it could be fairly and honestly claimed that there was an inter-oceanic line, extending from the Atlantic communication on the one side to the Pacific on the other. I think, Sir, it will not be necessary for me to say one word to show that, in the interests of Canada and of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it was impossible to make an expenditure which was more calculated to benefit the country and benefit the enterprise than the expenditure involved in carrying the terminus from Callander to Montreal. This makes an expenditure upon which, I think, there will be no difference of opinion of \$54,728,500. Then, there are further items covering in all the sum of \$3,966,865, for advances and accounts receivable; and these stand in a somewhat different position. It is quite true they are embraced, and they may be all held to be fairly embraced, within their charter. It provides for an extension to the seaboard, and the expenditure in connection with the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, and the South-Eastern are for purchases of the bonds of those roads and are, of course, a good asset held by them for the purpose of reaching the Atlantic seaboard from Montreal. The acquisition of the Atlantic and North-Western charter, and the expenditure under that charter of a considerable sum of money in connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Grand Trunk Railway by a line around the mountain at Montreal, is, of course, embraced within their charter. The expenditure to secure a controlling interest in the South-Eastern Railway was, of course, for the purpose of enabling them to place themselves in a position to draw traffic to the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the Atlantic seaboard, whether at New York, or Boston, or Portland, or St. Andrews, or St. John or Halifax. We, looking at it from the Maritime Provinces, are extremely anxious that they should go to a Canadian port; and I am glad to know that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company attach the greatest possible importance to getting the shortest line to the seaboard that they can, by an open winter port in Canada. The expenditure in connection with that matter—whether by connection with the International Railway, and thus making the shortest line that can be obtained from a Canadian port, open at all seasons of the year—is an expenditure which I believe every person who wishes to see this great trans-continental line of railway successful in drawing down traffic and travel from every section of the country, would be only too glad to see them make. It may be said that they aim also at obtaining access to Portland, Boston, and New York. Suppose they do. I say the Canadian Pacific Railway would fail in their duty in the great enterprise in which they are concerned, would fail in their duty to Canada if they did not take every practicable and feasible measure of drawing every pound of traffic they can draw from any port in the United States upon a Canadian line to be carried across the continent. Under these circumstances, I say, the expenditure which is made in that regard is one which, I believe, will commend itself to business men—and I am sure it will to railway men—as a sound and prudent consideration. I only regret that they did not when acquiring a railway to the city of Montreal go on to the real ocean port of Canada in summer, the city of Quebec; and I believe that it will be found necessary by that Company, notwithstanding that they have reached ocean communication at Montreal—I believe the interests of the Company will involve the necessity of their securing direct and complete through communication with the great ocean port of Canada, for the summer season, at the harbour of Quebec. I have no doubt that every measure will be taken that can be taken to attain that important object. I trust that, by the shortest line to the sea, reaching ports in the Maritime Provinces by a shorter line than the Intercolonial, and by

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

connecting the links which have been shadowed forth, in connection with this matter, they will never rest until they have come, not only to the harbour of Quebec for summer, but that, looking to the vital importance of having, as they will have, a great ocean port there in summer—the vital importance of having a Canadian port open throughout the whole year, winter as well as summer—they will never rest until they have established a route of communication to St. John, to Halifax, to St. Andrew's, and ultimately to Louisburgh. I say, Sir, the fact that when they have reached the harbour of Louisburgh, they will make it the interest of every man who has a letter to send or who wishes himself to pass in the shortest period of time from London to New York to go through that harbour, will compel the Company, in the interest of this great national work, not to rest short of attaining even that point as the ultimate object. But I have no hesitation in saying that the distance between Montreal and Halifax in winter can be so shortened by the measures that are in contemplation as to give every reason to believe that the Company will find it their interest, until Louisburgh is reached, to make Halifax at all times—in the winter at any rate—the great grain shipping port for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, with reference to the \$600,000 of stock subscribed by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Canadian North-West Land Company, that stands upon the same footing as many of these other measures. Why did they subscribe \$600,000 of stock in the North-West Land Company? Every person knows, who has been watching the proceedings of the Company, that they made a large sale of land to the Canadian North-West Land Company, and it was of great moment that the stock of that Company should be subscribed—should be placed in such a position as its inherent value deserved, for the purpose of rendering the Company's land operations successful, and thus giving them the means for promoting the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The advance to the contractors in construction of \$600,000, I understand to stand thus: A construction company was formed, embracing a large number of the members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, if not the Company itself, with a number of outside individuals who were prepared to go into a construction company, and the works were carried on by it. I expect, in response to the application of the hon. leader of the Opposition, to lay on the Table of the House, in the course of to-morrow, the contract with that Company, which will disclose its exact character; but I may say that, so long as the means were found by the construction company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company combined, to vigorously carry on the work, it was carried on in that way. But, when the time came—when, owing to the stringency of the money market in New York, and the depreciation of the property of the Company, it was impossible to obtain the means to carry on the work—they fell back on the principle of a guarantee in order to obtain funds from another source, and they closed their accounts with the construction company, to whom it appears they had made advances at that time of \$600,000. Then there is an item of sundry advances, carriers' back charges, and other matters, amounting to \$473,281, which are incidental expenses connected with every great undertaking of this kind. The next amount is the sum of \$184,614 paid in respect of securities deposited with the Government, in lieu of the \$1,000,000 cash deposit, to secure the completion of the contract. As the House is aware, the Government agreed to release the \$1,000,000 in cash, and to accept in its stead, \$1,680,000 of Credit Valley Railway bonds. It was found by my predecessor, the late hon. Minister of Public Works and has been found by myself and the hon. Minister of Public Works beside me, necessary—in order to give additional facilities to contractors to complete their work—to exchange the original cash deposit for real estate or a security of some other kind; and this action of the Government was simply in conformity

with the usual plan, adopted by the late Government as well as by this Government, in relation to all other contracts. And I presume—in fact I know—that this payment of \$484,614 represented stock belonging to Mr. Stephen in the Credit Valley Railway, and if that deposit is released, this money will go back to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to be used in prosecuting the enterprise. Now, Sir, having given as briefly as I could the character of these expenditures, I propose to show a little more in detail how the account will stand. On the main line, between Callander and Port Moody—on the eastern and central sections—with improvements made on the Government line west of Cross Lake, the expenditures have been as follows:—

*Main Line, between Callander and Port Moody, Eastern and Central Sections, with improvements made on the Government Line, west of Cross Lake.*

EXPENDITURE.		
Construction—Nipissing Division .....	\$3,249,971	
do Lake Superior Division .....	2,299,793	
do Western do .....	17,529,175	
		<b>\$23,078,929</b>
Equipment—rolling stock .....	\$6,130,792	
do steamers .....	552,251	
do tools and plants .....	187,002	
		<b>6,870,045</b>
Materials on hand—fuel .....	\$459,666	
do general stores .....	843,907	
do rails, ties, &c. ....	1,539,792	
Supplies for construction .....	1,521,474	
		<b>\$4,364,839</b>
Less advance on rails .....	339,235	
		<b>4,025,604</b>
Improvement on Government lines west of Cross Lake .....	353,606	
Five per cent. dividend on stock .....	\$2,128,000	
Interest, &c., on land grant bonds .....	372,880	
Deposit with Government on guarantee .....	8,710,240	
		<b>11,211,120</b>
<b>Total expenditure .....</b>		<b>\$45,539,304</b>

CASH RECEIVED.		
Cash subsidy paid by Government .....	\$12,289,212	
Proceeds of sales of land grant bonds .....	9,029,012	
Proceeds of sale of town sites .....	477,775	
		<b>\$21,795,999</b>
<b>Excess of expenditure over receipts .....</b>		<b>\$23,743,305</b>

*Main Line and Branches between Callander and Port Moody, Eastern and Central Sections, Branches with improvements made on the Government Line, west of Cross Lake.*

EXPENDITURE.		
Main line, as before stated .....	\$45,539,304	
Branches .....		
Algoma Branch .....	\$1,877,324	
Western Division Branch .....	1,892,469	
		<b>3,769,793</b>
<b>Total expenditure .....</b>		<b>\$49,299,097</b>

CASH RECEIVED.		
Main line, as before stated .....	\$21,795,999	
<b>Excess of expenditure over receipts .....</b>		<b>\$27,503,098</b>

*Main Line and Branches, between Montreal and Port Moody, Eastern and Central Sections, acquired Lines, Branches and Improvements, on Government Line West of Cross Lake.*

EXPENDITURE.		
Main line and branches, west of Callander, as before stated .....	\$49,299,097	
Acquired lines—		
Canada Central Railway .....	\$ 2,251,242	
Q.M.O. & O. Railway .....	180,853	
Improvements thereon .....	770,956	
Wife and Brockville Loop Line Branches .....	67,300	
		<b>3,270,351</b>
Rolling stock .....	900,000	
Shops—		
Montreal .....	\$362,620	
Parth .....	115,628	
Carlton Place .....	37,684	
		<b>516,032</b>
Tools and machinery .....	352,396	
Real-estate for termini and shops .....	290,799	
<b>Total expenditure .....</b>		<b>\$54,728,500</b>

CASH RECEIPTS.		
Main line and branches west of Callander, as before .....	\$ 21,795,999	
Net revenue—\$1,115,674 received .....	891,675	
		<b>22,687,674</b>

**Excess of expenditure over receipts .....** **\$32,040,626**

*Main Line, Branches and Extension, from Seaboard to Seaboard, Eastern and Central Sections, acquired Lines, Branches, Improvement in Government Line, West of Cross Lake, and advances on Lines to the Seaboard, &c.*

EXPENDITURE.		
Main line and branches between Montreal, Brockville and Kamloops, as before stated .....	\$54,728,500	
South Eastern Railway .....	\$ 1,582,327	
St. Lawrence & Ottawa Railway .....	69,900	
Atlantic & North-Western do .....	156,646	
Canada North-West Land Co. ....	600,097	
Advance to contractors on construction .....	600,000	
Mundry advances and carriers for back charges and other matters incidental to traffic, &c. ....	473,281	
Paid in respect of securities deposited with the Government in lieu of \$1,000,000 cash .....	484,614	
		<b>3,966,865</b>
<b>Total expenditure .....</b>		<b>\$58,695,365</b>

CASH RECEIPTS.		
Main line and branches between Montreal and Brockville and Kamloops, as before stated .....	\$22,687,674	

<b>Excess of Expenditure over Receipts .....</b>	<b>\$36,007,491</b>
Deduct advances, &c .....	3,966,865
	<b>\$32,040,626</b>

I trust under these circumstances we have heard the last, either in this House or out of it, of the unfounded statement—as I have proved it to be from the figures that I have submitted to the House—that this Company has taken the money received under this contract from the Government for the purpose of building a line of railway from Callander to Kamloops and expended it on outside enterprises, apart from and without any reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway. If we have not, I think we ought to have reached that point in the discussion. I may draw the attention of the House for a moment to the property that is to be covered by the lien. The Canadian Pacific Railway have property which, if realized at its fair value, is abundant to complete their contract without any assistance from any source. Having an enterprise on hand that has established itself beyond controversy as an enterprise based on a sound commercial foundation, they are in a position to say that with anything like a fair realization of the value of the property they possess they do not require assistance from any person. They are in a position to say to the Government, we can fall back upon our contract, we can disband our force of 9,000 men now operating near Lake Superior, we can draw in our expenditure, and by 1st May, 1891, we shall be enabled to sell land enough to provide with the net revenue for operating, all that we require. We shall have the means of completing our contract; but if you want that great work completed by the end of 1885, we ask you, not to give us an additional dollar, but to advance to us as the work proceeds the amount of \$22,500,000 for that purpose. I have told the House in the first place that they do not ask an additional dollar of subvention for the purpose of completing the contract they have made with the Government. I have told the House that the Company have the strongest confidence in the value of the subvention already given; that with the amount that can be obtained from the outside public, and that has been obtained from the outside public, they have the means of completing their contract. But while they do not ask the House to give them a single additional dollar they ask us to use the credit of this country—which, thanks to the management of my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Finance, never stood in a higher position—to obtain the means of accomplishing this

great national work by the end of 1885; and that without imposing the slightest shadow of a shade of additional burthen upon the Government or upon the country for the repayment of every dollar by the time the contract was to be completed, the 1st May, 1891. I say that if this is the position in which they are—and I think, I may venture to say, that hon. gentlemen opposite will not controvert the soundness of that position, will not question the fact that the security offered to the Government securing this temporary advance in order to quickly complete this great national work is abundant—we should not hesitate a single moment in giving that measure our support. Let me draw attention briefly to the property that is covered by this lien by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have already said that, if there is either one year's default in the payment of interest or default in the payment of the \$7,300,000 at the end of five years to cover the guarantee, or of the amount on the first day of May, 1891, if, by the first of May, 1892, every dollar of interest and every dollar of principal is not refunded to the Government of this advance, they propose that we shall become at once the possessors of the entire property of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. What does that embrace? That embraces the entire property from the ocean terminus at Montreal to Port Moody on the Pacific, it embraces the line on which they have paid over \$3,000,000 between Montreal and Callander, it embraces the line on which they have expended over \$2,000,000 the branch to Algoma Mills, it covers the 269 miles of branches in the North-West, it covers the three magnificent steamers that they are placing upon the route between Algoma Mills and Port Arthur, and it covers the entire 21,246,000 of acres of land that remain at the disposal of the Government. I shall not elaborate this question, because I do not anticipate that any hon. gentleman in this House will say for a single moment that the security is not so ample, that the value of the property pledged is not so enormous, as to place the possibility of failure or the possibility of our not having every dollar of principal and interest advanced to this Company refunded, beyond a question of any contingency or of doubt. I may say that this road will embrace, of the main line from Montreal to Port Moody, 2,886 miles, it will embrace 112 miles of branches belonging to the lines between Montreal and Callander, and it will embrace 395 miles of branches in the North-West, making a total of 3,393 miles of road. Let us look for a moment at the character of that security. The entire charge to which the road between Montreal and Callander is subject is \$5,323,333. The land grant earned by the Company and unsold at this moment is 10,002,305 acres, and the land grant unearned 11,244,295 acres, or a total land grant to which the Company is entitled when the road is finished of 21,246,600 acres, over the portion that they have sold. This land is subject to a lien of \$5,000,000, charged as security for the operation of the road, and, as I have already told the House, we do not propose in these Resolutions to release that lien. There is a very great misapprehension, I find, in some quarters on that point. There is no proposal in these Resolutions to release that \$5,000,000 of land grant bonds held by the Government as a security for the operation of the line for ten years. I may say that that is rather a matter of sentiment than otherwise, so far as the Government is concerned. We wish the contract to remain intact as we made it, and we, therefore, do not propose to release that lien, although we feel the most confident assurance that it is unnecessary to retain a single dollar of that \$5,000,000 of bonds for the security of a road when it is already shown that, with its unconnected portions, labouring under the greatest possible difficulty, its net earnings have been some \$978,000 within the last nine months. That the road when constructed will be a valuable property there can be no reason to doubt. That the road

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

this coming year will earn a very large amount of net profit over and above the expenses of its operation there cannot be a question; and, when opened from end to end, it is perfectly obvious that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be placed upon a thoroughly sound and complete commercial foundation, as one of the best lines of railway communication that is to be found in the country. Let us look a little more closely at what this 3,393 miles of road presents. I have already said that the entire land grant of the Company, the 21,246,000 of acres in the hands of the Government, over and above the small portion required to deal with the outstanding bonds, will be a security to the Government; and all the money derived from that source will come directly to the Government. The land grant bonds issued are \$10,000,000. Of this \$6,667,000 have been destroyed or cancelled. There are held by land companies, against instalments of purchase money not yet due, \$846,000, making \$7,513,000 of bonds that are either cancelled or held by land companies until they make payments on the lands purchased, and they then come in. That leaves the balance in the hands of the public \$2,487,000. The balance of purchase money of land bought by individuals not yet due, applicable to the redemption of this, is \$1,363,500, leaving a balance of issue not provided for of \$1,123,500 in all. So that, when this \$1,123,500 of land grant bonds that are outstanding is provided for, the whole 21,246,600 acres of land stand in the position of simply representing securities in the hands of the Government, or money that is to come into their hands as the land is sold. The extent then of the property placed in the hands of the Government is 21,246,600 acres of land and 3,393 miles of road. Suppose an improbable contingency—I will not say improbable—I will say an impossible contingency. There is not an intelligent man in this country who does not know that it is not within the range of possibility, with a lien of such an insignificant character upon a property of such magnificent proportions as I have shown this property to be, that any other result can happen than that every dollar of the principal and every dollar of the interest will come into the hands of the Government before a default of twelve months is made. I might dismiss that subject at once and forever from any consideration, were it not that it is just as well to look at a phase of this question that I think has not, perhaps, attracted public attention, and that is, the position the Government would be in, if this Company made twelve months' default in the payment of the last dollar of this money advanced for their assistance, or of the interest upon it at 5 per cent. Now, Sir, I have spoken of the lands and the railway. What will that road cost us, assuming that to-morrow after this arrangement is made, assuming that to-morrow they make default, assuming that to-morrow the Company were to abandon the work, what would be our position? And, Sir, it does not matter whether default is made now or at the end; the position, so far as these figures are concerned, will stand the same. I will show you what this 3,393 miles of road will cost the people of this country in case of the impossible contingency of default. I will put the land on both sides of the accident, the land which they have sold, and which netted them \$2.36 an acre on 3,753,400 acres. But, for the purpose of meeting the views of hon. gentlemen opposite as closely as I can regarding the value of these lands, I will call them worth \$2 an acre. If we call the subvention that goes to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of 25,000,000 acres of land worth \$2 an acre, it makes, with that which we pay in cash, and that which we paid in completed road, \$103,000,000; and that, I think, was the favourite calculation of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, I will charge ourselves with the 3,753,400 acres of land sold at \$2 an acre,

making \$7,506,800; I charge the advance on rails of \$339,235; I charge the cash subsidy paid, \$12,289,212; I charge the proposed advance of \$22,500,000; I charge the lien on the Canada Central and the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, \$5,333,333, assuming we will have to pay it if the road came into our hands; I charge the guarantee dividend on stock postponed, \$7,193,460; I charge the land grant bonds sold with no sales to redeem them, \$1,123,500; I charge the estimated cost of the work the Government has to build at \$28,000,000; I charge the balance of cash subsidy, \$12,710,788, and what is the total? I challenge the scrutiny of hon. gentlemen opposite; I will lay this paper on the table, and I invite the closest scrutiny and investigation as to whether this is not a fair statement of the position we would be in if, to-morrow, or at the end of two years, they made default, or if at any period they made default. In regard to this question, I say that is the account; every dollar is charged there that by any possibility the people of this country would have to pay for that 21,246,600 acres of land and 3,393 miles of road, without any charge upon it of any kind from end to end. The whole total is \$97,001,328. That is what the road would cost the people of this country. The paper is as follows:—

STATEMENT showing that should the Company fail to fulfil the terms upon which the loan is made, the Government will be seized of possession of the following property for the sums named below:—

*Extent of Property.*

Land .....	21,246,600 Acres.
Railway and branches .....	3,393 Miles.

*Which will Cost.*

3,753,400 acres land (sold) say its value at \$2 per acre.....	\$ 7,506,800
Advance on rails.....	339,235
Cash subsidy paid.....	12,289,212
Proposed advance of.....	22,500,000
Lien on Canada Central and Q.M.O. & O. Ry.....	5,333,333
Guarantee dividend on stock postponed.....	7,193,460
Land grant bonds sold, with no sales of land to redeem them	1,123,500
Estimated cost of Government work.....	28,000,000
Balance of cash subsidy.....	12,710,788
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$97,001,328</b>

Assuming the lands to be worth \$2 per acre, the following would be the position:—

21,246,600 acres at \$2 per acre.....	\$42,493,200
3,393 miles of railway at \$16,065 .....	54,508,128

Now, Sir, what more? What shall we do with the lands? I have charged the land they have used at \$2 per acre, and put it on the other side of the account, and showed equally what the lands have realized, and what our position would be, and what the road would cost us. I credit the road with the 21,246,600 acres of land at \$2 per acre, making \$42,493,200 of cash that will come back to us out of the \$97,000,000; and I take the completed road of 3,393 miles without a charge of a dollar upon it, from Montreal to Port Moody, costing the people of this country \$54,508,128. That is the total. So, Sir, I say that in that position there is no intelligent man who will say, in the first place, that there is a shadow of ground for supposing that every dollar of this principal, and every dollar of this interest, will not be returned, as provided for in these Resolutions, to the coffers of Canada. And I say, further, that in case of that impossible contingency arising, we would stand in the position after selling the lands—at the value these gentlemen have put upon them, the lands that would come into our hands, along with the 3,393 miles of main line and branches from Montreal to Port Moody—at a cost to the people of this country of \$54,508,128. Well, Sir, what will the Canadian Pacific Railway proper cost us?—that road, Sir, that hon. gentlemen opposite declared would cost \$120,000,000. I need not remind the House that when we were discussing this question before, the hon. leader of the Opposition gave to the House a careful calculation of what it would cost the Government of this country to build a road from Callander to Port Moody,

with not a mile of branches—the simple line from Callander to Port Moody; and the hon. gentleman stated that he had submitted the careful calculation in regard to this matter of his colleague, the former Minister of Public Works, who had been for years examining this question, and dealing with it as a Minister; and, Sir, these two hon. gentlemen came to the conclusion that the lowest amount for which the Canadian Pacific Railway could be built from Callander to Port Moody was—the hon. leader of the Opposition stated it—\$120,000,000. He submitted the calculation of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) my distinguished predecessor, containing the result of that hon. gentleman's most careful and accurate calculation, which put the cost of the road from Callander to Port Moody at, more accurately, \$121,700,000. Now, Sir, that is the value of the road, as stated by hon. gentlemen opposite—the lowest cost at which it could be built. It was true, Sir, I had estimated the cost of that line from Callander to Port Moody at \$84,000,000, and my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, took the opportunity of reminding me that that was not a railway, it was nothing but a tramway. That was after I had stated to the House the character of the road we expected to be able to construct, and I was unable to controvert the statement of the hon. gentleman because it was true. I had stated that, in the position in which we were placed, we had no alternative but to go forward and do the best we could, and I showed that the smallest amount for which we could construct the most inferior line of railway that would give us communication from Callander to Port Moody, would be \$84,000,000. I could not controvert the soundness of the hon. gentleman's calculation that the lowest cost for which a railway worth the name—as he called it—could be constructed was \$120,000,000, or, to state more accurately the calculation of my distinguished predecessor, \$121,700,000. Now, let us see what that is going to cost the people of this country under this Administration:

STATEMENT showing what the main line between Callander and Port Moody would cost the Government in the event of the Canadian Pacific Railway failing to repay the loan:

3,393 miles of main line branches and steamers cost.....	\$54,508,128
The 457 miles of main line and branches between Montreal, Broekville add Callander, cost \$23,550 per mile, amounting to .....	\$10,762,736
The 395 miles of branches west of Callander at the cost shown by the Company's accounts.....	3,759,793
The steamers cost.....	552,251
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$15,074,780</b>

Making a total of \$15,074,780, which should be deducted from the above sum, \$54,508,128, to arrive at the cost of the main line between Callander and Port Moody, showing the cost to Government of line between Callander and Port Moody..... \$39,433,348

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear;" but I will invite him to place his finger upon the slightest flaw or error in this calculation. I will stake, Sir, my standing in this House on the accuracy of the statement I have presented; and if the hon. gentleman can show that I have not given a fair, frank and unvarnished statement of the figures and facts as they stand out in the public records of the country and the documents before the House, then I will admit that I have no claim to the confidence of the House in regard to the statement I am making on this question. I have said there is only one point which is a question of estimate at all. There are two points. The one is the estimate that the work with the supplies on hand can be completed for \$27,000,000. Well, all I can say is that the Chief Engineer of the Department has gone carefully into that question, and, as the House is aware, has committed himself to the statement that he believes the figures of the Company may be accepted as accurate. With respect to the \$28,000,000 of expen-

ditures on works still under construction, I have given the House the figures down to the present moment, and I have no reason to believe they will be, to any considerable extent, increased. But I think the House will agree with me that there is a great difference between these amounts and \$120,000,000, the estimate of the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Blake). And I may say, in giving the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave, on an important occasion, his estimate, saying there was no reason to suppose that the construction of the line, even if due time were given, could be brought within \$100,000,000. I think, Sir, I have shown the House that between the estimates of the cost of this work on the part of the hon. leader of the Opposition, the leader of the late Government, and the Finance Minister of the late Government, and this amount of \$39,433,348, there is a pretty large margin. Under these circumstances, the line from Callander to Port Moody, 2,541 miles, would cost the people of this country about \$15,520 per mile, with ample equipment for service after completion. I need not discuss, I think, at any length, the question of the value of the land. I have placed the value of the lands sold by the Company at \$2 per acre against the road, and have credited the Government with the remaining lands at \$2 per acre, which hon. gentlemen opposite will not be likely to question. By reference to the speech made by the hon. leader of the Opposition it will be found that he estimated 11,500,000 acres of choice lands—as will be seen by *Hansard*, 1880, page 13—as worth \$4.04 per acre, making \$45,450,000; at \$3.18, \$35,775,000 and, addressing your humble servant, he said: "At your miserable \$2, \$22,500,000." So that the entire amount we are asked to advance to the Company by the proposed Resolutions for which there is not other ample security, is \$22,500,000, which sum the hon. leader of the Opposition declared that 11,500,000 acres of land at my miserable figure of \$2 would produce. So, I think, under those circumstances, the hon. gentleman is not likely to question the accuracy of the calculation which I have submitted to the House in which those lands are placed as worth \$2 per acre. On 17th December, 1880, the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave the House the benefit of his calculation, and (page 16, *Hansard*), he said: "And 18,750,000 acres of selected land worth to-day, as lands are selling in the North-West, at least \$37,500,000." And no person knew the value better than the hon. gentleman, because he was giving his attention to that question; and I am not at all certain, if I had been as free as the hon. gentleman to deal with lands in the North-West, I would not have been alongside him endeavouring to get the benefit of his judgment in making my selections. I am quite certain that from whatever quarter objection may come as to making this advance of \$22,500,000 it will not come from that hon. gentleman who has himself declared, so long ago as 1880, before the contract for the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was put in operation, when that country was comparatively dormant, when there was 100,000 less people located in the North-West than there are to-day, that 18,750,000 acres of selected lands were worth \$37,500,000—that hon. gentleman, I say, will not question the ample character of the security, when instead of 18,750,000 acres we have 21,246,000 acres to cover any advance. There is no doubt that, however valuable the lands were then, they are much more valuable to-day. No person in this country has been more enthusiastic in regard to the value of lands in the North-West than myself. I never was more enthusiastic in regard to their value than I am to-day. I say that the value those lands had when the hon. member for South Huron made the speech to which I have referred, is much greater to-day, when there are facilities for access, not only by the construction of the trunk line, but by 239 miles of branch

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

lines now in operation in the North-West. The hon. Mr. Anglin, your predecessor, said, on the 31st of December: "If the land is worth anything, if the country is worth settling at all, \$2 must be a low average indeed." I may add that, so far as the sales of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have gone, they fully justify and corroborate the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the value of the lands, because, on the 3,753,400 of acres already sold, they have received a net price of \$2.36 per acre. Now, Sir, I shall not have much more to say in regard to this question, except as to the value of the earnings of the road. I need not say to any person in the least degree acquainted with railway matters that, after all, the vital point, when you come to the question of value, is, what can the road earn? As to the ability of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to earn money, there was no doubt a large field for difference of opinion, for speculation, for calculation, as to whether the road would or would not be able to pay its working expenses. I will say nothing of those who were most despondent on that subject, but I will say that those who were most sanguine in this House and out of it, in regard to the character and position of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a commercial enterprise, were not prepared for the evidence which is already furnished, of the fact that all question as to the sound and commercial basis upon which that great national work is placed is completely set at rest. With the evidence already given of the power of the road to earn money, it is settled at once and forever that from this time forward, as the road advances, the receipts will be advanced; and that when we have this great trans-continental line completed from ocean to ocean we will be in the proud position of finding not only a great volume of traffic and travel drawn over the line, but that the railway will be in a position to make a more satisfactory return than was expected to those who had the enterprise and the courage, when it was a question of doubt, to put their means into this work and grapple with so gigantic an enterprise. I hold in my hand a statement of the gross earnings for 1883; and I find, estimating for the month of December, the amount not to be less than \$5,420,931. It is true this includes an amount for the transportation of construction materials and supplies of \$1,274,000. But there is no person at all acquainted with the development of the North-West who does not know that the development of that country, which is in its infancy at present, must be in the nature of things very rapid—so rapid that in every ensuing year more will be required in the way of transport to supply the demands of the population by the carriage of freight and passengers than the amount which is charged in this account for the transport of materials. But even deducting that amount and taking the actual traffic revenue, we have a sum of \$4,146,913 as against \$2,449,824, in 1882, an increase of \$1,697,089, on the earnings of the road during the past year over the preceding year. Then, as I have already said, the earnings of the last nine months, and which I have treated as the receipts of the Company, are no less than \$978,660. The announcement of that fact will show the House that the most sanguine expectations of the people who had most confidence in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway have been much more than verified by the actual facts as they are now before us. I shall only refer again for a single moment to the enterprise of the promoters. I refer to the gentlemen who originally formed the syndicate of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and I say, Sir, that the very difficulties with which they are now struggling, the very position in which they now find themselves placed, notwithstanding all that energy and enterprise and skill could do, is the best evidence of the courage with which they have grappled with this enterprise. It has been asked what money these gentlemen put into the Canadian Pacific Railway? Well, Sir, I have

shown that if you deduct the last dollar received from every source, there is a large balance standing against the Company for money contributed, after all they have received from cash subsidy, from sales of their land and their town sites, from the net profits of operating the line and from the stock they could sell even at the low price at which it sold—deducting it all, you have a balance still standing against these gentlemen. And what is the fact? Of course there is no syndicate now; the syndicate ceased to exist, when they organized the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and subsequently put the stock of the Company on the open market then it ceased to become their property, and it is now with the shareholders that we have to deal. But I cannot forget that there would have been no Canadian Pacific Railway Company, there would have been no such gigantic progress as there now is if these gentlemen had not had the courage, the energy or the enterprise to risk their own money to the extent of \$10,000,000, before asking the people of this country to put a single dollar into the purchase of stock. I say, that they had such confidence in this work that they imperilled their own capital; and if we had not had the good fortune to make this contract with men of great wealth, great resources, great energy and enterprise, and great experience, we would have had a most disastrous collapse in connection with this work, and all the progress and advancement and development which has taken place in connection with the rapid prosecution of this enterprise would not have existed to-day. I do not rest these Resolutions for a single moment on the low ground of any claim that these gentleman have. They have no claim. They made a contract and they received by the terms of that contract a magnificent subvention for the work, great as it was, that they were undertaking to deal with, and they have, no doubt, prospective profits of a large character before them. I do not ask for a moment that these Resolutions shall receive the consideration of the House on any such claim. I say, that if there was no disposition on the part of this House to meet their wishes and their interests in the slightest degree, these Resolutions must stand on the broader foundation of the interests of Canada itself. But, Sir, unless it can be shown, that apart from any claim, these gentlemen have that, in the interests of Canada, the means should be provided which are required to prosecute this work with the unabated vigour with which it has been prosecuted, then the Resolutions cannot commend themselves to the House. You will allow me to glance at a few figures—distasteful as they are to myself and to the House—which will show what has been the effect upon Canada of the prosecution of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

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

#### After Recess.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had drawn attention to the important fact that in case, from any cause, the Company should fail to pay every dollar of the \$22,500,000 to be advanced as the work proceeded, and for the purpose of carrying it to completion, or the interest thereon, the people of Canada would obtain the construction of the entire Canadian Pacific Railway—from Callander to Port Moody, for which Parliament provided a subvention (counting the land at \$2 an acre) of \$103,000,000—for less than \$40,000,000; and I assumed that that being the case, such a contingency was entirely impossible—that under no circumstances could it be supposed that a Company, possessed of a property which I have shown to be of such immense value, would fail to provide for the payment of a comparatively small sum of money such as is provided for by these Resolutions; and, assuming that they did pay the money, Parliament and the country would obtain the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway on precisely the terms

provided in the contract originally made with the Company. I showed further that such was the result of the operation of the line—yielding, as it has, a net profit of \$978,660 within the last nine months from the disjointed and disconnected sections of the road, as they now are—that I might assume, as I think I had a right to do, that all question as to the commercial value of the enterprise was entirely set at rest, and that we might fairly come to the conclusion that the Canadian Pacific Railway might be regarded henceforth as placed upon a thoroughly sound commercial basis. I showed that the present Government had adopted the policy of their predecessors in regard to what is called the monopoly in the Province of Manitoba; that when the late Government undertook to carry on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government work, they felt bound to protect the traffic of the road from being drawn off to lines to the south of us in the adjoining Republic, and had consequently refused to issue a proclamation which would charter lines within the Province of Manitoba to connect with American lines to the south. I said that the present Government, when we came into power, adopted that policy; that we felt, as our predecessors did, that, grappling with so gigantic a work as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we were bound to adopt every possible means of protecting our own line against having its traffic drawn to lines to the south—and, mark you, this was at a time when we did not contemplate at an early day carrying the Canadian Pacific Railway further than Port Arthur. I said further that when we made it obligatory upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to extend at once the line north of Lake Superior, giving us an all-rail route from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean, or from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, we felt obliged to give to that Company, upon which we imposed such onerous obligations, all the security that we had considered necessary, and that our predecessors in the Government had considered necessary, for the protection of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I am glad to be able to state to the House that, although, true to that policy, the Government refused to give assent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba to connect with American railways to the south, such is the evidence presented by the operation of the line so far as it has gone, such is the conclusion arrived at by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself in regard to the ability of a through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to take care of itself, and by the inherent power of its own advantages to maintain its position notwithstanding any competition to which it may be subjected—although we have no power, under the contract, to touch any portion of the country in the North-West Territories, we are now in a position to review and to reconsider the policy of the late Government, and the policy of the present Government, as to the continued necessity for any long period of protecting the Canadian Pacific Railway against competition. I am glad to be able to state to the House that such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself, that when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, connecting it with American railways to the south. I can give no better evidence to the House and the country of the advanced position which we consider this great enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway has attained, than when I say that I feel it is consistent with what we owe to the people of this country and to that great national work, that the Government should not deem it incumbent on themselves to pursue the restrictive policy within the Province of Manitoba, which we have hitherto been obliged to maintain. When the House rose, I was about to draw its attention for a few moments to the effect the rapid construction of the

Canadian Pacific Railway has had upon Canada, and I feel that it will not be wasting your time if, instead of giving you my own opinions in relation to that question or the general public sentiment with regard to it, I should for a few moments call your attention to figures and facts which place, I think, upon a foundation that nothing can shake, the evidence that the progress of Canada, under the rapid construction of this Canadian Pacific Railway, has surpassed anything that the most sanguine promoter of that great enterprise ever could have anticipated. Let me give you a statement of its effects upon the sale of land in the North-West. Our predecessors were engaged as actively as they felt was in the interests of the public service in the promotion of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When we succeeded them we felt obliged, in accordance with the opinion we had always professed, to grapple somewhat more vigorously with that work; but we were not able, down to the time that it was in our power to make this contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, to take such energetic action as I am glad to know has been taken by that Company since it received the approval of Parliament. I hold in my hands a statement showing the amount received on account of Dominion lands, homesteads, pre-emptions, sales, colonization companies, timber, grazing, minerals and miscellaneous receipts in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and I asked the hon. Minister of the Interior to divide this so as to show, as far as possible, by contrast, the effect upon this important question of the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. From the 1st July, 1870 to the 30th June, 1880, ten years, we received from all these services the sum of \$817,426; from the 1st of July, 1880, to the 31st December, 1883, we received \$3,572,836, giving the most palpable evidence possible to be given of the effect upon the development of the North-West Territories of the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is due during the next three years on pre-emptions, since 1880, in addition to the \$3,572,836 received since the first of July, 1880, no less than \$4,393,070. It would be impossible for me to give to the House more striking, more incontrovertible evidence of the effect upon the development of the North-West Territories caused by the rapid development and construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, than that furnished by the statement I have just submitted. Then, if you turn to the Department of Customs, what is the effect shown there upon the trade of that country by the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway? In 1880, the Customs receipts in Manitoba were \$79,766, and in the North-West Territories, outside of Manitoba, \$21,856; or a total receipt of Customs revenue in the North-West, including Manitoba, of \$319,622. In 1882, the Customs receipts in Manitoba were \$1,054,601, and in the North-West Territories, \$51,755, or a total of \$1,106,356. In 1883, they had risen from \$297,000, in 1880, to \$1,764,805 in Manitoba, and \$68,137 in the North-West Territories; or a total of \$1,832,942, in 1883, as compared with \$319,622, in 1880. It would be impossible for any evidence to establish more conclusively the enormous and rapid development of any country, consequent upon any action taken by a Government, than these figures establish. The total amount of duty collected in Manitoba and the North-West Territories from January 1st, 1881, to December 1st, 1883, was \$1,831,167 more than the total sum collected from June 30th, 1870, to December 31st, 1880. So that you have the striking evidence of a single year covering a larger amount of duties than the ten years previous. Now, Sir, I will draw your attention for a moment to the evidence given by another Department of the public service—that of Inland Revenue. It will hardly be necessary for me to allude to the fact that, under an Act which I had the honour of submitting to Parliament when Minister of Customs, in 1873, the Inland Revenue Department has not much to do, I am happy to say, in the North-West Territories,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

because, under that Act, we established what is called a Maine Liquor Law throughout the North-West Territories, which prevents the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors in any part of those Territories. The result of that enactment has abundantly justified it. It was with no small degree of satisfaction that I found, when it was proposed to take a section of the North-West Territory within the bounds of old Manitoba, that the people arose *en masse* against it, and protested against being carried into the Province of Manitoba on any other terms than that they could take the exclusion of intoxicating liquors which they then enjoyed in the North-West, and retain that provision when they became part of the Province of Manitoba. But in that Province, as you are aware, the Excise Department has had something to do, and the Excise revenue of 1879-80, was \$65,841, with \$1,567 for stamps in addition to Excise. The Excise revenue rose from \$65,000, in 1879-80, and \$96,000, in 1880-81, to \$184,750, in 1882-83, and to \$84,257 in the first six months of the fiscal year from July 1st to December 31st, 1883. From 1873-74 to 1879-80, six years, the Excise collected was \$215,000, whereas, from 1880-81, to December 31st, 1883, two years and a half, it was \$530,328. Then, if we come to another indication of the condition of the people and a very striking indication of the condition of the masses, of the people, the balances at the credit of depositors in the Government Savings Banks, we find additional evidence all pointing in the same direction. On December 31st, 1880, there were balances of \$153,589. On December 31st, 1883, the balance had risen to \$615,354, an increase since the contract was ratified with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of over \$400,000 of balances due to depositors in the Savings Banks. Then, if you take the evidence which the Post Office Department affords, you find the like gratifying indication of the remarkable progress of the country. I hold in my hand a statement showing the amount of mail matter posted at offices in Manitoba and the North-West during the period of one week in 1881, 1882 and 1883, and I am obliged to confine it to one week because I could not obtain the same general statistics in that Department as I was able to obtain in the others. In a single week in 1881, the letters and post cards mailed were 42,394, and the newspapers, books and samples, 6,552. For a week in March, 1882, there were 62,892 letters and post cards mailed, and 12,053 newspapers, books and samples. For the corresponding week in March, 1883, it had risen in a single year from 62,000 to 89,847, with 18,193 newspapers, books and samples. The money order business in Manitoba also exhibits a very striking illustration in the same way. The issues of money orders in 1875 were \$26,452.85; in 1876, \$29,139.73; in 1877, still less, \$28,350.25. In 1878, when of course the change of Administration gave new life and impetus to the people, they rose to \$46,751, in 1879 to \$69,986, in 1880 to \$172,396, and in six months to the 31st December, 1880, to \$107,101, making a total from the 30th June, 1875, to the 31st December, 1880, of \$480,000 issues of money orders in Manitoba. The amount of money order business done in Manitoba and the North-West Territories from the 1st of January, 1881, to the 31st December, 1883, was as follows: For the six months ended June 30th, 1881, \$114,270; for the year ended June 30th, 1882, \$398,241; for the year ended June 30th, 1883, \$677,722; and for the six months ended December 31st, 1883, \$347,854. From the 30th June, 1875, to the 31st December, 1880, the total issues were \$480,000, while in the six months ended the 31st December, 1883, they amounted to \$347,000, or nearly as much as in the whole of those previous years, and the total from the 1st January, 1881, to the 31st December, 1883, was \$1,538,088. Now the most striking illustration perhaps of all, the most striking evidence of all of the rapid development of the North-West, that in which we are all the most interested, is the number of immigrants that we

are enabled to attract into the country. We all know that we have in Manitoba and the great North-West Territories an unbounded field for development. We all know that in that country we have the great remaining wheat field not only of British North America but of North America itself. We all know that Mr. Consul Taylor, the American Consul for the last twenty years at Winnipeg, and a high authority, has publicly declared that three-fourths of the remaining wheat belt of North America lies to the north of the boundary line. We all know, in the first place, that the soil of that country exceeds in fertility the soil of any part, I may say, of the known world—certainly there is in the wheat bearing States to the south of us no parallel to be found to the fertility of the soil in the Canadian North-West. We know now, Sir, that we have 25,000,000 acres of magnificent farming lands that for fertility cannot be surpassed on any portion of the civilized globe. But, Sir, notwithstanding that we have that unbounded field for development, we were able to accomplish but little, and we never would have accomplished much, towards its development, but for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, the best evidence we have that at this moment the eyes of the world, the eyes of those who, in the older and more thickly populated countries of Europe, are looking for a newer and better field for their labour and their exertions, is what is taking place now across the water. We know that their eyes are concentrated upon the North-West of Canada as they never would have been, and never could have been concentrated, but for the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. And, Sir, we know, not only that we have a field of boundless extent for development, but that in addition to the fertility of the soil, the character of the wheat that is grown in that northern clime surpasses in excellence the character of the wheat that can be grown in any southern or more genial clime. So, Sir, from every point of view from which we may be pleased to look, we see boundless possibilities in that country. We all regard every means for the development of that country as the means, and the only means, by which Canada can rapidly become a great and prosperous country, and attain such a position as every true Canadian must desire to see her attain, and that at a very early date. It would be impossible to over-estimate the effects that this rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the measures taken by that Company to diffuse throughout the world information in regard to that country, have had in drawing immigration into it. Now, Sir, let me give you the figures touching immigration, and what do they show? Why, Sir, they show that the total number of persons who entered the North-West during the ten years previous to letting the contract to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that is, from 1871 to 1880 inclusive, was 64,755. The total number who entered the North-West since the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was signed, that is, during 1881, 1882 and 1883, is no less than 149,560 immigrants. The total value of the money and effects brought to the Dominion—and that is an entirely secondary consideration to that which is more valuable than money—that industry and labour which is necessary to create great national wealth—I say, even in that regard there is great progress, for the total amount brought in by settlers in 1875 to 1880 inclusive, as nearly as it can be ascertained in six years, was some \$6,000,000; while during the past three years the sum taken into the North-West, at the lowest rate, can be placed at over \$15,000,000. I leave these figures to the House as evidence of the effect produced in the development of the North-West Territories by the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, a very important point in connection with immigration is the cost of carrying immigrants into the North-West. The first question

asked by an immigrant in any part of the Continent of Europe or in Great Britain, when he proposes to come to this country is, what is the cost of my being able to get there? And the question of a few dollars in the difference of cost very frequently, as any gentleman who has any knowledge of the subject knows, diverts the immigrant from one line to another. Now, Sir, the published charge on the all-rail route from Quebec to Winnipeg, at the present moment is \$31.50; the charge *via* the lakes and Duluth on the all-rail route from Quebec to Winnipeg is \$25.50. The figures I have given are those that prevailed for some years, but an arrangement that has been in operation for the last two years, has reduced the charge from Quebec to Winnipeg to \$21.64, and *via* the lakes and Duluth to \$16.64. I believe, Sir, these rates have never been published. But, in consequence of the rapid progress made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it is now in our power to say to the immigrants on the Continent of Europe, and in the British Isles, that the rate from Quebec to Winnipeg, *via* Port Arthur, will be reduced this spring from \$31.50 to \$12, and from Montreal to Winnipeg, *via* Port Arthur, to \$10. I need not say to the House what an enormous impetus this change in the cost of carrying immigrants into that country will naturally produce upon the volume of immigration that will be thrown into it. I desire, Sir, to say a single word here in regard to a point that has attracted some attention in a portion of the press of this country, and that is: that an arrangement has been made at a comparatively low rate for immigrants coming by New York, over the Erie Railway, and making connection at Brockville, thus reaching Winnipeg *via* the port of New York, at an unprecedentedly low rate. I may say, Sir, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had nothing whatever to do with that arrangement. My hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, is responsible for that arrangement; and I will make a statement to the House that will satisfy every man in Canada that he would altogether have failed in his duty to the country if he had not adopted that course. Every person will acknowledge the immense importance of reducing the rate for immigrants from Quebec to Winnipeg from \$31.50, the published rate, down to \$12. Every person will see at a glance the enormous tide of immigration that will be brought into that country by that change. But, Sir, there was this difficulty, that if you made that low rate by the Allan steamers to the port of Quebec, and did not provide for a correspondingly low rate to the port of New York, the effect would have been this: At this moment, as you are aware, on the Continent of Europe, all the emigration service is performed by agents of steamships lines, and the moment that the rate was cut down to that low figure by the Allan line of steamers to Quebec, and there was not a corresponding reduction by New York, you would enlist the services of every emigration agent on the Continent of Europe and throughout Great Britain also, who was in the interest of the lines of steamers running to New York—not against the Allan line of steamers—for they dare not do that, but to denounce and decry Canada, as the only means by which they could serve the interest of the Allan steamers sailing to New York. It thus became absolutely essential in the interests of Canada that we should have not only this low rate of passage and this communication from Quebec, but that in order to retain our hold, and to strengthen our hold, which we are most anxious to do, upon the immigration from the Continent of Europe, we should prevent that which was otherwise inevitable, and that was that every agent for every line of steamships sailing to New York from Great Britain or the Continent, would from Monday morning to Saturday night, year in and year out, would have been denouncing Canada for the purpose of holding immigration to the port of New York. Under these circumstances, I am sure, Sir, there are no men in this country who would not feel that our policy was in the interests of Canada and in the

interests of Quebec, for the moment you set every immigrant agent on the Continent of Europe against this country and thus prevent people coming by the Canadian Lines of steamships, you take most effective means to prevent the great tide and volume of immigration which, under existing circumstances, will naturally flow to Canada through the port of Quebec. Of course, we all know the importance of saving the distance as well as lowering the rate. Men who were obliged to go by Chicago to Winnipeg had not only to pay \$31.50 instead of going through Canada for \$12, but they were obliged to run the gauntlet of a long journey through the United States, during which every possible inducement could be used by agents of land and railway companies to prevent them ever reaching the Canadian North-West. That is one of the great objects attained by the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is one of the great objects attained by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in obtaining a line from Montreal through to Winnipeg, and in that way we have not only avoided exposing immigrants, who would otherwise be liable to be taken off our lines to other sections, by carrying them by a route entirely through Canadian territory, as they will be carried next spring; but they will avoid a circuitous journey of 500 miles longer and be taken by a direct line from Quebec to Winnipeg, through our own territory instead of round by Chicago. I want to place a very condensed calculation before the House in respect of the capabilities of the North-West. I am not going to deal with the question of a little difficulty that has occurred in consequence of the frost during the past season. It has been greatly magnified, greatly to the disparagement of the North-West and Canada. But they had frost in Ontario, Dakota and Minnesota, and even in New York State, and those who were not fortunate enough to get their crops in early have suffered to a greater or less extent. It only requires a little more prompt and energetic action on the part of the farming population in getting their crops in early in spring to avoid any contingency of that kind in the future, and of course it was an entirely exceptional year. But I may say that I believe there are few members of this House, much as our attention has been turned to the development of the North West, who have begun to contemplate in all its fulness what the capabilities of that great country are. I have spoken of its enormous extent, of the unexampled fertility of the soil, of the splendid description of wheat that can only be produced in these more northern and colder climes. But let me just ask the attention of the House for a single moment to a few figures which will indicate what the capabilities of that country are in regard to the production of wheat. One hundred thousand farmers, each farmer cultivating 320 acres of wheat land—has any hon. member made the calculation of what they would produce?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad the hon. gentleman has done so. I am glad his attention has been drawn to the fact that 100,000 farmers cultivating 320 acres each, or 200,000 farmers cultivating half that quantity each, and taking the product at only 20 bushels to the acre, instead of 27 or 30, which is the average in the North-West in favourable years, would give 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 50 per cent. more wheat than the whole United States produces to-day. You have only to look at those figures for a single moment to see what the future of Canada is, to see what a magnificent granary for the world is placed in our Canadian North-West; and when you remember we have six belts running through that fertile country that would each give 320 acres each to 100,000 farmers, you can understand to some little degree what a magnificent future awaits us in the development of that great country. And,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir, I say that I believe Canada has just reason to be proud of the fact, and all history will give credit to the people of this Dominion, because they had the courage, the daring I may say, to grapple with the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, when the United States had a population of over 38,000,000, the world was astounded at the fact that they undertook to secure the construction of a trans-continental railway. It attracted the attention of the civilized world, and day by day it was heralded in the press as an astounding fact, that the United States had undertaken to construct the Union and Central Pacific Railway. Why, the Union and Central Pacific all told were nothing like as long as the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Union and Central Pacific only covered some 1,900 miles of road, while the Canadian Pacific Railway proper covers 2,541 miles; and yet four and a half millions of Canadians, which we were then, had the courage to undertake a greater work than that which was undertaken by 38,000,000 of people in the United States, and which attracted the admiration of the world. I say, and I say it fearlessly, that history does not furnish to-day an example of a more courageous, a more daring and more energetic enterprise than that which was undertaken by the Government of Canada, when they said: We have a magnificent North-West to develop. We have a great country, half of the continent of North America, placed under our control and management, and for which we are responsible; and with these responsibilities we will do and dare what only men who feel they can rely confidently upon the resources of a great country, half a continent, ought to dare and undertake; and if the present generation do not give us credit for it, in all time to come it will be regarded as one of the greatest accomplishments of the century in which we live, that we had the vigour and daring to grapple with that great enterprise. Providence has favoured us. God and nature have marked out on the face of the Canadian Dominion the shortest and best route for a trans-continental line of railway. Providence has marked out and placed within our borders and within our reach a line of communication from ocean to ocean, the shortest that can be found, a shorter connection with the east and the old world than any other. Providence has placed within our borders a line of railway, a larger portion of which runs through a more fertile country than is to be found on the continent of America. Providence has placed in our hands and under our management a line of railway in which the pass through the Rocky Mountains is lower, the Rocky Mountain section is shorter, and the snow-fall is lighter than on either the Northern or Union and Central Pacific. This road, when completed, makes it shorter for the man living in Chicago—to say nothing of our own people—who wishes to reach the Pacific Ocean, to take the Canadian Pacific Railway by the nearest approach he can obtain and pass to Port Moody, thereby obtaining a shorter line of travel than he could take to San Francisco within his own country. Under these circumstances the Government of Canada have discharged what they believed to be their duty to their country in grappling as they have grappled with this great question. I say, Sir, with the evidence that we have before us of the unexampled and unprecedented development which has followed our efforts in this regard, we would be faithless to our obligations and to our country if we neglected to adopt the simple means which are now propounded for the consideration of Parliament, of accomplishing the rapid and early completion of that great national enterprise. I know too well how thoroughly this question of the Canadian Pacific Railway has sunk into the hearts and minds of the people of Canada, to have the slightest doubt or hesitation in assuming that this Parliament will, on the present occasion, as it has on previous occasions, give a hearty and generous response to the proposal of the Government. We would be unworthy the position we occupy—the advanced position we occupy on this Continent in regard to

this great national measure—if having put our hands to the plough we were to turn back, or for a single moment shrink from the plain and obvious duty which devolves upon us of carrying this great national work to completion at the earliest possible moment in our power. Let us contemplate, for a moment, what would be the effect of turning back at this juncture. We have obtained a position in the estimation of the mother country and of the world, we have obtained a status by the rapid construction of this gigantic enterprise that Canada could not have obtained in twenty years by any other means. With that fact, patent and lying on the surface, in regard to this great question, the people of Canada will demand at our hands that when the opportunity presents itself of obtaining without the cost to the country of a single dollar of additional subvention, the completion in two years of a work which otherwise would take until 1891—they will demand that without hesitation we should, in the interests of Canada adopt the course which is indicated in these Resolutions. As I said before, I ask this not in the interests of any body of gentlemen—not in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—I ask it, Sir, from this House, as the people of this country will demand it from us in the interests of the country to which we belong, of Canada of which we are so justly proud. Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I believe that whatever other predictions the hon. gentleman may have made in respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway in the past, which have hardly yet come true, whatever other predictions he may have made to-night, which may yet be falsified, one prediction he has made, which, I dare say, he has taken steps to see shall be verified, namely, that the Resolutions shall not be lost, but shall carry. Notwithstanding, it is my duty to point out to an Assembly, which, I am well aware, does not receive with acceptance the views which I entertain, some positions which, I think, are fit to be considered by the House, fit to be considered by the country, before a decision is reached on the important question which is submitted to us. It is an important question. The hon. gentleman has treated it as one of very small moment to a country of such ample extent, of such large resources, with a glorious present, with such a wondrous future as he has depicted, to enter into additional engagements involving thirty millions of money—as really not of much consequence. And when it is so absolutely certain, as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, that the engagement is only nominal, formal, temporary, sure to be redeemed, it is of less consequence still. But, Sir, I think the people at large will believe that before Parliament should have been called on even to take the initiatory step which the hon. gentleman proposes we shall this night take, it was right that we should have been placed in possession of more information—more detailed information; that more light should have been thrown on the situation in many respects than that which has been vouchsafed to us. It is not to be forgotten that for years past we have been moving for information upon important particulars connected with the progress and operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, answers to which have not even now been vouchsafed. It is not to be forgotten with reference to that the price which the stock realized, the mode in which it was distributed amongst the corporators, the values actually obtained for it, the prices in stock which were paid for certain works: it is not to be forgotten that with reference to the contracts which the Company have entered into, information has been asked, not this Session only, but in previous Sessions; guaranteed, so far as the Government were concerned—in words—guaranteed, so far as assent by this House was given—in words—but not followed by any effectual result; and that to-day we are asked

to go into Committee in the face of these repeated and ineffectual demands for that information, which, in part under the law of the land, the Company was bound from year to year to supply, and in part, under the powers which this House and Government possess, it was on demand also bound to supply. Information has been given us this Session with reference to this proposal, and the usual papers have in part been laid on the Table. But the hon. gentleman presses forward the consideration of his proposal before these papers have been printed, before they become accessible to hon. members. I happen to have been able to read in manuscript some portion of it, and only some portion. I am not aware that any other member of the two hundred and odd who compose this Chamber and are supposed to take an interest in this question, have read any portion of these papers, save the letter of Mr. Stephen, which has appeared in public print. Of course I except hon. gentlemen who belong to the Administration and who had previous opportunities for reading, as they were responsible for these papers; but those of us who have not had that advantage are called upon, as I say, to take the initial step without having had a fair opportunity of seeing what the grounds are. The statement which the hon. gentleman himself has made to-night—the maze of figures into which he entered—varies in some particulars—not, perhaps, of any very great consequence, but sufficiently so to derange the calculation somewhat—from that which is presented in the letter of the President of the Company; and some more light, it is true, he has thrown on some of the details, in the speech he has made to us. But that light—partial though it is, dim though it is, microscopic though the gleam is that is thrown on the subject—is all in respect of points on which information has been repeatedly demanded, and, up to this time, practically refused. Now, Sir, the proposal is one of extreme gravity. To those of us who remember the discussion which took place when this contract was entered into—to those of us who remember the observations which from time to time were made by hon. members who sustained that contract, it comes as a very unpleasing surprise. Why, were we not told that the country felt uneasy as to the unknown quantity of the possible demands in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway? Were we not told that the country was decided, and that Parliament, expressing the views of the country, was determined, that once for all it should be definitely settled what the limit of our obligations was? Were we not told that it was better for us to know how much it was, even though it was a large sum, and make up our minds to it, and have an end to the matter? Why, it was only a Session or two ago that an hon. member—I think the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beatty)—recurring to the subject, then perhaps somewhat stale, said that the people were satisfied about it, because they felt such an ease at knowing the limit of their obligation. There it was, and we buckled ourselves to the work, and braced our shoulders to the enterprise, knowing the price of the Government sections and the amount of the cash subsidy, and knowing perfectly well that we should not be called upon for any more. Well, some two or three years have elapsed since the contract was made, and we are called upon to advance \$22,500,000 cash—a sum very nearly equal to the original subsidy, and to pledge our credit for nearly \$7,500,000 more; so that the element of finality, which was so paraded as one of the things which was to cause the contract to be favourably received by the House and the country, has pretty well vanished from the scene to-night. Were we not also told, time and again, of the enormous resources, wealth, and credit of the syndicate with whom the contract was made—that this was a consideration of the utmost consequence—that it was so important to enlist not merely Canadians, but capitalists in other countries, in the States, in England, in

France, with such ample means that they were themselves able to build a Canadian Pacific Railway? Were we not told time and again that we were ensured in the successful completion of the contract by the enormous resources of credit, and of capital, and of confidence which had clustered round the corporators to whom hon. gentlemen opposite entrusted the work? It is not so long ago that this statement was very emphatically repeated. It was not merely at the time of the passage of the contract that it did good service; it was not merely in that House which I always thought—and I say it to its credit—was somewhat reluctant to accept the contract, that this statement was made; but at a later period—some time in November, 1881—the hon. leader of the Government made this statement at Toronto:

“What have we done? We went to England; we opened negotiations with capitalists of France, England and New York. We did not want to have only one string to our bow. We made a selection from these three great markets of capital, and we have formed the strongest and most enterprising body of capitalists that ever built a railway from the beginning of railways to the present time.”

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it appears they have a sleeping partner, the Dominion of Canada.

“The whole country sees it. The whole country knows it. At this moment they are laying down a mile and a half of railway every day, and should no unexpected accident or misfortune happen, they intend and believe they will have the whole railway constructed from the Red River to the foot of the Rocky Mountains before the snows of 1882 fall.”

Well, they did not quite do that. They did not quite carry out the scheme which the hon. gentleman was sanguine enough to hope they would carry out, namely, complete the railway to the foot of the Rocky Mountains by the end of 1882.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very nearly.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, they did not do it; and you may conceive how gigantic were their plans when that was their hope, although what they did do is set forth as wholly unprecedented. Now, it seems that this great combination of capital, the strongest that was ever formed—comprising the strength of Canada, of the United States, of England and of France—yes, the strongest that was ever formed from the beginning of the world to to-day—comes—to do what? Comes to ask us for some more money, in order that they may—earlier, it is true—but in order that they may implement the work which they contracted to perform; and it seems that the boast which, for the last year or two, has been resounding continuously in our ears—the statement which we have heard repeated time and again, that the Government and the Parliament which passed the contract were vindicated—vindicated triumphantly—because of the wonderful display of capital, of credit, and of energy on the part of the corporators—because they were going so fast and so far—because they were going to complete the railway at such an early date—is a statement which is to be taken with this rather large grain of allowance, that they will do it if we pay for it. Now, there is another point which was much discussed at the time of the contract, and in respect to which also this night vindicates our position. We heard the hon. gentleman point out—with an appreciation, some three years late, of what the interests of the country require—that it was important, in the interest of Canada, that there should be a new allocation of the subsidies for the construction of the road. It has now dawned upon his mind—he has now after three years of reflection and experience ascertained—that it is positively dangerous to Canada that the road should be paid for not by a *pro rata* but by a mileage rate. He says that in the interest of Canada—not at all in the interest of the Company, oh no!—it is important we should take care that the Company does not get an excessive subsidy for the lighter work that remains to be done, because if that should happen,

Mr. BLAKE.

when they come to the heavy 95 miles of which he spoke, where would be the money to build it. He forgot that they were already at the 95 miles, that they were stopped there and that the difficulty was not in the present condition of the contract, that the money would be gone in the lighter work before they came to the heavy, but that they were at the heavy work and they wanted to get part of the money allocated to the light which is to come after. But, as I said, it is about three years too late, and I am sorry we could not persuade the hon. gentleman at an earlier period of the soundness of the view he takes to-night. We argued that the subsidies should be distributed in proportion to the whole cost of the work. We declared that it was important, in the interest of the country that, if certain lands and certain moneys were to be paid to this Company for the work, they should get it in proportion as the total amount of subsidy was to the value of the work to be done at a particular point. We pointed out that the hon. gentleman was applying a different principle—and to that very portion of the work which would be earliest done he gave a wholly disproportionate part of the subsidy. We pointed out that thus the resources which were to be retained for the heavy work would be gone before the heavy work was reached, and we begged that the principle of *pro rata* distribution should be applied at a time when it might have been usefully applied. But the hon. gentleman could not be persuaded by us. Oh, no, he said, we admit that the subsidy is wholly disproportionate for the prairie part relatively to the subsidies for the other part of the work. There is no doubt, that we might arrange to pay according to the proportionate value of the work. But we deliberately decline to adopt any such principle. We intend that the earliest and lightest work shall have far more in proportion than that which is to be given for the late and heavy work. Now that the Company have come to the heavy work they want the position reversed. They have had all the benefit practically of the other position, of getting a disproportionate share of the subsidy on the principle of mileage rates assigned to the different sections, and having come to the heavy work, it is now proposed that another principle shall apply which shall help them out of that difficulty. I have said the resources which were due to the ends of the work are gone, and it is necessary to see that full inquiry is made, as to how it is that these resources have disappeared. That is the prime duty of this House before even approaching the consideration of the question whether it will give more. It was the prime duty of this House to watch that subject, altogether apart from the question of giving more—it was the duty of the House to watch it, having, as it had, the right to see what the contracts were and to consider how the work was really going on; but to-day, when it is indicated that to carry out the plans into which the Company and the Government have entered, it is necessary that this enormous advance should be made, it becomes obviously an imperative duty on our part to ascertain how the account for the past really stands; how it happens that so large a sum has been expended in the work which has been done. Now, for the prairie in the North-West, roughly calculating what the hon. gentleman's figures gave, I apprehend that independent of equipment, and, I presume, without ballasting, the road in the North-West, the main line, must have cost something close upon \$18,000 a mile; and I have never been able to see how such a figure could be justified as the fair cost of constructing that line through that country. If you look at the price which the hon. gentleman has affixed to the branches in the North-West, you will find a very different statement as to the mileage cost there. I said the other day, and I repeat now, that a large portion of this expense is probably due to speed. You cannot build a railway at the rate at which this has been built without paying more for its construction than you would if it were built at the ordinary speed, or at a speed

not so extraordinary as to be called "absolutely unprecedented." I repeat such speed as this means cost, and that it was quite impossible, whether with reference to location, whether with reference to economical arrangements for construction, whether with reference to the supply of labour or materials, the road could have been built as cheaply at the rate at which it was built, as it could be if a more moderate rate of speed had been adopted. But there is another question, and it is a question to which I have directed attention several times. How has it been built? By whom has it been built? I have called for information upon that subject. The law called for it. The Consolidated Railway Act made it the statutory duty of this Company to return to the Minister of Railways in each year, on the 30th of June, the contracts which had been made for the construction of the railway. That law was violated by this Company. They deliberately disobeyed it. They did not return those contracts. Parliament was informed of that violation. I asked repeatedly for the contracts. Eventually I moved for one contract and the instrument of association of the North American Contracting Company, but Parliament declined to have the law enforced and would not order the production of these papers. Parliament preferred to be kept in ignorance as to these things which the law had said should be disclosed. And to-night, although Parliament has recanted rather that view within the last few days, although we unanimously passed Addresses calling for the production of those contracts and representing that it was of high public consequence that this law should be obeyed and those contracts should be produced, still the law is not obeyed, still the contracts are not produced; and it is only in the speech of the Minister when he invites the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the proposition that we are let, to a small extent, into the character of the arrangements for construction. And the hon. gentleman now informs us that the work has been done by a contracting or construction company, in which were many members of the syndicate. So that the corporation has been contracting with its own members for construction. He tells us that that arrangement has now terminated, that it terminated when the supplies terminated, that it terminated when they could no longer find money to keep the construction company going; and amongst the sums embraced in the total of \$58,700,000, which the President of the Company claims credit for, as having provided for the construction of the road, is a debit balance against the construction company, and in favour of the Syndicate, of \$600,000; so that although they stopped operations because there was no money to pay them with, they did not do work within \$600,000 of the money that was in their hands already, paid in advance. And it seems these were the arrangements, so far as light has already been thrown upon them, between the Company and its construction company. Now, Sir, I do not think I do injustice to the Company and its corporators in assuming, since the hon. gentleman has said that many members of the Company were corporators in this Company, that several directors of the Company were corporators in it. I may say I have no knowledge on the subject. I have moved repeatedly and I have been unable to obtain the information as yet. The hon. gentleman indicates that he will lay it on the Table, shortly: I suppose after we have decided what we shall do.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To-morrow, I hope.

Mr. BLAKE. To-morrow. Then we are not going to decide to-night, I hope. Whether I do injustice or not, I shall assume, in the absence of the information, that several of the directors of the Company are also members of the construction company. Now, what relation does a director of the Company who contracts with the Company, whether as a member of the construction company or not, occupy? As a director

of the Company he is bound to consider whether the contract is a favourable one for the Company or not. As a member of the contracting company he is bound to consider whether the contract is favourable to the contracting company or not. It is a somewhat difficult task which he undertakes to decide, to hold the balance just, to do no injustice to the railway company, and to do no injustice to the contracting company, under such circumstances. Parliament has thought that men ought not to be placed in such an invidious position, and for fear that in the conflict between their interest and their duty, interest might prevail over duty, it has forbidden such arrangements; for in the Consolidated Railway Act of the hon. gentleman, it is provided that:

"No person holding any office, place or employment in, or being concerned or interested in any contract under or with the Company, shall be capable of being chosen a director or of holding the office of director: nor shall any person being a director of the Company enter into or be directly or indirectly for his own use or benefit interested in any contract with the company not relating to the purchase of land, necessary for the railway, or be or become a partner of any contractor with the company."

And if, therefore, it be the case that this contracting company is composed practically, to a large extent—of directors of the railway company which made the contract, I apprehend they have violated not merely the spirit, but also the letter of the law; and that we may look with not unnatural suspicion upon any such contract. The law also provides that no contracts for work of construction or maintenance, etc., shall be entered into until after tenders have been invited in advertisements given at least four weeks in some newspaper published in the place nearest to that at which the work is required to be done. I do not know how many hon. members saw the advertisement published by the Canadian Pacific Company calling for tenders. I do not know in what newspapers it was published. I dare say it was published; but I dare say it was published in newspapers which do not receive a very extensive circulation. I know I was never able to hear of any invitation to the general public to tender for the works of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and I am not surprised if, as a matter of fact, the works constructed by the railway company have been constructed by a contracting company composed largely of the directors of that corporation. Now, we pointed out when the contract was being discussed in Parliament the possibility of arrangements of this description, the possibility of a larger price being thus obtained for the work than the work really cost; and I say again that we are entitled,—especially are we entitled, in view of the refusal to inform us, in view of the defiance of the law to which I have referred, in view of the statement made at this last moment by the Minister,—we are entitled to full and searching enquiry into this matter as a preliminary to considering what further and more intimate relations we shall engage in with this corporation. It may be, although the contracting company has been dissolved, or has ceased its operations, that, if the fountains of Canadian liberality are opened once again, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman said it had stopped because the supplies had stopped—when the supplies are re-opened the company may be reorganized, and we may find that just so long as our liberality lasts the contracting company will be ready to spend the moneys which we liberally provide. But, I do not think that will be satisfactory to the people of the country, and I maintain that full enquiry upon this subject, searching enquiry, exhaustive enquiry, rigid enquiry, should precede, if this House is to do its duty, any recognition of any demands made by the Company, or any suggestion by the Government, that we should further involve ourselves with it. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman has said that it is demonstrated that the public funds have been used, have been used altogether—and far more than the public funds—on the contracted

line; and he seems to think that it is wholly unnecessary to enter into many considerations which have been urged as pertinent to the present position of the Company, in view of the figures which he laid before us. I pointed out in the past, I pointed out the other day, and I point out to-night, that there is much more than the question of cash in this matter; that there were two important questions besides; that if you ally to cash, credit, there was the question of the responsibility involved in the various other enterprises, to which the hon. gentleman has not made an allusion. There was also the question of the energy, the time, the labour involved in connection with those other enterprises; and besides all that, there was the grave question of policy involved, in a company in the position and obliged to make the demands upon public confidence, which the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be obliged to do, according to the programme now before us, in involving itself in enterprises not connected with the original enterprise at all, so disconnected with it that, large, wide, ample as were their corporate powers, they were not adequate to enable them to engage in those enterprises, but, having engaged in them in some sort, through the medium of their directors or otherwise, in the way in which we know companies often do in matters beyond their corporate powers, they were obliged to come here—I think it was last year—for legislation to enable them to engage formally and ostensibly in those other enterprises; and even that legislation, it seems, has not been found adequate to the occasion, for we have before us at this present moment another Bill to give them additional powers to go on further in this direction of enterprises not contemplated by, nor embraced in the original charter. I say, Sir, that you cannot conclude by any arrangement of the figures—even if they were accurate, as I think I shall point out that they were not, presently—you cannot conclude even by such an array of figures as he has put forward, if they could be maintained, that everything we were entitled to expect from this Company has been accomplished. We do not know that the difficulties in which they find themselves are not due to something by them done. Now, Sir, it has been my fortune upon more than one occasion—upon three or four occasions—to point out since this contract was let, what the position of the Railway Company was under it, according to the statements of the Government, according to the statements of the Railway Company itself, and as I conceived them. I have pointed out that they had, as I thought they had, a magnificent contract, that they stood in a wonderfully good position. But, I also pointed out, lately, that no matter how magnificent the contract, no matter how admirable the position, the enterprise was one of such magnitude as to require the undivided energy and devotion of those concerned in it, as to require great prudence, wisdom and capacity in the conduct of it, else these elements of fortune which, as I conceived it unquestionably possessed, might not avail to prevent results disastrous to the corporation. And I pointed out, before, where I thought dangers existed in the course and conduct of that corporation, and to some of these, in a vague way, the hon. gentleman alluded this evening. We contended against the wide powers with reference to the extension of branches. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that more railways than one in the North West Territories are a necessity. I have always said so. I told him so when he was proposing the Canadian Pacific Railway measure. I agree with him—though I was a little surprised to hear him say so—that some of the branch lines this Company has built are of more importance than many sections of the main trunk line. How he reconciles that with his general notions as to the trunk line, I do not know; but however he may reconcile it with them, I quite agree with the sentiment which he expressed, I think, twice this evening, that there are branch

Mr. BLAKE.

lines that are more important than some sections of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I contended with reference to the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and with reference to its branches, that it was important that we should keep our control, and that we should decide for ourselves whether, and where such extension and such branches might be authorized. I felt that otherwise the funds which might have been devoted, and which prudence might require to be devoted, to the construction of the contracted line, might be diverted to other purposes; and I felt that each time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, while this contract was yet incomplete, came to Parliament to obtain power to acquire or build an extension, or to acquire or build a branch, it would be pertinent to enquire, how are you getting on with your main contract? What is being done? How is the money holding out? Or, is it certain that this enterprise in which you are proposing to engage will not involve you in one way or another in such sort that the conditions of your contract may be imperilled? All that was cast to the winds, and Parliament decided, at the instance of the hon. gentleman, to give a practically unlimited power with reference to extensions and branches—not absolutely an unlimited power to build in all directions, because it did not include power to run up through the eastern part of Ontario, as has since been done—but short of that, an unlimited power. Well, now, it has been said that what has been done, in so far as the hon. gentleman discussed what has been done, is all right; that it was important for the country, and that it was important for the Company, that the money should be judiciously expended, and has been so—and upon that subject I will trouble the House a little later. With reference to the route, however, the hon. gentleman has not touched upon that subject to-night. Although he announced that he was about to make his general statement as to the progress of the work, he did not think fit to embarrass the discussion by details upon the subject of route. We contended that too wide powers were given as to the route, that they would probably be used in a way which Parliament might not approve, that the road would probably be deflected too far to the south for the national interests, and that the special interest of the Company, as a monopolist and a cheap constructor, might be found to overbear those considerations which had up to that time fixed the route in another direction. Those interests have prevailed, and the road has been run very far to the southward. At a very early period, the Company decided upon running the road by Calgary, which meant upon running it *via* Kicking Horse Pass, or some route in that neighbourhood. They decided upon so doing before it was found that any pass was feasible; they have stuck to that ever since, and we have not yet had laid before us such information as serves to show that even now a pass within the contract is feasible. On the contrary, the information laid before us indicates that no road can be constructed by that route within the meaning of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract; that the lowest maximum grades that can be obtained far exceed those maximum grades which are accepted as the standard grades, those, namely, of the Union Pacific Railway; and I maintain that without an Act of Parliament it is not within the power of the Executive to sanction the passing of the road by a route which does not give the grades which were prescribed in the contract, else the Executive alters, and does not execute, the contract. Well, then, Sir, much trouble has arisen already, and more trouble will arise, from the use of another power to which we objected, namely, the power of issuing stock for less than its cash par value. We pointed out that under this plan stock might be issued to an amount in excess altogether of the real requirements of the road, for considerations much less than its par and nominal value; that opportunities for the creation of speculative interests, for arrangements disadvantageous

to the country in many particulars, might result from the exercise of such a power, and that ultimately the road would be loaded, as too many roads are loaded, with nominal capital far in excess of the money really required for its construction; and we find that that is so. It is true that no one, I do not believe that the hon. Ministers themselves, had the slightest idea of the extent to which that power would be used, because they would have been wanting in their plain duty to this House if, having the slightest idea of it, they had allowed the contract to go as they did. \$25,000,000 was named as the maximum capital, and all our calculations and discussions were predicated upon the idea that that was the largest capital this Company would issue, the largest nominal capital. It might represent a much smaller sum in cash. But availing themselves of a general authority in the Railway Act, which was made applicable to them under the hon. gentleman's provisions, they not long after incorporation increased their nominal capital to \$100,000,000. Now, no one pretended that they wanted \$100,000,000 of money. It was with the view of issuing stock at a discount; it was in order to float the stock at something about fifty that \$100,000,000 were created. It was not because they wanted \$100,000,000, but because for certain purposes they preferred issuing a large amount of nominal capital to secure a comparatively small amount of real cash. Well, one of the incidental difficulties arising upon that was much discussed. For some time the hon. Minister of Railways held very strongly that they were entitled to pay 10 per cent. upon the whole nominal amount of capital, but ultimately he receded from that position; the threatened split in the Cabinet on that subject was healed, and the hon. gentleman acknowledged that it was what the road really cost, and not the nominal amount of capital that should govern, so far as we were concerned. But in the meantime difficulty had grown out of it, because the Company announced that they were about to agree to pay interest upon their capital during construction at the rate of five per cent. The law says that interest may be paid during construction at a rate not exceeding 6 per cent. upon the amount actually paid up; and the stock being issued as paid up stock, the Company assumed itself to be entitled to pay interest at the rate of 5 per cent. upon the amount paid up. I maintained before, and I maintain now, that that is an illegal operation; that the Railway Act, which is the only authority for their taking the capital of the Company, and applying it to the payment of interest during construction, expressly limits that somewhat dangerous power to a six per cent. dividend upon the amount actually paid upon the stock, and that to agree to pay \$5 on every \$100 when \$46 or \$50 only have been paid, is to evade—not to evade, but really to violate the law. Another difficulty growing out of this mode of the emission of the stock was the uncertainty as to what the real capital of the Company was. The country was deeply interested in that, because the obligation which we had entered into as to the non-diminution of the tolls was dependent upon that, and yet upon that until to-night, we have been utterly unable to obtain any information, and the information which we have obtained to-night is very general and not at all satisfactory. Suggestions were made at an early period that the stock was being emitted at sixty. I afterwards saw a statement that the issue price was really fifty to the syndicate which undertook the issue of the \$30,000,000. I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to that statement, and he said he had never heard any thing of the kind and indicated his own want of credence in the report. But, to-night, we learn for the first time what \$55,000,000 of stock has realized, and we learn that it has realized only \$25,358,000; or if you are to assume that none has been distributed, none has been issued at a greater discount than another part, the stock

has been emitted at 46 net to the Company as near as may be. Ought we not to know to what extent the syndicate has increased its nominal holding of stock. They were to pay \$5,000,000 in cash, the original capital. I have no doubt they did so. But what does that now represent in stock of the Company? No doubt it represents much more than \$5,000,000. How much more? What did they take before they emitted the \$30,000,000? What arrangements were made for the disposition of the \$25,000,000 of stock, the only originally authorized capital? At what rate was stock taken, if stock in fact was taken, for the purchase of some part of the Canada Central Railway? All these are questions which are of deep interest to us, because we want to know what the Company has really obtained in cash for its stock, which is the measure of our liability, at least of our limitation as to the reduction of tolls. And we want to know it further, because it bears upon the considerations which are addressed to us in inviting us to sanction this loan to the Company. I have seen some organs of public opinion so ill-informed as to declare with respect to this proposition that the necessity of doing something for the Company was made manifest because its stock was actually selling at fifty-five, only fifty-five cents for a dollar, and when the stock had fallen so low it was quite clear that we never could allow the poor fellows to issue any more at such a rate as that. But, as I have said, those organs of public opinion were ill informed; they were deceived by the character of the operation. The Company emitted a nominal amount of stock far beyond what was required at a discount. They preferred to call the capital \$100,000,000 instead of \$50,000,000—it sounded better. They felt better to know that they had \$100,000,000 instead of \$50,000,000, and it gave them certain collateral advantages in issuing a large dividend or interest during construction and gave greater opportunities for a rise, because it was easier to get stock up from fifty towards par than if it was issued at par to secure prices considerably above par. I have shown the House that the stock of the Company has been emitted at an average price net to the Company of forty-six, and upon this they have agreed to pay interest at \$5 on the \$100, which means a rate of almost eleven per cent. per annum, payable half yearly. These poor people whom you are asked to assist—these energetic people who want to push this railway on for you so fast—took sufficient care of themselves to arrange at an early day that on these sums which they had put into the enterprise they should get about eleven per cent. while construction was going on; and stock is to be sold and subsidies are to be obtained and advances are to be gathered in, and land grant bonds are to be realized, in order that, during construction, eleven per cent. interest may be paid to the Company. Presently, they decided that they would finish construction very quickly, and then they decided they would have a guarantee as to interest. And they announced an arrangement whereby, even after construction, for a long period of years, the bulk of this dividend is to be actually guaranteed. It seems to me that when you find a nominal stock proposed to be emitted of \$100,000,000, when Parliament supposed \$25,000,000 would be extravagant; when you find that a part of that stock has been emitted at an average price of forty-six only; when you find arrangements made for the payment of a dividend upon that average price of about eleven per cent.; when you find the Company asking, in calculating the sum of this expenditure, that you should give it credit for making that provision for eleven per cent. upon its investment, it must be evident that these things require to be enquired into; that they require to be sifted and analyzed, and that we ought to get at the bottom of them. If we are to do that which the hon. gentleman not inaptly described in the instructions he gave to his engineer and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue—if we are going to enter into what he put into

the alternative of either a large transaction of mortgage or a partnership with a firm; if we are to go into partnership with a railway company, we ought to see how it has handled its business, what it has done with its stock, how it has been distributed; we ought to discuss this question of dividend and ascertain its result. I shall show presently that our position is not to be quite so advantageous as that of a partnership. We may be exposed to the risk, but it is not likely we shall have any of the profits. Then we objected to the monopoly, and I think events have vindicated that objection. It has been shown to be a very serious obstruction to the settlement of the North-West. It has been shown to be a very evil thing in the present and for the future of that country. We objected very strongly to what we believed was a wholly unauthorized and unconstitutional extension, in practice, of the monopoly which the hon. gentleman inaugurated—I use the phrase advisedly—when he advised the disallowance of certain railway charters upon the principles upon which he did so. The hon. gentleman is very fond, when he can, of sheltering himself under the ægis of those whose past, as a general rule, he busies himself in reproaching and reviling and despising. But upon this occasion, he is entirely wrong in saying that the policy of the preceding Government furnishes an authority for his policy. There are two reasons against it. The first is, that what was done at that time—though it was not disallowance, but even supposing it equivalent to a disallowance—was done at a period when neither the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway nor the system of construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway—whether it should be by a Government or a Company—nor the terms of construction were settled; and I maintain, as I have maintained before, it is an entirely different thing to say you will control the railways of a country, through which you have a Government railway worked by the Government, and to say you will control them when you have handed that railway over to a private corporation. As long as it is a Government railway it is the people's railway, and the people cannot have a monopoly in its own concern—not an offensive or objectionable monopoly—because the interest to be served is that of the community that possesses the railway. Does any one suppose that rates too high for the good of a country could be charged by a Government having a railway? Why, look at this Dominion. Take the two ends of it, cutting off for the moment British Columbia—and I hope no hon. gentleman will suppose I mean permanently, but just for an instant—take the North-West at the one end and the Maritime Provinces at the other; take the Government railway, extending from Quebec to the Maritime Provinces and the private corporation's road extending through the North-West, and ask upon what system the services are regulated respectively, by what rules the rates are established, what are the practical results to the communities respectively through which those railways pass, and tell us, if you can, without a smile, that you will put both in the same category. Again, such a policy was a revocable policy. It might be modified and changed. The same public opinion which would control the rates would decide, at the moment, when more access should be obtained. What the hon. gentlemen did was, as far as they could, in the contract, to render it impossible that access should be obtained, and what they could not do in the contract they did by violating the spirit and executing the letter of the law, in disallowing all other railway charters in Manitoba. The contract itself says that in the North-West Territories, in those parts in which the Dominion of Canada has jurisdiction, no railways running in such a direction and within such limits shall be chartered for the next twenty years, and it says that in any new Province hereafter to be erected in the North-West, this prohibition shall be continued, obviously meaning that in the existing

Mr. BLAKE.

Provinces, no such prohibition could be made or was intended, obviously indicating that if such a provision had not been in the contract, the instant a new Province was formed it could exercise the constitutional right of chartering railways free of control. To prevent that, the contract contained the extraordinary provision that the constitution of a new Province, as yet unborn, should be hampered and restricted by a provision prohibiting it from exercising its constitutional right. In the face of that and in the face of the statement made by the hon. First Minister in the debate often adverted to, that we cannot check Ontario and Manitoba, he has been checking Manitoba ever since. Now, he tells us he is glad he is able to inform us to-night—I suppose he hopes to gild the pill for the North-West, as in another way he attempted to gild the pill for numerous persons to the eastward; but I think the gilding was put on pretty badly; I think I saw the pill show itself in several places, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman, with all his old experience, was not able to accomplish the task more deftly than he did—he hopes to gild the pill by saying that, as soon as the railway is actually built, the Government will be able to review the question of reconsidering the policy, and they really think they will be able to stop oppressing Manitoba and violating the constitution at some period two or three years hence. Why? He is kind enough to tell us why. Because the Company think they will be able to do it safely. They think by that time, what with their powers, and their privileges, and their exemption from taxation, and the claws they will have stretched over the whole of that country, they will have it so entirely in their grip that it is really of no consequence what power you give the poor people. "Live horse and you will get grass;" but the hon. gentleman proposes that the horse shall die, and then he will put a feed of hay before him. As soon as the people of Manitoba are completely under control, he will grant these concessions, and he calls on them to fall down in thankfulness for the concessions he proposes to make. Now, Sir, we contended that the monopoly was a grievous one, inasmuch as it was calculated to produce high rates and to produce the usual results which are produced by monopolies; and that it was important, in the early settlement of the country, that power, free power, should be given to construct railways. Since that time, argument has been addressed to us to show that the rates were extremely moderate; that they were very reasonable; that they were all that could be expected; that, in a new country like this, it costs a great deal—as no doubt it does—to run a railway; that, in a country with not much return freight, it necessarily costs more; that, in a country the climate of which is somewhat severe, it necessarily costs still more; and that, therefore, the rates should be high in order that the railway might be remunerative. But these arguments are all lacking in this, that those who use them forget that it was one element of this contract that the road would be run at unremunerative rates for a long time after it was opened, and that, in consideration of that circumstance, large moneys and lands were added to the public aid that was to be given to the owners of it. We were told, when we contrasted the price with that which was to be done, "Oh, but you don't take into account the circumstance that the Company will have to run the road at a loss for a great many years; we've taken it into account as, as honest men, we should, and we are paying them in advance for that unremunerated running." Well, having paid them in advance for that unremunerated running, it is now argued that the rates should be such as to remunerate them, and therefore they are to be paid double, first in advance under the contract, and then by the people of the North-West—or, according to the statements which are made, the people of the North-West are to pay in both cases; because, if those statements are to be credited, the North-West is to pay the whole contract price out of its lands, so that it pays first in

advance under the contract for cheap rates, and then pays dear rates after the contract has been accomplished. Now, I have been unable to observe that the speed with which this enterprise has been conducted has conduced to its success. I have been unable to observe that those who have been concerned in it have had such miraculous powers of intuition and of judgment and decision as to reach conclusions more rapidly than they need have been reached, and at the same time rightly. Hasty decisions have been taken, different plans have been adopted; and these have indicated, from time to time, the absence of that careful consideration, that prudence of action, which was essential to make this enterprise a success. Take for example what was called the Sault Ste. Marie Branch. At a very early period in the history of the undertaking, it was announced that the Company was about to build a branch to the Sault Ste. Marie. At that time other companies were thinking of striking for the Sault Ste. Marie, but the great Canadian Pacific Railway Company announced that it was going to build a branch to the Sault Ste. Marie. It was announced in public, and the hon. Minister told me, "Your views are about to be fulfilled; you said the Sault ought to be reached, and they are going to reach the Sault." Well, a little while later, the hon. gentleman received a communication to the effect that they had altered their views. They had sent in their plans in which they called this the Sault Ste. Marie Branch. They had now decided to make the main line by the Sault Ste. Marie; and they asked that their plan, which was called the plan of a branch, might be made the plan of the main line so far; and they announced that their engineers had gone over the road and found a practicable route, and it was a much better thing, although more expensive, for other reasons much better than the former route; and the hon. Minister acceded, with the reservation advised by his engineer that, until they had established on the ground the possibility of connecting Port Arthur with the Sault or the neighborhood of the Sault, the subsidy should be retained. Well, they were going on, and, at that same demonstration at which the hon. the First Minister made the observations to which I have alluded, he spoke at length upon this subject, and he told what a great thing it was for the country, what a great thing it was for Ontario in particular, that it was now arranged, and that the change of route was about to reduce the period of construction on the north shore of Lake Superior by many years. Not long after, the whole collapsed. There is no letter brought down—I know not whether any such exists—explaining it, but, without any explanation given to Parliament or the public, the plan is altered, and they determine to carry the main line through the interior, they go back to the old route; and then they determine to build a branch to Algoma Mills; and that is the plan upon which they have been working since; thus showing no less than three changes of plan, and indicating, as I have said, that this extreme haste of execution is very apt to lead to hasty, and very possibly, to imprudent and erroneous decisions. And we were told that it was of the last consequence that the Algoma Mills Branch and the connecting link to the eastward of it should be early built. We were told that it was going to be a great thing for us this coming year, that the immigrants should go by this short and speedy route to Port Arthur. We were told we should see the Canadian Pacific Railway carrying the immigrants by that route, a splendid route, so many miles from Montreal to Algoma Mills, then the twenty-four hours' voyage from Algoma Mills to Port Arthur, and so on. But the newspapers tell us—and I believe in this case they tell the truth—that that is not to be the route at all; that the steamers are to sail from the port of Owen Sound for Port Arthur, that the business is to be done from the port of Owen Sound and not from Algoma Mills this year; that the immigrants are to be carried by the Ontario and Quebec and the Toronto, Grey

and Bruce to Owen Sound, and that the voyage is to be from that port to Port Arthur, and not by the other route at all. So it appears that, for the practical purposes of getting a route to the North-West within our own territory for immigrants, there was no necessity for that great expedition which was used in building the branch to Algoma Mills. If the branch to Algoma Mills is not to be the immigrant route to the North-West, what was the object of hurrying that branch and of expending the close upon \$2,000,000 which have been expended in its speedy construction? If you find that the bulk of your immigration next year, that the bulk of your transport of passengers and goods next year goes, not by Algoma Mills at all, but by Owen Sound, will you not find that once again speed, rapidity of decision, has resulted in premature expenditure, in expenditure which, having regard to the other obligations of the company, and to the difficulties which it was possible would surround them, and which it turns out have surrounded them, had better have been deferred? Then Sir, the decision with reference to the southern route, to which, I have adverted, was, I greatly fear, a mistaken decision on another ground. I have never said anything upon this subject in public before, but I have collected such information as I could ask of everybody whom I met, who had passed over the western part of the railway, and I am obliged to say that the opinion unanimously entertained—I never was able to elicit any contrary opinion from any gentleman I approached—was that the appearance of the country along that southern route in the western part, west of Moose Jaw to the foot-hills of the Rocky Mountains, was far inferior to the appearance in other parts (far inferior to the territory that would have been passed through by the central route) and considerable apprehensions were entertained and expressed by every one to whom I spoke, as to the results to the Company of the inferiority of that land in quality and the difficulty with reference to want of water and to the dryness of the climate. Now, with reference to those eastern operations, which the hon. gentleman has not particularly alluded to—at least, to most of which he has not particularly alluded—I think they fall into different categories. There can be no doubt that there was a great amount of reasonableness in the view that the Canadian Pacific Railway should seek to extend its direct control as far east as the city of Montreal. There can also be no doubt that the contract itself, in terms, indicated the probability of such an extension. It refers to that extension particularly. It deals with the Canada Central. If I recollect aright, it deals with the other railways; but at any rate it indicated pretty plainly an intention, if possible, to get to Montreal. However, it is one thing to say that that intention was a sound one, and it is another thing to say that the means adopted, the bargains made, the arrangements entered into, were such as were prudent and wise. I have not been able to ascertain, from the information which has been laid before us, with an approach to absolute accuracy, what the cost of the railways which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has acquired in the east is. I have made a conjecture, to which I will refer later on; but, I say, that it is obvious that the purchase included numerous branches not very material at all to the main line, and that upon the main line expenditure and the main line mileage between Callander and Montreal, the cost of these railways, treating them as acquired for the purposes of the main line communication, will be an extremely heavy cost. The hon. gentleman has not on this occasion alluded to one of those purchases, which is generally treated as absorbed in the great purchase. I refer to that of the Laurentian Railway, a separate railway bought about the same time, and, as I showed last Session, from such information as I could obtain, purchased from Mr. Senecal at a price which realized to him an enormous profit, and which was far in excess of the mercantile value of the railway. I do

not believe it has been any value to the Canadian Pacific Railway at all; and whatever value it may have to anybody, the price which I believed was paid was a price far in excess of the value of the concern. I pointed out the details of that transaction last Session. I maintain, when we are called upon to decide that this Company has so well and wisely expended its funds, that we have a right to lend it \$30,000,000 more, that that transaction ought to be explained. I maintain that we ought to have information upon it. I maintain we ought to be told why it was that this link of railway was purchased, and at what price and under what circumstances. I believe it to have involved the throwing away by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of something about \$400,000, as near as I can conjecture. Now, sir, so much for the moment with reference to that which is ordinarily put together under the heading of Callander to Montreal. But with reference to other roads, not much information is given. It is true that, with trifling exceptions, the funds of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not been directly expended in the Credit Valley enterprise, so far as is shown. It now appears that \$484,000 of the Company's money has been spent in Credit Valley bonds, which are at present held by the Government as security for \$1,000,000 of money. It is made plainly to appear, that there is \$484,000 of its money spent in the purchase of these bonds. But, Sir, upon an occasion of this description, when we are called upon to consider what the obligations of that Company are, to which we are to lend money, I maintain that the hon. Minister has not discharged his full duty when he has failed to tell us how the Company stands in relation to the Credit Valley, the Ontario and Quebec, and that whole system. So far as the general sources of information and the Act of Parliament enable us to judge, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is becoming the lessee of those lines on terms which oblige it to guarantee five per cent upon the bonds which are outstanding. The bonds which are outstanding were sold, in the case of the Credit Valley, at, I fancy, somewhere from thirty to thirty-five cents on the dollar, and they have been made worth par—if the Canadian Pacific Railway guarantee will make them worth par—by the guarantee of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway has agreed, in effect, that those roads shall earn five per cent. on their whole cost; and legislation is before us this Session (as well as I could understand the Clerk at the Table, who was reading the petition) for power for this Company to extend its railway through the western peninsula of Ontario, to the border; and other proceedings are being taken to enlarge the bonding system of the Credit Valley Railway. I do not know—we have no information at all before us—as to what the real extent of the obligations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are, with reference to this enterprise. Those obligations may be light or they may be heavy—it depends upon the results of the traffic of these roads when they are completed. But I need hardly say that we may fully expect the completion of the operations through Ontario, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to result in a temporary advantage, at any rate, to a considerable portion of the community. I believe there will be a very severe competition there; I believe there will be very low rates of fare for some time; I believe the Ontario and Quebec system will be forced to run at rates, and under circumstances, which will render it extremely difficult for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, out of its earnings, to pay five per cent. upon the complete cost of that system. If so, the general assets and capital of the Company will be responsible for the deficiency. It is, I presume, responsible for the deficiency to-day, in the case of the Credit Valley Company, be that great or small. Then there is an arrangement made with the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company, under which that rail-

**Mr. BLAKE.**

way is leased by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Nothing has been said about that; we have not heard what the extent of this obligation of the Canadian Pacific Railway is; we know not what the traffic account of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway is; we know not whether the probable traffic of that road will pay the expense of it. If it does not, that, of course, becomes an onerous obligation to the extent of the deficiency. Then there is the Atlantic and North-Western Railway, in which the hon. gentleman said a sum—I have forgotten exactly what it was, something under two hundred thousand dollars—had been expended by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in acquiring the charter, and so forth.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** And building a road.

**Mr. BLAKE.** How much was built?

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Round the mountain at Montreal.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I don't know how many miles were built. It would be interesting to know how much was paid for the charter. We pass so many charters, Mr. Speaker. Our hands are so full of them. So many hon. gentlemen are engaged busily during the Session in passing railway charters. We pass them with so much freedom. It is so very little difficult to pass a railway charter, unless it be in Manitoba, that what the worth of a commodity of that kind is, after it has received the valuable imprint of this House and the Senate, and the assent of the Executive, it would be interesting to know. I suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, itself, would have no difficulty in getting such a charter as that of the Atlantic and North-Western. But some one else got it. How much did the Canadian Pacific Railway Company get it for, and for what purposes? Doubtless, in order to secure connection with the South-Eastern. There the hon. gentleman felt himself treading on somewhat tender ground, because he said that it was very important for the Canadian Pacific to acquire an interest in the South-Eastern. From his description of the road, it appeared to me to run almost everywhere. It seems to furnish the most direct means of connection with Boston, Portland, New York, Halifax, St. John, St. Andrews and Louisburg—I do not know whether I have got them all; but it seems that the Montreal, Portland and Boston Railroad was the one thing needful, or one of the things needful, to get to these different places. It seems, also, that they have to build a railway to get to Quebec. The hon. gentleman says they will build one immediately. I hope he will give his bail for that. It seemed to me the South-Eastern was of an extraordinary character, and from the capacities it possesses, I am not surprised that the Canadian Pacific gave \$1,600,000 or \$1,700,000 for a controlling interest in it. It is a valuable thing, and they seem to have got it very cheap. The hon. gentleman said it was important that we should have the Canadian Pacific Railway run to a winter port in Canada. He said, also, that the Company were of the same opinion. In point of fact, I do not know but that they have been expressing their opinion on that point to some members of this House very recently. In order to do it, it was necessary they should secure the Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway. It was probably with the same admirable intentions they were engaged a little while ago, in the City of Portland, negotiating with the municipal authorities of that city, for the purpose of acquiring the Portland and Ogdensburg Railway, which also, I have no doubt, possesses the same admirable faculty of being capable of being used to give connection with St. Andrews and the other Maritime Province ports. The hon. gentleman explained, with that lucidity and clearness which distinguished his utterances to-night, and which particularly distinguish his Parliamentary utterances upon this subject, how they were to reach

these ports, except St. John, which he left out, or almost left out; and I observed, when he dilated on Halifax, how the jaw of the Finance Minister fell, as if he were saying to himself: "This will never do, he is making an awful mess of it; he is making too much of Halifax. The idea of setting Halifax up! He should have put all the ports on an equality. He should have mentioned them all several times, so that each one might be mentioned first." The hon. gentleman having gilded the pill for St. Andrews, Halifax and St. John, and having told the people of Quebec that they were to have a third railway—I wonder on which bank of the St. Lawrence, or whether in the middle of it—to reach their port as a summer port—having satisfied the different members, in that way, he went on to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway would have failed in its duty to Canada if it had stopped there. It ought to have gone further, and he there pointed out that admirable faculty which the South-Eastern possesses, namely, that it would not only reach these ports, but the United States ports as well. He said they ought to reach there in order to be in a position to take the commerce from the port of New York, to take the commerce from the port of Portland, to take the commerce from the port of Boston, and cause it to pass over their great railway, and that they would be wanting in their duty to Canada if they did not provide the facilities. Mr. Speaker, there was once a man who was asked if he would contribute towards a bonus to a road to run out of his town, and he said, "Never; I will contribute towards as many bonuses as you like for roads to run into the town, but out of it—never." Does the hon. gentleman suppose that if traffic comes from New York, Portland and Boston towards the west, over the Canadian Pacific Railway, the traffic will not go eastward to New York, Portland and Boston? Does he suppose his railway will run only one way, like the man with the bonus? It may be right—I do not say it is not right—but it would be trifling with the intelligence of this House to suppose this is other than a serious question with reference to the terminal point of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we may as well face it. We may as well understand distinctly whether it is part of the policy of the Government and of Parliament that the resources which this Company possesses, by virtue of this contract, are to be applied—while yet we are to be engaged in pouring out of the public treasury \$30,000,000 more—to creating an Atlantic terminus in the United States for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, this was not all. With reference to the expenditures, it turned out that the sum of \$700,000 had been expended in what the hon. gentleman calls—I believe it is the technical word of the market—"sustaining" the stock of the Canada North-West Land Company; and there are divers other large items mentioned in the hon. gentleman's statement but not explained. But the hon. gentleman said: I felt it my duty, in dealing with this matter, to procure thorough, sound, good information. He felt it his duty to ascertain, to the bottom, how things stood, and so he employed his engineer and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue to go to Montreal and make an investigation into the accounts of the Company, such as would be suitable in case somebody else was going to advance them a large sum of money upon their property, or to become a partner in their business. That order was issued on the 28th of January, and the report was made, if I understood the hon. gentleman aright, upon the 2nd of February. What were they sent down for? To inform the hon. gentleman's mind? To enable him to understand what they were doing? To enable him to get that information which was necessary for him and his colleagues to arrive at a decision? Oh, no! Because they had already reached a decision. They reached a decision before the report came. An announcement was made; we had their policy declared to us, and therefore it was not for that purpose. But I suspect that it was because it was thought that we would accept this statement, and

the hon. gentleman's officers and the officer of the Minister of Inland Revenue, were sent down to make a report with reference to the transaction under this state of things. The Ministers under whom they serve, concluded that they would enter into the partnership, that they would make the advance, and Parliament should have, they agreed, such information as would enable it to agree with the Ministers. The officers come down and they make enquiry, and it is expected Parliament will agree. They make the enquiry in two, or three, or four days into these transactions, involving so many millions of money; they make it in reference to a decision already arrived at. Is it not the most surprising thing in the world that these two subordinates of the hon. gentleman did not find that the accounts were all wrong, and that the transaction was one that he would not accept? I am amazed! It was so probable that they should have found differently from what the hon. gentleman had decided; it was so probable they should have differed from the Cabinet with reference to the proposition they were about to submit to Parliament, that it is really extraordinary we should have from them the report we have heard from the hon. gentleman tonight. Now, Sir, in that report they tell us that they did not enquire into the distribution of the stock; they tell us that they did not investigate the expenditure on the line; and if we are lending money upon the faith of a wise dealing with the stock, and upon the faith of wise expenditures upon the line, they did not investigate things that were extremely material. I have no doubt that these accounts are not falsified; I have no doubt that these accounts are kept as these gentlemen said they were kept; I have no doubt that there has been no falsification or fraud in the keeping of the accounts of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. But the question is, what their transactions have been? The question is, whether they have been prudent, whether they have been wise, what the nature of them has been. These were the questions which were to be entered into—these were the questions which were to have been investigated. But the investigators tell us: We did not enquire into the distribution of the stock; we did not enquire into the expenditures of the Company. Then, Sir, everything went well as long as the money held out. As I have said, the Company was lauded by everybody holding views consonant with those of Ministers, as possessed of all those capacities and faculties which Ministers credited them with. They could make no mistake, they did make no mistake; they were building faster than any one had ever built before; they were building better than any one had ever built before; they were building cheaper than any one had ever built before. The road was improving all the time in its prospects; the work was becoming easier; and it was found from day to day and from year to year that the difficulties were disappearing; that traffic prospects were becoming brighter. Everything pointed more and more to the extreme excellence of the enterprise. With this joyful news we were regaled in season and out of season, until the time arrived that another story was told; until the time arrived that the country was startled, in the month of October last, by the statement that the Government had agreed to guarantee the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the extent of three per cent. for the period of ten years. In the meantime the possessors of the fortunate contract, of this magnificent enterprise, had been dealing just as you would expect them to deal; they had been acting with reference to it just as you would expect them to act; and now suddenly, without a moment's notice, we are told that they are to get a Government guarantee. The first announcement was on the 27th of October, and it was that the Government had guaranteed the interest upon \$100,000,000, and that they had received \$15,000,000 in cash, and \$5,000,000 was to be received on the 1st of February last, and \$4,500,000 in undoubted security. That

was the announcement when the details were given, but in the first instance, there was a simple announcement that the Government had made the guarantee as stated. Now, Sir, I have never been able to understand, and the hon. gentleman has not explained to-day, how it could be that if the Company gave cash, or the equivalent of cash, to an amount representing the present value of that guarantee, they would be any the better for the operation. It is not in the nature of things that they could be. It is impossible that they could be improved by simply taking a certain portion of their available assets and locking them up at a fair price to represent dividends for ten years. The hon. gentleman tells us that the greatest financiers of Canada, of New York, of London, all agree that this operation would have the effect of increasing the value of the shares of the Canada Pacific Railway Company. Well, all I can say is, that I should like some explanation as to how it is possible, on the assumption I have named, that tangible assets of the Company, fairly representing the worth of the guarantee, and which were handed over for the guarantee, could increase the value of the shares. He might as well tell me that by taking your money out of your own pocket and putting it into your hands to keep, you were increasing your wealth. He might as well tell me that by locking up a portion of your funds in certain investments producing only four per cent. you are better off. It is quite true that if that had taken place, which was for some time thought to have taken place; if the Government had given that gratuitous guarantee, if the Government had engaged the credit of the country for cash or its equivalent, that might have been an advantage; the then holders of the stock might have realized more for it, because persons might buy more readily when they understood that the Dominion of Canada was good, at any rate, for three per cent. upon the nominal value of the stock for ten years; and that would cost the company nothing. But, if that was the assumption, it was speedily to be disturbed. That was, apparently, the assumption, for the stock rose. In England, a cable was received by Morton, Rose & Co., the agents for the Company, announcing that the Government had guaranteed three per cent. on the \$100,000,000 for ten years, and announcing also that the earnings of the Company were left free to supplement this dividend with interest at three per cent. That cable was, no doubt, unintentionally, very unfortunately worded, because the impression that it would convey—that it conveyed to me, and that it conveyed to others—was, first of all, that the guarantee was gratuitous—not that it was simply a deposit by the Company with the Government, of assets which the Government was going to hold, but that it was a gratuitous guarantee. I certainly did suppose when I read that cable, which declares that the earnings of the Company were left free for ten years to supplement the dividend, that no part of the earnings of the Company was charged to pay this three per cent.; but I find, when the papers come down, that the postal and the transport services, two elements of the Company's revenue are expressly charged to pay the dividend, although I am unable to reconcile with my reading of the agreement, the statement made upon the London market, and I presume upon the New York market, that this arrangement was such as left the earnings free. However, upon this understanding, the stock rose, and it rose to somewhere about sixty-four in New York and London. There was a considerable amount of speculation, and I believe that the market was what they call milked, and that a good many people lost a good deal of money in Canadian Pacific Railway stock. Who profited has not yet been disclosed. In a few short days it was found the Company had made a mistake. They said in their letter, written about eight days, I think, after the first proposal, that they did not want this arrangement. They proposed that

Mr. BLAKE.

the guarantee should extend to this \$5,000,000 only, because they said they did not want to sell the \$35,000,000 at once, and they said, also, it would cost them too much money. Is the House surprised, are the Government surprised; is the country surprised that some financiers, although not perhaps so wise as those who thought it was an excellent arrangement, should have declined to believe that the value of the stock was raised by a transaction of this description? The stock shortly fell, and full disclosures were made—no not full disclosures, but more disclosures as to the character of the arrangement. It was discovered that a certain amount of cash was paid, that more cash was to be paid, and that securities were given for the rest. The securities were not disclosed. According to the explanations of the hon. gentleman himself, the check and fall in the stock is attributed to the mystery and want of openness which had characterized the transaction; and I must say that so far as regards the Company itself and the Government in connection with this transaction, it was unfortunate in the last degree that it should have been carried out as it was carried out—carried out in a manner which enabled the imputation to be made with too much apparent reason, that negotiations with the Government had been made use of to profit private persons who were aware of them. I maintain there should have been absolute secrecy as to this arrangement, and no dabbling in the stock of the Company by any one acquainted with it, and that when completed it should have been made known, in all its particulars, to the public. The whole arrangement should have been made known. I say, so that the public could have become aware exactly what the Government were giving, and what the Company were giving to the Government, and judge for themselves what the effect upon the stock would be. But the First Minister, as the *Montreal Witness* informed us some time ago, is said by Mr. Drinkwater, Secretary of the Company, to have told the Company not to speak, and to have declared that he himself intended to make a full explanation in a few days, and in the mean time they should be silent. And silent they were. But the First Minister did not speak; he does not speak now. The transaction affected the Government otherwise. What a chorus of laudations were heard. It was described as a magnificent transaction, one in which the Government had achieved a financial success; an operation of a character capable only of being achieved by the present Finance Minister. Why, the failure of the domestic loan turned out to be a blessing in disguise, because the hon. Finance Minister did not want money, for the Syndicate would provide him with it. What did he want with \$4,000,000 when \$24,500,000 were to be provided by the syndicate of the Canadian Pacific Railway? What a lucky thing it was that he had not taken up a loan? He would not have known what to do with the money, because of those \$24,500,000 he was going to get from the syndicate. Not merely was the money to be supplied which was intended to be taken from the pockets of his fellow-countrymen by making a loan, but the loans which were about to expire in eleven months, were also to be largely met. The situation was easier. The hon. gentleman would have to go to England, it is true, but only for a fraction of the sum for which he would have otherwise had to go, because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, adding one more to the immense blessings which it had already conferred upon the country, was pouring out of its abundance into our coffers those sums, to enable us to redeem our indebtedness. Did those who described this transaction as admirably beneficial to the Government and the country, ever consider that if it was so good for them, it could not really be so very good for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company too; that it really could not advantage the Government so enormously and be also a great good to the other party to the

bargain. A mere money transaction of this description cannot possess those conflicting characters. How changed the situation now is. In November last, we were congratulating ourselves that we had \$24,500,000 of solid cash ready to be furnished by the Company to redeem our debts, and to-night we are discussing a proposition that we shall advance \$22,500,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If that is not a turn-about-face, from November to February, I do not know what a turn-about-face is. It was a splendid thing for the Company and the country that the former should furnish \$24,500,000; it is now a splendid thing for the Company and for the country that the latter should loan them \$22,500,000. The hon. gentleman stated that this transaction was almost warranted by the law. We have a new idea respecting the sanctity of Acts of Parliament, and the power of the Executive in these later days. It was only the other day that a solemn Act of Parliament passed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and which provided certain things imperatively, was dispensed with by those hon. gentlemen, and when I asked under the authority of what law I was told it was done under the law of necessity. We know that necessity knows no law, and as the hon. gentleman represented necessity, I do him no injustice in saying that he knew no law on that occasion. There was actually no Order in Council passed, but a Departmental Order was issued, informing Collectors of Customs throughout the country that they were required to disobey the law. In that view I am almost surprised to learn that the hon. Minister of Railways admits that they have a little transcended the power of the Government in making this arrangement. I am surprised he did not say that they were fully clothed with authority for it. Why should he not have done so? There is a law which authorizes them, in case they require cash to pay our debts or meet our obligations, to borrow that cash and issue terminable annuities in return therefor; and having that, is it not almost within the law that they should issue the securities without getting the cash? It is true that inconvenience would arise; because the object for which the transaction was carried out was to obtain cash, and if the cash was not obtained, the debts could not be paid. The hon. Minister says that the Government, in taking this action, but slightly transcended their powers. I say it was an exceedingly grave act; that it was an act to be done only under a sense of the gravest responsibility; an act to be done only in some emergency which would be of itself a justification for the breach of the law; that it was an act which is calculated, if slurred over as this act is slurred over, to throw doubt upon all the securities of the Canadian Government; an Act as to which the Ministers, before they entered into it, ought to have been satisfied, first of all, that it was absolutely required by some pressing emergency, and secondly, that it would have met the emergency. But, Sir, they were not satisfied that it was a pressing emergency, nor did it meet the emergency after all; for the hon. gentleman tells us that the result of his great *coup* was not merely a failure, but positive disaster; that it was disastrous to the Company that the transaction should have been entered into, because they did not improve the price of their stock by a dollar, and they did pay into the hands of the Government the \$8,700,000. And they come down to Parliament and in the Speech from the Throne they tell us that they made this arrangement in October. They do not tell us that they transcended the law under the pressure of necessity and that they are about to ask us for a Bill of indemnity for that transgression of the law. They do not propose any bill of indemnity, but they say, we will treat this as an ordinary transaction and we will ask you to make it a little better for the Company. You will go into the committee, treat the agreement as a valid agreement, and the Company not being able to implement the agreement itself, we will

ask you to agree to a postponement of the February cash to the end of five years. I say that that is no constitutional, no proper mode of treating transactions of this kind; and this Parliament will be wanting in its duty to the people it assumes to represent if it does not insist on transactions of this enormous magnitude, created in defiance of the law, being at any rate dealt with, with such due regard to their gravity as to call for that formal and full sanctioning of them on that ground of necessity which can be their sole ground of justification. The Government, however, were certainly persuaded, and they put the shareholders of the Company in a pretty good position. They agree to guarantee the dividends to the stockholders for ten years, and to do that to a large extent on credit, after having received the cash which was the price of the dividend. Here again is a little inversion of the order of things, as it existed. We were told when the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was passed, that we were obtaining from the Company security that they would complete the line; but now it seems it is proposed to us that we should give up the security to complete the line, and in lieu of it give them security to pay their dividends. This is an arrangement which is highly satisfactory, I have no doubt, when accomplished on credit, to the shareholders; but if it is not an alteration of the contract with the Company, I fail to understand what an alteration is. Now, Sir, the present proposal is that we should guarantee to the extent of a sum which is equal in cash to a present value of \$7,300,000, and lend them \$22,500,000 besides. Thus we are to engage \$30,000,000. In doing so we are also to abandon the security for the completion. The Government is to occupy a very peculiar relation to the Company—a sort of double and inconsistent relation. First it is to guarantee dividends to the stockholders, and secondly, it is to be the mortgagee of the road. It is to guarantee the profits to the stockholders of the Company for ten years and to be the mortgagee of these very profits out of which the dividends can alone be paid. What is the result of that position? Very little cry for lowering tolls after this will be listened to by this Parliament, because the answer of the Company would be. Ah! gentlemen, very good. You are of course aware that you have guaranteed interest on our stock to the extent of three per cent; you are aware that you have lent us \$22,500,000 for which we agreed to pay interest, and the only funds out which we can pay interest are the profits of the enterprise. If you choose to cut down the tolls, you understand that you cannot get—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is the sale of the lands.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course there is the sale of the lands, but what has been said about the sale of the lands. The dividend is to be paid all the time, and the interest. How will the Government be in a position, under these circumstances, to meet the suggestion of the company; that the interest of the country requires high tolls in order that the obligations entered into may be implemented without loss to the company by reason of the Company having a deficient revenue? Now, I do not intend to go into a great many of the estimates which the hon. gentleman has made. There will be ample opportunity for fully discussing these figures, which are not the same in some particulars as those which are given in the Company's own statement. The hon. gentleman has introduced, and rightly introduced, certain elements which were omitted to be expressly set forth in the Company's statement, as for example, the element of cash received for town sites, and the element of the income received from the earnings of the road. There are other items which should also be added, amongst them being the Winnipeg bonus of \$200,000, which was received in the last year. It is better that the statement should be

made once for all, with a full appreciation of the bearing of the hon. gentleman's additions and changes on the statement of the Company themselves—that it should be made in the most perfect form to night and repeated afterwards. A few general observations, however, may be made with reference to these calculations. Last Session I pointed out to the House the estimate of the Company, according to the report of December, 1882, of what the road would cost, embracing the line from Montreal to Port Moody and the branches, exclusive of the Government sections. What the Company said then was that the road would be built for \$25,000,000 of subsidy, for land grant bonds to the amount of \$20,000,000, and for \$90,000,000 stock, which, at sixty, was equal to \$54,000,000 in cash; that is, for in all, \$99,000,000 of money. As late as April, 1883, the President of the Company published a letter in which he said that the cost to the shareholders of the 3,260 miles fully equipped, would be the \$54,000,000, which he assumed would be realized for the \$90,000,000 of stock against which they would have 17,000,000 acres of the finest wheat lands on the continent. This same estimate, practically repeating in April what had been stated in the December previous, was, that the whole line from Montreal to Callander and the presently contemplated branches would cost the Company \$99,000,000, of which the Company would have to provide \$54,000,000. Now, last Session I showed, analyzing that statement, that from this should be taken to get the cost of the main line contracted for, for the extensions and branches, about \$3,000,000. I was unable to speak with exact accuracy, but that was the nearest approximation I could make, and I am not yet persuaded that there was any material error in that approximation. If there was, it was against the figures as I now present them. That would leave the cost of the contracted line \$91,000,000, according to the estimates of the company in 1881. Now, in January 1884, a fresh estimate is presented, and that estimate is really worth the attentive consideration by Parliament, when it is called upon to rely upon this new estimate as proving that funds are now being provided with which the road will be completed. This estimate embraces these figures: Mr. Stephen states that the total expenditure of the Company has been \$58,700,000; and that it will cost to complete, \$27,000,000—and I add for equipment, \$2,800,000 to that estimate; making a total cost of \$88,500,000 to complete the whole railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It includes equipment.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to hear it. Then the present estimate is that the total cost will be \$85,700,000. Now, that amount is \$13,300,000 less than the estimate of April last for the whole road; so that, if we assumed the estimate of \$85,700,000 to be for the same subject-matter as the estimate of December, 1882, and April, 1883, we find a diminution in the cost of something like \$13,000,000. But that is not all; for this new estimate of \$85,700,000 embraces much more than the old estimate. It embraces the deposits for future dividends for years after the completion of the work. I leave, as supposed to be embraced in the old estimates, those dividends until the period estimated for completion—the two years remaining; but there are many years after completion for which the Company has already provided dividends out of this \$58,700,000. For that, \$5,000,000 is to be deducted. That sum embraces also that multitude of items—the seaboard extension items—to which the hon. gentleman referred, amounting to \$3,500,000; and it embraces also the Credit Valley bonds of, say \$500,000, making in all \$4,000,000 in round numbers—that is, \$9,000,000 altogether, of items which are embraced in the transactions contemplated by the last estimate, and not in the former ones. Deduct, therefore, \$9,000,000 more, and you get a sum of \$76,700,000 as the cost now estimated of the same work which was estimated at \$99,000,000 nine months

Mr. BLAKE.

ago. Now, I want to apply these considerations to the estimate for the contracted line. I have shown what they were as applied to the whole line now contemplated. Mr. Stephen's figures with reference to the contracted line are these, in round numbers: Work done on the main line, \$23,080,000; proportion of equipment—for I assume that the equipment was for the whole line, and therefore deduct some for the branches—\$6,000,000; materials, \$4,000,000; to complete, \$27,000,000; and I add for interest and dividends, no less than \$6,000,000; which, omitting the equipment, would give me \$66,000,000 as the present estimate for the contracted line. The Company now think that the contracted line from Callender to Port Moody will cost them \$66,000,000, as against \$90,000,000, their estimate of so late ago as April last; that is, a saving of \$24,000,000 on what they had agreed and are bound to this country to do,—including, as I said, in that estimate, the large sum of \$6,000,000 for dividends out of capital, irrespective of earnings altogether. Now, these discrepancies are entirely confounding. It is impossible to understand them. The hon. gentleman has not attempted to grapple with them. He has not taken up the estimates which we were given last Session, and which we discussed and dealt with, and compared them with the estimates which he now brings forward, and told us how it is that \$24,000,000 less is required to finish the contracted line than was required ten months ago. I think an explanation is required, and enquiry should be made on that point. I am not satisfied with these estimates. I am not satisfied with the statements made without a single particular given to us, except what is contained in a few lines which the hon. gentleman has read to-night. Now, then, if the contracted line is to cost only \$66,000,000, the Company are to receive \$25,000,000 in cash; from land grant bonds, \$9,200,000—of which it has received over \$9,000,000; bonuses and town sites, already received, \$700,000—and they will probably receive further on that account, \$500,000—making altogether \$35,400,000. And they are to get from us now \$22,500,000, making \$58,900,000 from the public, as against a total expenditure of \$66,000,000 on the contracted line. And they have already in their hands 10,000,000 acres, and are to get, during the progress of the contract, other acres to the amount of over 11,000,000 more—over 21,000,000 acres in all. That is the proposition, Sir. We contracted with them to build this railway. They tell us now that this contracted railway, the subject of the contract, is going to cost them only the sum which I have named. And we say that they have received from public resources over \$35,000,000 and the loan is almost to make up the whole of the rest—and besides they are to get 20,000,000 acres of land, and what they may make out of their stock, while what they got out of their original stock, their first \$25,000,000, would be enough to complete the work. It is impossible, under these circumstances, to contend against proposition that it is not the contracted line that has caused the difficulty. It is impossible, under these circumstance, to contend that if the energies of the Company had been limited and prudently applied to the contracted line, there could have been any question of this kind. The loan of \$22,500,000 is not required for the contracted line under these circumstances; it is wanted in consequence of the general engagements into which the Company has entered. Now, as I have said, I cannot, without explanation, acquiesce in these altered estimates. I cannot understand upon what they are based. It is true that we are told that the work is much lighter than was expected—that the contract is going to be much more profitable than was expected. These do not appear to be extremely valid reasons for advancing more public money to the fortunate contractors, but the question, whether they account for so large a sum as would be represented by this estimate of only \$27,000,000, being required to complete, is a very serious one. Now, if you

apply the new proposition to the contracted line, as I have said, you will find that on any calculation of any moderate advance or application of the Company's own funds to that line, the public resources are adequate to carry on the work with reasonable rapidity. And the truth is, that under the proposed arrangement, it is not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but the Government, practically, which will be providing funds to build the contracted line. The president says that this \$58,700,000, which he has provided includes the various items—which I do not challenge—which come from the public viz.: subsidy, about \$12,300,000; land bonds, for which he gives credit for only a little over \$9,000,000, but the account says that \$9,200,000 have been received by the Company, and I suppose the rest is in the hands of the Government; bonuses and town sites, which he omits, \$690,000; and the earnings to the 30th of June last, which I presume to be about \$1,400,000, would make \$23,600,000. And then he inserts as part of what the Company has provided their floating debt, the debt which they cannot provide for, and for which we are called upon to provide—for which we are going to give \$7,500,000 of this \$22,500,000 at once to meet this part of what the Company has provided, and which is included in the \$58,700,000. Why have they not provided it? It is because they have not provided it that we are here to-night. We have to provide it. We are to lend them the money and take a mortgage for it. He includes also the \$8,700,000 for future dividends. I do not think myself, that it is an absolutely necessary expenditure upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, so far. It may have been a very prudent thing for these corporators to say to us; "As our stock is at forty-six what it cost us, we would like to get 11 per cent. more while the work is going on, and we will insure ourselves three-fifths of that amount; but in order to insure ourselves that we will deposit it; we could not deposit it ourselves in a bank, because if any difficulty arose it would be taken away from us, but we will get the Government of the country to take it from us, and hold it for us, and pay it out to us in dividends from time to time, as the years roll on. We will hand over \$8,700,000 of the present assets which otherwise could have been used in the work, in order that we may provide against a rainy day, in order that the Government and the country may provide for us—dole it out to us—from year to year, so that we may be secure of something." After having made that application of \$8,700,000 of what has been raised one way or the other,—to include it amongst the \$58,700,000 provided for the purposes of the railway, seems to me to be rather a broad proposition. Well, now, I deduct these two sums,—the floating debt we have to provide for, and the \$8,700,000, which is locked up for the benefit of the shareholders *in futuro*; and I find that this, added to the \$23,600,000 of public resources to which I formerly adverted, makes \$39,800,000, leaving a balance of \$18,900,000 alone as provided for by the Company for the work. And from this—dealing with the contracted line—there are other deductions. The expenditure from Montreal to Callander includes the various items which the hon. gentleman gave us to-night in that connection—\$5,400,000; for branches, \$3,800,000; sundries, \$3,600,000; and Credit Valley Bonds, \$500,000 more, which gives us a total of \$13,300,000 to be deducted; leaving, dealing with the contracted line alone, only somewhere about \$5,000,000 of money provided by the Company out of its own resources. Now, Sir, that is the state of things with reference to the contracted line, and that, slightly modified, is the state of things with reference to the whole line. And these considerations once again show how ridiculous it is to say that this money would have been wanted had the Company dealt with this enterprise in the true spirit and with reference to the obligations of the contract. It is because that spirit and those obligations have been departed from,

and because other things have been entered into, which may be useful, which may be profitable, and may be in the interest of the country, but which ought not to have been entered into to the detriment of the ability of the Company to perform its obligations to the public, that this money is required. The first thing for them to consider was: Can we perform our obligations to the public?—before launching out in these various ways; but the first thing they did was to launch out. They cannot perform their obligations, and they come to us to enable them to do so. If, however, it be the case that there is no satisfactory explanation of the reduction in the estimate of cost; if the cost is still to be estimated at what it was estimated only nine or ten months ago, then it is clear that the calculations of the hon. gentleman entirely fail. It is clear, also, that his suggestion as to the financing entirely fails. If you only apply these calculations of debit and receipt to the present estimate, you produce one result, but if you apply them to the estimate of cost of ten months ago, you produce quite a different result. According to the present estimate of cost, which reduces the cost of the railway so very far below whatever it was estimated to cost before, you find this result: The company owes \$7,500,000; it wants, to complete the railway, \$27,000,000, and it wants to pay its floating debt. It therefore wants \$34,500,000 of money. What is it to get from the Government? It is to get its subsidy, \$12,700,000, and a loan of \$22,500,000, or \$34,500,000 in money. It is therefore, according to the present estimate, to get every shilling that is necessary to complete the road from the country. It is to give, not merely every shilling necessary to complete the road, but every shilling necessary to pay off the floating debt besides. That is the statement; and these results being ascertained, it is possible, and I put it forward as a subject for enquiry, that this floating debt does not itself include the \$5,000,000 temporarily borrowed on \$10,000,000 of stock; and if so, the result of the payment of the floating debt would be to free the \$10,000,000 of stock at the disposal of the Company. But meanwhile the hon. gentleman is able, triumphantly, to say, the road will be finished with this money—that is to say, if those estimates are correct. Why, the hon. gentleman who offered, with a lavish hand, to provide every dollar which is estimated to be necessary to finish the line from the beginning to the end, and to pay the floating debt, may well say, "I am making adequate provision for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway." Yet if the estimates be under-estimates, if they be not perfect estimates, if something like the cost of last year be the real cost, the account is quite on the other side, and large sums will have to be provided from some other source to meet the further demands. The hon. gentleman will say: Oh, they will get it out of the lands or further issue of stock, out of something from which they have failed to get it hitherto. But you, Sir, know the statement we have as to the condition of the road indicates there is no ground for believing in that result, because the loan is not to be repayable until 1891, which means it is not expected that very large resources will come from any other quarter before 1891; certainly not within the next two years; and if large resources are not to come from any other quarter within the next two years, then it is clear that if this estimate be an underestimate, if the estimate of last year be the correct estimate, more money will be wanted, and I think this night's proceedings will tell where that money will be asked from. The information we have had is, as I have stated more than once, wholly defective. I have pointed out enormous discrepancies in the estimate of the cost, extremely convenient in order to persuade Parliament to the view, that now at least, full provision is being made for the construction of the railway; extremely convenient in order to persuade Parliament to the view that it runs so

risk of being applied to again. But no explanation is given of how it happens that those conveniently low estimates are so much lower than the estimates of only ten months ago. Of that we are entitled to some explanation. Then as to the sales. In 1882 the report made to Parliament was that there were 6,450,000 acres of land sold. The report made to Parliament was that there was \$17,300,000 worth of land grant bonds to be redeemed by those sales. The report made was that there was \$18,500,000 worth of land grant bonds sold. Up to June, 1883, in the statistical return for the year, laid upon the Table of the House yesterday, the railway Company report their sales of land grant bonds at \$18,500,000. The paper laid before us reports the total sales of lands, instead of 6,450,000 acres, to be 3,750,000 acres; instead of \$18,500,000 bonds sold, \$10,000,000 only of bonds were sold—fewer acres by 2,700,000; fewer bonds by \$8,500,000. This change in the circumstances of the Company is a great source of weakness. I attribute their difficulty to the failure their expectations in regard to those transactions which resulted in the former flourishing report. And what I complain of is, that with allegations on the part of the hon. Minister that he was coming forward to give a perfectly frank statement of the transaction, that he felt it his duty, and the Company felt it their duty, to let the whole cat out of the bag and give the House the whole story, a large part of the cat's tail has remained inside the bag. Eight millions of cash which was expected, has not been realized in this branch alone. The reason is the failure of the Canada North-West Land Company to fulfil its contract; and we hear now, what I was about to have referred to even without the hon. gentleman's statement on the subject, how intimately associated the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been with the Canada North-West Land Company. This corporation, which is known, unfortunately, to too many Canadians, was created with a view to assisting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and was composed, in part, I believe, of some of its corporators. The people of this country, were told it was going to be the best thing of the boom. It was the real thing—the cream of the North-West. They were told—the people here were persuaded—that individuals in England were to take two-thirds of the capital, or \$10,000,000, and Canada was to be privileged to have \$5,000,000; but they were told that the demand was going to be so great that any man who wanted \$5,000 must subscribe for \$10,000, because he would never get what he wanted unless he subscribed for double the amount. By this means they procured subscriptions of \$10,000,000, instead of \$5,000,000, in Canada, and they were told the deposit was all that would require to be paid, and the greedy Britisher would be so anxious to swallow the stock that Canadians would be able to send it across and sell it at an enormous premium. Subscriptions for \$10,000,000 were got here, and the list was sent to England and subscriptions, not for \$10,000,000, but for \$5,000,000, were obtained there. How much was obtained by others than the projectors I know not. The concern dragged. In my opinion this was because it was founded upon a false basis—upon a false opinion as to the amount of capital required to work transactions of this description. The subscribers expected that sales would be made so quickly that they could pay for the lands without calling upon the stockholders; and the public of England did not take to a company involving such a large amount of liability which they thought would be called upon. The stockholders here, who had been told that if they wanted \$5,000 they would have to subscribe for \$10,000, were told they had subscribed for \$10,000 and not for \$5,000, and some of them paid as long as they could, and then sold for a fraction of the \$10,000; and the loss to the capital of Canada by the operations of this Company was several millions of dollars. Now, we learn that our money given to the Canadian Pacific Railway

Mr. BLAKE.

Company to build this railway, has been expended, to the amount of \$600,000, in "sustaining" the stock of the North-West Land Company; that operations which, when they occur in banks, of bankers sustaining their own stocks, are treated very harshly, have been going on with respect to that Company. And the hon. gentleman says it was quite natural and proper and within their charter, because everybody knows how deeply interested they were in sustaining the stock. I do not think that was a proper application of the money at all. It was an application of the money which was to lead the investing public to believe the stock was worth more than it really was; to believe that there was a demand for it that did not exist. It was a mis-application of the funds of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Stephen says nothing at all in his statement of the outside land sales or of the bonuses, but the return to Parliament shows \$200,000 of bonuses at Winnipeg, and I think \$490,000 for town sites already realized. Then we did not get from him—though the hon. Minister has given some information—any information at all as to the working account, or as to the net earnings; and I was at a loss to understand whether the \$2,128,000 which he represented as paid for dividends was provided for partly by the net earnings, or whether it was exclusive of the net earnings. I gather, though I am not sure I am right, from the hon. gentleman's statement, that the net earnings are included in the \$587,000 spoken of by Mr. Stephen, and therefore he has given credit for them. But the statement would appear to show that that was money provided by the Company, though it was money accrued from the running of the road and ought to be set off against the interest paid on the capital so far. The hon. gentleman says the returns are satisfactory. I am sorry I cannot agree with him, and I am of the opinion, also, that on this subject we ought to have much more information. If I rightly read the return of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the year ending the 30th June, 1882, its profits on work over expenditure to that date are placed at about \$840,000; and I see by the return laid on the Table of the House, its profits over working expenses last year are placed at somewhere about \$537,000 only. The letter says nothing of that for a complete year, but it gives an account of the nine months which have elapsed immediately preceding, showing some \$900,000 odd as the earnings of those nine months. One would like to know what this means. One would like to know what the true running account is; how far these nine months overlap the previous year; what is the meaning of the discrepancy in results between the complete year ending 30th June, 1883, and the complete year ending 30th June, 1882. Then it was not until this evening that, for the first time, we learned anything as to what the stock had realized. The letter gives no information about it. As I have already observed, we do not know now how the stock has realized that amount; at what the \$30,000,000, issued to the public, was sold; how much the syndicate took, at what rate they took it: what, in other words, are the real merits of a transaction in which we have a very deep interest. Not one word is said in the statement furnished to the Government and by the Government to Parliament as to the relations of the Company with all the other roads to which I have referred, or their relation to the Hamilton and North-Western in which, in their interest, a large quantity of stock and bonds was purchased, as I have been told by those concerned in that transaction. No explanation whatever, either, is given by the president of the Company of the transactions with reference to the Laurentian Railway and the Canada Central, and the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental. The statements are rather difficult of apprehension. One statement is that there has been paid by the Company on those roads, \$3,200,000. I think the hon. gentleman to-night said \$3,333,000, and I presume the statement of the

president was made up to the 31st of December. But taking \$3,200,000, round figures, there are mortgages for five and a half millions of dollars, it is said, which would apparently make a cost of \$8,700,000, for these roads. But if you will look at the statistical railway returns you will find there a statement that there is unpaid by the Canadian Pacific Railway on the Canada Central, in round figures, \$4,000,000, and on the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental, \$3,850,000, a total of \$7,850,000. Add to this the \$3,200,000 that have been paid and you find \$11,000,000 as the cost of those roads, instead of the smaller sum to which I have referred. To this has to be added, I presume the equipment and other charges. The payment of \$2,300,000 as interest on deposit and purchase money, equipment and other charges, will bring the cost up to a very high figure; but, of course, it includes the nugget of gold which the Company is so delicate in speaking about—the Laurentian Railway. We had no information until the hon. gentleman vouchsafed it to us to-night, as to the particulars of the expenditure of \$3,500,000 for roads towards the seaboard and for other purposes within the charter. We find now that it is considered a purpose within the charter to spend \$600,000 in sustaining the stock of a land corporation, or to buy stock in a United States railway; and I do not know what are the undefined purposes yet within the charter, when I find these are the defined and avowed purposes which are alleged to be included in it. There is much information which it would be important for us to receive with a view to really ascertaining the value of the statistics given—how much of the sum which is said to have been spent on the main line is due to the incomplete line and what the finished line has cost. A large sum is said to have been expended on the line which is not yet completed. It will not do, of course, to divide that indefinite amount over the mileage of that which is completed, because that would make an extravagant cost of the mileage of the completed road. But we have no statement of what the completed railway has cost in its different sections. We ought to know what each separate section or link has cost, so far as it has been completed. We ought to know what are the arrangements with reference to the more easterly part; we ought to know the class of arrangements with reference to the central part and those entered into with the North American Company with reference to the work recently terminated. Last year some information was given to us. We were told what the embankment was in the prairie section; we were told that the enormous quantity, for such a line, of 15,300 cubic yards of embankment to the mile had been made, but we did not know what was done in the other places this year. When we are called to advance \$22,500,000 and to pledge our credit for nigh \$7,500,000 more, we are not given so much information as was vouchsafed last year when we were told no demand would be made upon us. We see nothing in the president's letters about the contracts made. We have not the instruments of association of these contracting parties. Only two days ago I heard there were more than one. I heard there were two, perhaps three, different parties operating at different times; and since one of the firms has unhappily dissolved, owing the Canadian Pacific Railway \$600,000, put in as providing for the work. It is really important for us to get at the bottom of the relations of the Company with its contractors. What dependence, under these circumstances, with no detailed estimate, with no division even of the cost, with no statement of how much of what is expected to be paid will be required for the eastern end, and how much will be required for the mountain end—what dependence can be placed on the allegation that the road will be completed for the estimated amount of \$27,000,000, contradicted as this is by the estimates of last year? I doubt the estimates. I doubt their accuracy. I doubt their definiteness. I was startled

last fall to find reported the opinions of the general manager on this subject; and they correspond so admirably with results as they are developed here to-night, that I propose to trouble you with some statements made to a reporter by the general manager some time about the period when the company reached the foot of the Rockies, this fall:—

“A reporter of the Montreal *Star* recently interviewed Mr. Van Horne with the following result:—‘We are,’ said Mr. Van Horne, ‘at this season of the year at the very height of our expenditure, and it is safe to say that we are spending \$100,000 a day.’”

Then he states what they are doing and where they expect to be. He speaks also of the pass across the Selkirks, and so forth.

“‘Our line is now located through from Montreal to Kamloops, and, with anything like good luck, we will be through to that point where we join the Government work in about two years.’ ‘How much will it cost per mile through the Rockies?’ ‘We don’t know.’ ‘Have you not estimated the amount beforehand?’ ‘The Canadian Pacific Railway,’ replied Mr. Van Horne, bracing himself up and speaking as if he wanted the reporter to understand that he meant every word he said, ‘has never estimated the cost of any work; it hasn’t time for that; it’s got a big job on hand, and it’s going to put it through.’ ‘Well,’ said the reporter, ‘but if you haven’t estimated the cost of the construction through the mountains, how do you know that you have sufficient funds to push the road, as you are currently reported to have?’ ‘Well, if we haven’t got enough, we will get more, that’s all about it.’”

And so it is getting more. We are providing for it to-night. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Mr. Speaker, has not time to make estimates; it has got a big job on hand, and it is going to put it through; it does not know what its road will cost through the mountains, and if it has not got enough money it will get more. These are the views of the manager, and these are the views which we find have commended themselves to the prudence and judgment of the Ministry, and which are to be realized by this proposed resolution.

“‘And how about your eastern connections? What about the North Shore?’ ‘That and all other matters in the east are for future consideration. I think we will do well if we get through from Montreal to the Pacific in two years.’ ‘And how about your bridge and eastern connection to the Atlantic?’ ‘Now, come,’ said he, and I think he must have repeated this to the Minister just before he made his speech, ‘‘It does not do to give too much publicity to all our schemes, and might do us harm.’ ‘Rumor says you will get to the Atlantic by the South-Eastern.’’—I suppose it is the South-Eastern, unless that road is south-west as well as south-east—‘and that, as a matter of fact, you now control that road?’ ‘Not to my knowledge.’ ‘Then you will want the North Shore?’ The question failed to elicit a reply, and the reporter, seeing that he had probably obtained as much information as possible from the general manager, retired, forcibly impressed with the resolute frankness of character displayed by the man who is the administrative head of this great Canadian enterprise.’”

That is grand, Mr. Speaker. That is glorious. That is just what any of us would do if there was no bottom to our purses, if money was no object; that is just the way we would manage if we had the Dominion of Canada to back us, to bank for us, to give us a guarantee without the authority of law if we wanted it, and to give us twenty-two millions and a half more if we wanted it. What is the need of estimates? What difference does it make how much it costs? We have a big job and we will put it through. We have the Government at our back, and between the Government and ourselves we shall put it through. They will find the money; we shall find what we can, and they will find the rest. The president now says it is profitable to change the mode of estimating the subsidy. It was proper before to take the mode laid down in the contract. Now it is quite proper to adopt a mode which is the contrary to that laid down in the contract, the president believing it to be good for the Company, and the Government believing it to be good for the Government, and both being agreed that it ought to be done. It does seem to me that these statements furnish the ground for the proposition that we have not had sufficient information. I say that it was the duty of the Government, before they committed themselves to the proposal to advance this money and to agree to this guarantee, to have had a thorough investigation into the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way Company, right to the bottom; I say it was their duty to have investigated most thoroughly the past, the present, and the future; I say it was their duty to have obtained full, ample information, to have got all the details, to have obtained the detailed estimate of the expenditure for completion, to have ascertained how it was that that estimate ran so very far short of the estimates of ten months ago, and to have established, to their own satisfaction first, and as a preparation for submission to Parliament, all the particulars to which I have generally alluded to-night, as a preliminary to their reaching a decision. They did nothing of the kind. They decided first, and then they sent down two gentlemen to report as to whether they were right in coming to a decision or not; and that report is made while Parliament is sitting, within a day or two of this time, as I say just in preparation for this resolution being brought before the House. The hon. gentleman has said that the main line—in one of his numerous calculations, the only one which in this connection I will refer to—would cost \$49,300,000, but in this is included the floating debt of \$7,500,000, and the future dividends of \$8,700,000, and therefore it would not cost that amount according to any fair estimate of funds provided by the Company. He said also that in case of default the country would get the road for, I think he said, \$54,000,000, and he staked his reputation upon the accuracy of that statement, and he repeated it time and again; and after the recess he repeated it once again, saying he had pointed out that we would get it for this sum—I forget exactly what it was—of forty or fifty millions, and that he had proved that fact, while it would cost ninety-seven or a hundred and three millions, for at one time he used the one figure and at another time the other. The hon. gentleman was wrong. He made a calculation of a most peculiar character. In summing up what the road cost to the country he charged, as a proper thing to be charged as paid by the country, the value of the lands that were sold, not indeed at the price they had realized, but at his assumed estimate of two dollars, and he put in seven millions and a half for the three and three-quarter million acres as fairly chargeable as part of what the country has paid, and, with that item introduced into the calculation, he ran his figures up to something approximating to a hundred millions. He did not put in, however, the land that was unsold as any part of the cost. Then, when he came to ascertain the ultimate cost to the country, he took the land unsold, converted it into cash by a wave of his hand, made \$42,000,000 or \$43,000,000 out of it, and deducted that from the cost he had estimated before. Sir, where did the land come from? If it came from us, it is to be charged as part of the cost before he can make his calculation. Sir, the calculation is defective, and he had better submit it to Mr. Miall or Mr. Schreiber. The hon. gentleman adverted to estimates which had been formerly made of the cost of this road. It is quite true that I submitted to the House, as the result of the calculations of my hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), based upon the estimates of the engineers up to that date, the probable cost of a first-class railway, from Callander to Port Moody, at the sum he mentions—\$120,000,000. That is perfectly true; I do not understand that the hon. gentleman now finds fault with that estimate. He did find fault with it—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, he said to-day that he could not controvert my argument about his estimate being too low because my estimate was true. I venture to say that I heard a great deal of complaint against my argument when I used it. I was told that it was extravagant, and the hon. gentleman thought it was too much altogether; but neither my hon. friend from York, nor myself, was responsible for more than this, that the estimates were

Mr. BLAKE.

the fair results of the estimates of the engineers laid on the Table of the House and printed in the Sessional Papers. I believed them to be so, and that was all we said. I say that the estimates of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company last year came exactly to that figure. They were to spend \$91,000,000 on the road from Callander to Port Moody. The Government sections were to cost \$28,000,000; and if you add \$28,000,000 to \$91,000,000, you get just about \$120,000,000, as nearly as possible; and if you allow a trifle—if the hon. gentleman would be bending enough to-night to allow a trifle or so for the \$5,000,000 for surveys—you will find that the estimate of the Company last year does accord with the estimates of the engineers made so long before. But while I felt pretty confident, under the circumstances, that the Company were probably right, my confidence as to their present attitude is altogether shaken, because they are departing from their own estimate and the estimate of the engineers. They say it will cost \$24,000,000 less, and that \$24,000,000 is not on a capital of \$120,000,000, but on a smaller capital of \$91,000,000. The hon. gentleman adverted to some of my estimates of the price of the land, made in 1880. I did not think he would have done it. I was prepared for a good deal, but not for that; because I thought he would have remembered—unfortunately he forgot—that this was a calculation applying to the proposal of the Government, and the estimate of the Hon. First Minister, as to the price to be realized from the land situate within certain distances of the railway. We applied these figures of the hon. First Minister, and out of his own mouth we convicted him of an extravagant contract. Now the hon. gentleman says, you estimated these figures. The hon. gentleman says that the earnings of the road are most satisfactory. Well, I do not know whether they are or not. I should be glad to think they were; I hope they are. But in order that we may know whether the result is satisfactory or not, we should have the earnings of this eastern or disconnected portion given by themselves, as well as the earnings of the other part, given by themselves. We want to understand the progression, the cause of the difference between the receipts of last year and this; we want to understand to what extent these earnings are due to the very high rates which were charged,—rates admittedly so high that they were lately reduced by 25 or 30 per cent. for east-bound grain. The hon. gentleman says there will be no default at all, and that if there is a default, what a good bargain the country will have. Well, as I have said, we have no proper data before us to-day to justify the reduced estimates of cost that are given us. Without verifying and establishing those reduced estimates of cost, we have no proof that the funds provided are of themselves adequate to finish the road in two years. It has practically been stated to us that the lands will not realize much in the two years, and it is not expected that much of the Company's stock will be sold in the two years. Other things are required to be done. More branches have to be built; an expenditure of that description is wanted; and the Government takes authority, under this contract, to apply the proceeds of the stock, &c., in extensions and other things on the road. I say, therefore, that the whole calculations depend emphatically on the accuracy of the surprising estimates which, unvouched and discrepant from former estimates, have been laid before us. There is a third alternative. The hon. gentleman says it is either pay or hand over the road. I say that you may and probably will find the Company knocking at your doors again for further aid. I say that if you set them the example of these lavish subsidies, dealing as they have with outside enterprises, going on in the magnificent method in which they are going on, committed as you are, not merely by taking this mortgage but by giving these guarantees, you are powerless to close your hands against their further

demands; and I say that although you may put in all these terrible clauses about the Company ceasing to own the road if they make default; of the road being *ipso facto* the property of the Government; of the employees of the Company, by some wonderful process of transmutation, becoming the employees of the Government—though you may make all these propositions, which are in themselves enough to appal the stoutest heart, if he did now know the ways of a Canadian Government, yet the Company may make default and may not lose the road. We have had other companies which did not lose their roads under similar circumstances. We had the Grand Trunk, to which we made advances on a first lien, a very first lien, a splendid first lien, and where is that lien now? It is away down among the dead men. I believe it is seen in the Public Accounts and in our balances, but it is visible nowhere else. So it might be here. It is impossible not to recognize the lesson and the story of the past, when looking at the present, and trying to forecast the future. And in what position would the Government and Parliament be if at the end of these two years default should be made? Are you going to sacrifice the interests of those shareholders—those poor people who have spent money on the road, who have done so much good to the country, who have built a road faster than ever a road was built before and spent more money upon it than ever was spent before? Your charity and confidence and sympathy are immense: are you going to foreclose, hard hearted usurers that you are? You, who said yourselves that the security was worth two or three times the sum advanced, are you going to shut down and turn these people out of house and home, strip them of their palaces, take away their lordly equipages? Surely you will not behave so badly! That will be the appeal which will be made; that will be the appeal which will be listened to. The past tells us what the future will be. Now, then, the hon. gentleman has stated that the prosperity of the North-West is due to the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he gave us a number of most interesting figures with reference to the development of that country in the last three years. We all rejoice in this development, and we are all familiar with the figures. We have had them before us many times. We know that the North-West has grown, but the question is not without another side to it. For example, the hon. gentleman told us that he had received from lands, from the first of July, 1881, to the 31st December, 1883, \$3,572,000. We know that that included the early payments on colonization schemes, and therefore it does not represent anything like a permanent source of income from lands. But we know also that in the same period during which he gave us those large receipts from lands, we expended the following sums in the North-West: On Indians, \$3,096,000; on Mounted Police, \$1,135,000, and on Dominion Lands, \$1,340,000, making a total of \$5,571,000 in three items only, to be put on the debit side of the account. If, therefore, we are getting, we are also paying. If it were proved that this development was due to the extreme rapidity of construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I could have perceived some force in the hon. gentleman's argument as indicative of the proposition that this entitled the Company to consideration; though he does not say that. He says it is simply because it is in the country's interest that he is now moving. But, Sir, I have denied before, and I deny to-night, that the extreme rapidity of construction did tend to this development. I maintain that it has tended to produce certain evils in that country rather than benefits, and that a reasonable rapidity of construction would have been conducive to more permanent good, entirely irrespective of the enormously increased expenditures occasioned by that extreme rapidity. Then, it was urged as important that we should go fast in the future—not for the development of the North-West. We have gone

through the North-West already, and what is important for the North-West is immediate freedom of railway communication—moderate rates and more railways. That is what is wanted for the development of that territory—low rates and more lines; but what is proposed to hurry on is the building of the railway on both sides of the North-West—on the Columbia side and on the Ontario side—and therefore, even if you could argue that the great development of the North-West was due, not to the construction, but to the very rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it would be nonsense to argue that there would be increased development in the North-West by the rapid construction of lines lying far outside of that Territory. The hon. gentleman has said that the cost of transport is enormously reduced. I was glad to hear that cheap rates are to be given; but when the hon. gentleman compared the old all-rail rate of \$31.50 from Quebec to Winnipeg with the new rail-and-water rate of \$12, I do not think it was a fair comparison. In the first place, we took the old rate instead of the present all-rail rate, which is \$16.64, and compared it with the new rail-and-water rate, which is \$12. It is not an important thing, but every pound or two of expense counts to the immigrant.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must admit that I gave those figures.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, the hon. gentleman gave all the figures, and having given them, made this unfair comparison.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I gave the figures, but I said it was not a published rate.

Mr. BLAKE. Why was it not a published rate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I gave the only published rate.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman say it was not an effective rate? The Minister of Agriculture likes to ask us for a large vote, but he says: I will not tell you what I am going to do with it. That is the sense in which this was not a published rate; but the agents of the hon. gentleman at home knew that they were able to offer this rate of \$16.64 for the last two years. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says a new rate is being established. That is a good thing; but he takes the responsibility off the Pacific Railway Company and lays it on the Minister of the Agriculture, whose shoulders are broad, and who is apparently willing to carry it. I was glad to hear of this move being made. It is of the last consequence, we have heard, that we should keep Canadian immigrants on our side, for fear of their being diverted to the United States. I am glad to hear that there is no danger of their landing at New York, or, while travelling on their way, of being intercepted at Buffalo or elsewhere by the Yankee agents, but that steps will be taken to protect them against having any preference for the United States over Canada, and we shall be able to keep them in our own country. I have always felt a certain amount of humiliation myself that we should be obliged to bring in our own immigrants through a foreign country; though I had thought that the merits of our own country would have been sufficient, even in that case, to induce them to go through to their destination in spite of the efforts of American agents. How much advantage there might be, however, in bringing our immigrants by way of New York and Buffalo, I do not know. The hon. gentleman has told us that the capabilities of the North-West are enormous: which is true, and he has given us an estimate of them. He has told us that a hundred thousand farmers would produce 640,000,000 bushels of wheat. I should certainly be glad to see his figures realized; but it is new to my experience that a man puts every acre of his farm into wheat; and although the North-West is

a great wheat country, I hardly think it is of such a character that every acre of every man's farm would produce an average yield of wheat every year. And I fancy that if it did so, this return of 640,000,000 bushels is a return which would be rather laughed at than otherwise by those who know practically how many acres it takes in a large country, with varied climate, to produce a given quantity of wheat. However, it is not necessary to publish fantastic statistics of that character to establish to the world (on the contrary, I think it is injudicious) the true merits of the country. What we want to do for that purpose is to get authentic statements from practical men of what the country can produce. Nothing can be more convincing than the statement of a man himself, who has gone there as a farmer, who has met with the initial difficulties, whatever they are, who can speak from his own experience of what the soil can produce, and who sees himself a happy and prosperous man, accumulating property. But, on the other hand, nothing can be more unfortunate, nothing can be more calculated to do detriment to that country than to find people discontented, gathering together and complaining of oppressive taxation, vexatious regulations, high railway rates and elevator difficulties, and who find that progress and prosperity are not being attained. It is not fantastic calculations, made on a magnificent scale, on a desk in an office, which only requires a pencil and paper to work out—it is only the actual life of the people living there, that will tell; and it is, therefore, deeply to be regretted, that we should have such actual results detailed as have, to a large extent, been published to the world during the last few months. I agree with the hon. gentleman in his remarks on the frost. That, no doubt, was an affliction which extended over a very large extent of territory, where it was more exceptional than in the North-West. We may fairly conclude that that was an unexpected contingency on a recurrence of which we need hardly count if due precautions, such as the hon. gentleman has referred to, are taken. Though we cannot deny that there is a liability to frost in some portions of that country, still that such a calamity, on a large scale, should recur is not to be expected; and I think it right to say that casual and unexpected as it was, it was extremely unfortunate, and if the expectations of the Government and of the country at large as to immigration are not fulfilled to the extent we would wish, I dare say it will be largely due to that unfortunate accident for which they are not responsible. But I do regret that while that occurred at a critical period, ever to be regretted, which we could not help, so many things have happened by our acts in this House and the acts of our Executive in the Council Chamber, which could have been avoided, and which, concurring with this unfortunate accident, have damped the hopes and weakened, to some extent, the energies of the people in that country, and diverted to a large extent the immigrants who would have settled in our North-West to go elsewhere, and give their energies to building up other interests. The hon. gentleman will remember that if the North-West wants anything, it wants reasonable rates, the right to build railways, and more railways, and that as speedily as possible. That is the kind of development that is wanted there, and that country is not so deeply interested in the construction of the ends. Now the whole object of this proposal is placed on a very simple basis by the hon. gentleman. He says that it is not because the Company want this money to fulfil their contract. He says, speaking somewhat more strongly than Mr. Stephen does in his letter, that it is certain that the Company do not want anything whatever to fulfil their contract, and by 1891 the road will be finished according to their contract, and will be operated afterwards, if we reject this proposition. But, he says, we want this road to be finished by the end of 1885. A while ago it was to be finished at the end of 1886; now we want it to be finished at the end of 1885,—and why? Partly to develop the North-West,

Mr. BLAKE.

partly to obtain, or earlier obtain, power to compete with the Northern Pacific Railway for the trans-continental traffic. Well, as to the grooves of trade, and so forth, I think that to-day they are much more easily changed than they used to be. I think if the Canadian Pacific Railway is built so as to offer a good access, a shorter line, and shorter communication altogether between the one side of the continent and the other, it will be very easily able to obtain its share of the traffic, no matter whether it is constructed a year or two earlier, or a year or two later. I do not at all believe that the traffic will be prevented from going there, if it is the best road, from the simple circumstance that its completion is delayed a year or two; and I say, by bending all your energies now to the construction of the railway to the north of Lake Superior, and from the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops—by straining every nerve to do that, you are preventing yourselves from doing what is most important in the interests of the North-West; and you are making arrangements to enter into a combination with the Company, identifying the Government as the endorsers of its dividends, as the mortgagees of its road, to such an extent and so intimately with the Company, that instead of securing the glorious result of October last—the Company assisting the credit of Canada—it is extremely probable that your arrangements,—which involve, the raising by this country, and the paying by the Canada Pacific Railway Company, within a period of two years, of something approximating \$20,000,000 a year, because we have the unpaid subsidy to pay as well as the \$2,500,000—will do much to depress and damage the stocks of Canada, instead of to improve them. There is really no tangible argument given for this extraordinary haste; there is no argument upon which we can rely; there is nothing that you can lay hold of and say: this is a reason why we should guarantee their stock; this is a reason why we should advance them \$22,500,000 of money. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman holds out no hope of compensation; he holds out no hope of relief from the monopoly. He says, indeed: As soon as the road is finished, I think that I shall no longer unconstitutionally veto Bills passed by the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba—I think I may promise you I will no longer do that. But, he says, the contract must not be touched; we are determined not to interfere with or limit the contract in any way. But, Sir, the contract is being interfered with. The security for the completion of the road is being handed over. The mode of paying the subsidy is being altered from the terms of the contract. A guarantee of stock is being given, which was not a term in the contract; \$22,500,000 of our money is being loaned, which certainly was not embraced in the contract. Suppose these terms had been put in the original Canadian Pacific Railway contract, would you have voted for it, Mr. Speaker? Therefore, are we not changing the contract? And yet the hon. gentleman is right in saying that the contract is not changed in one particular. Although this enormous aid is given in order that the road may be completed by 1885, it is not provided that the road shall be completed by 1885. You are providing them with all the money to do it, but they are just as free as they were before, in case it is not finished by 1885. Now, Sir, whatever might have been the case before now, particularly when Parliament is called upon, as I have shown, to alter the terms of this contract, in favour of this Company, and to grant them great concessions—to do great things for them—now is the time when we may fairly say: If you ask, you must also give; and when we should call upon them to give up that odious monopoly, which is going to do more than any other thing to injure the North-West Territories in the years to come. I say that this is an opportunity when such a stipulation may fairly be made, and when we may fairly insist upon the resources which we are providing and enabling to be provided by all these

arrangements, not being applied to extensions, not contemplated by the contract, to the American seaboard to the east. The hon. gentleman has said that history does not show today a more courageous or daring instance of action on the part of a company or government than that of this Government when they entered into this contract. Well, it was audacious; and the very promises upon which they induced the Parliament of the country to assent to it, were audacious also, and this night is the falsification of those promises—as I show you when I point out how utterly and completely the company has failed to realize those expectations on the faith of which this contract was made;—because I do not believe the country will agree for a moment that it is simply in order to finish this road in two years that we are asked to engage Canada's credit for \$30,000,000. When it is found that the work has been handled unfortunately, as it has been; when it is found that the Company, by its imprudent management, has excited animosities and hostilities which have been very unfortunate for the Company; when it is found that the road has been proceeded with, on account of this very speed, in an unfortunate manner; when the creation of its capital stock has been unfortunate, and the Company has deprived itself of the confidence of the world of capitalists, it must be evident that the object of the Company is not speed to complete the road, but to get the money from us. The hon. gentleman has made out a case which is daring, which is audacious, but let us be prudent in our action. Let us decide that no case has been made out for this transaction, that it is better to go on, on the terms of the contract as it is, without engaging the capital and credit of Canada to this enormous amount, when no advantage will ensue from the alteration of our position and the entanglements in which we will be involved by this proposal that is not contained in the alternative now before us. I affirm first, the House has not been treated with due respect in reference to the obtaining of information and details which ought to have been laid before us, in order that we might be able to judge; and secondly, upon such facts as have been laid before us it is plain further enquiry is necessary; that those things to which I have adverted with reference to the contracts, the stock, the acquisition of other roads, ought to be searchingly enquired into. It is better, in the interests of the Company, that they should be fully brought to light, and that all should understand exactly how the case stands, and that the system of mystery, of concealment, of half truths, which has gone on should not continue further. It would have been better for the Company if we had known the exact facts as to the guarantee when the guarantee was given, as to the stock when the stock was issued, and as to the acquisitions of other lines when the acquisitions were made; because what we did know imperfectly was magnified and a worse construction put upon the things than they might have borne if the truth was known. The directors of the Company are also contractors for the execution of their works, and we have no returns showing the particulars of those contracts or estimates of the cost of construction of the different sections. Even those friendly to the proposal must see that it is inadvisable to accept it. We are face to face with a condition of things, financially, which will be the subject of discussion in a few days, and it behooves us to be prudent—to pause before imposing additional engagements at this time on the country. Face to face with this state of things, we are asked to enter into those large engagements for which no reason has been given, and for which I pretend no countervailing advantages are offered. I, therefore, cannot give my assent to this proposal.

Mr. IVES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:30 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 6th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Owen Sound Dry Dock, Ship Building and Navigation Company, limited.—(Mr. Allen.)

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Ontario and Québec Railway Company.—(Mr. Wells.)

Bill (No. 47) respecting the winding up of the Spring Hill and Parrsborough Coal and Railway Company and the sale of the property thereof to the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Tupper, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Atlantic Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Nova Scotia Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the International Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 51) to amend the Act incorporating the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 52) further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(Mr. Mulock.)

### COMMITTAL OF A BILL.

Mr. AMYOT moved:

That the Order of this House of Monday the 4th inst., referring the Bill to incorporate the Pilots serving between Montreal and Quebec, to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, be discharged, and that the said Bill be referred to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the proper procedure in this case would be for the Committee to whom this Bill has been referred—namely, the Committee on Banking and Commerce—to look at it; and if, in their opinion, it did not affect the subjects referred to them, they could so report to the House, and the House would then refer it to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills. I think in former years the practice has been that when a Committee has received a Bill which the members of the Committee believed was not properly referred to them, they have so reported to the House, and the House has acted on that report. But, of course, it is in the power of the House to act upon the motion.

Mr. AMYOT. I have followed the precedent of two years ago. On the 17th of April, 1882, on motion of Mr. Haggart, seconded by Mr. White, it was ordered:

“That the Order of this House of Friday the 10th March last, referring the Bill to incorporate the Saskatchewan, Qu' Appelle and Assiniboine Navigation Company, to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, be discharged, and that the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.”

The reason I make this motion is that this Bill does not affect banking and commerce at all. It is only a private bill, to enable the pilots to regulate their affairs among themselves, with the unanimous consent of themselves. I may quote as a precedent the Act to incorporate the pilots below Quebec, passed in 1860, which was referred to the Private Bills' Committee. I may also refer to the Act to amend the same in 1862, and to the Act further to amend the same in 1866, as well as to the first Act passed incorporating the pilots, in 1852-53, all of which were referred to the Committee on Private Bills. I do not see why we should trouble the Committee on Banking and Commerce, who will have so much to do this year, with a Bill of this

kind, which ought to go to the Private Bills' Committee. I have been told by old Members of the House that this Bill should be referred to that Committee; and as this House is the supreme master of its own decisions, it might properly grant the motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand from the hon. gentleman that this Bill is only to enable the pilots to make their own private arrangements among themselves.

Mr. AMYOT. Only.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Therefore it does not affect trade, and the hon. gentleman desires that it may be referred to the proper Committee—the Committee on Private Bills.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman, of course, runs his risk; but after all it is the action of the House. The Bill has been read the second time. We are presumed each to have read the Bill, and to be able to render an intelligent reason why it should be referred to one Committee, or to the other. I think the hon. First Minister it was who suggested a reference of the Bill to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and it was so referred. I confess my impression was that it was a matter for the Private Bills' Committee to deal with, since it proposed an incorporation which was not designed ostensibly, at any rate, to interfere with trade and commerce, but which was simply a mere benevolent association of individuals. The hon. gentleman is quite right in making his motion to destroy the Order and have the Bill referred to the other Committee. The real, substantial question was whether we were in error the other day, or not.

Order discharged, and Bill referred to Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

#### HUDSON BAY ROUTE.

Mr. ORTON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to send out an exploratory expedition to the Hudson Bay and Straits, with the object of ascertaining the feasibility of the route *vid* Hudson Bay to Europe?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The best answer I can give is, that I am under the impression that when the Estimates come down the hon. gentleman will be satisfied.

#### OYSTER POND BREAKWATER.

Mr. KIRK enquired, Whether the Government has expended the grant of \$2,000 made last Session for Oyster Pond Breakwater, in the county of Guysborough, N. S. ? If not, is it the intention to expend it before the termination of the fiscal year? If not, why not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Joseph Hedley, sen., has been appointed foreman. He has been furnished with plans and specifications for the work he has to do, and has instructions to proceed with the work, which will be completed on or before the 30th June next.

#### NEW HARBOUR AND INDIAN HARBOUR.

Mr. KIRK enquired, Has the Government caused, during the recess, an engineer to visit New Harbour and Indian Harbour, and report upon the probable cost of constructing a breakwater at each of these harbours, suitable to the wants of the fishermen, as promised last Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has made a mistake in saying "as promised last Session." Last Session the hon. gentleman enquired whether it was the intention of the Government to proceed with the works at New Harbour and Indian Harbour. He was informed that "when the time came to use the

Mr. AMYOT.

vote of \$2,000 appropriated by Parliament, enquiries were instituted as to the total amount required to make it a really useful work, and it was found the amount was so large that the Government were not prepared at that time to proceed with the work." The hon. gentleman might refer to the answer given last Session, on page 78 of *Hansard*, 1883.

#### MORPETH HARBOUR.

Mr. JACKSON enquired, Has the contract for harbour improvement at Morpeth, in the county of Kent, Ontario, been let? If so, were tenders invited for the work; if so, who tendered for the same; what was the amount of each tender; to whom was the contract awarded, and what is his post office address?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract for harbour improvement at Morpeth, Kent county, has been let. Tenders were invited. There were six tenders received, viz.: John Mellagh, John Bruntren, John McKenna, J. W. Dinwoodie, Harry Buckner, John E. Askwith, and W. J. Douglas. The amounts of the tender were from \$17,400 to \$38,850. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to insist on having the amount of each tender, for the reason that the contract is now being prepared; and it is proper the contract should be prepared before we give the amount of other tenders. The successful tenderer is the lowest, Mr. John E. Askwith, of Ottawa.

#### EXCISE AT PERTH AND AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) (translation) enquired, What is the amount of the sums collected by the Excise Officers at Perth during the fiscal year 1882-83? What is the amount collected at Quebec during the same period? What is the salary of the Collector of Revenue at Perth? What is the salary of the same officer at Quebec?

Mr. COSTIGAN (translation). Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honorable member, I must say that the amount of the sums collected by the Excise Officers at Perth during the fiscal year 1882-83, is \$47,111.20 and that the amount collected at Quebec during the same period is \$47,727.28; that the salary of the Collector of Revenue at Perth is \$1,200 and that of the Collector at Quebec is \$1,450.

#### THE AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS COMMITTEE OF 1882.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) moved for a statement of all expenses incurred by the Committee, appointed during the Session of 1882, to enquire into and report upon the operation of the Tariff upon the Agricultural Interests of the Dominion, comprising the following: 1st. The names of the parties summoned and examined by the Committee, and the amounts paid to each such person for travelling and other expenses; 2nd. The names of the reporters and clerks employed to report evidence and prepare report, &c., of said Committee; 3rd. The party employed to print the same, the number of copies printed, and the whole cost of publication of the report, evidence and other expenses incident to the same; also, how and when said reports were distributed.

Mr. GUILLET. I cannot assume that this motion is made from any unfriendliness to the Committee, or its report. I cannot assume that; but I wish to point out that the report of that Committee was unanimously accepted, that there was no adverse report by the minority, that there was no adverse expression of opinion in this House; and I think that no expenditure authorized by the House has been more acceptable than that devoted to obtaining the information which that report furnished. It was a remarkable circumstance that there was no opposition to this report when

it was presented, and it was also a remarkable circumstance that, when a motion was made to authorize the publication of 5,000 copies of that report in English, and 5,000 in French, it was opposed by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the motion was lost; and it was only at a subsequent meeting, when the supporters of the Government were in greater strength, that it was carried. It did seem as if hon. gentlemen opposite desired to suppress the information obtained by that Committee as to the operation of the Tariff. I desire to direct the attention of the House to the fact that there was opposition to the publication of the report and also to the fact that, at the ensuing Session, so satisfactory has that report been to the country, a desire was expressed that the evidence should also be obtained and published. A large number of copies were distributed throughout the Dominion, and I believe with the result of greatly increasing the knowledge of the people with respect to the operation of the Tariff on the agricultural industries of the country. I think, therefore, that the return is desirable, as showing how great an amount of information has been imparted to the country at so small an expenditure.

Motion agreed to.

#### APPOINTMENT OF HON. J. A. MOUSSEAU TO THE BENCH.

Mr. LAURIER moved for: 1st. Copy of the petition contesting the election of the Hon. J. A. Mousseau, in 1882, to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, for the Electoral District of Jacques Cartier, and particulars delivered in connection therewith; 2nd. Copy of the evidence adduced, and of the admissions made by the parties to the said petition, at the trial; 3rd. Copy of the judgment and report of the Court; 4th. Copy of the petition contesting the election of the said Hon. J. A. Mousseau, in 1883, to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, for the Electoral District of Jacques Cartier, and particulars delivered in connection therewith; 5th. Copy of the Commission appointing the said Hon. J. A. Mousseau, a Judge of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec. He said: My motive, Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, is to put the House in possession of all the facts bearing upon the appointment of Mr. Mousseau to the Bench of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec. Many of these facts are already of common notoriety, and have been widely circulated through the press. I am sorry to say that some of them are, in my humble judgment, such as to render the Government liable to the gravest censure for having appointed Mr. Mousseau to that high judicial position, at such a time, and under such circumstances. I hope the House will understand that, in speaking as I do upon this matter, I do not in any way impugn the professional qualifications of Mr. Mousseau for the high position to which he has been called. As to those qualifications I have not one word to say, either for or against the appointment; but I desire to allude to the very grave accusation which rested upon Mr. Mousseau at the time of his appointment, and which, until it has been removed, ought, in the opinion of all those who value the honour of the Bench, to constitute a perpetual and effective bar against his appointment. It is a matter of common notoriety that at the very moment he was appointed a Judge of the Superior Court of Lower Canada, he stood before that Court charged with violations of the Election Law, and, moreover, with personal bribery and corruption. And now, Mr. Speaker, since this appointment has been made, we find this most extraordinary state of things in the Province of Quebec—that a Judge of the land is liable at any moment to be called upon to step down from the Bench where he sits, and to take his trial under the bar, like any other man, charged with a violation of the law which he has

been appointed to administer. It is certainly a demoralizing state of things when a Judge of the land, who holds in his hands the life, liberty, honour and property of his fellow men, may be at any moment declared by the Court of which he is a Judge, to be unworthy of the rights of citizenship. It may be said, perhaps—and I do not know that any other defence can be made—that accusation does not imply guilt, and that no one is to be presumed guilty until he has been tried and found so by competent authority. We know, Mr. Speaker, that the maxim that no one is to be presumed guilty until he has been found so by competent authority, is a very stale maxim, and one of daily application; but, in my opinion, it would be a sad misapplication of it to invoke it in favour of a Judge of the land under these circumstances, and is the last excuse which ought to be made in his favour. It is true, also, that if the prosecution that is brought against him is continued, he may be honourably acquitted; it is possible the charges may be dismissed; and it is equally possible that they may be brought home to him. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask any one who can give an unbiassed judgment on the matter, whether, to say the least, it was not an act of most indecent haste on the part of the Government to appoint Mr. Mousseau as long as he was liable to be tried, and before he had cleared his own character which was impugned in the Courts of Justice. In speaking as I now do, I take what I conceive to be the most favourable view of Mr. Mousseau's position. I speak as if the petition against him had been just brought into Court, as if no evidence had been adduced, and no facts elicited. But, unfortunately, evidence has been adduced upon the petition, facts have been elicited, and that evidence and those facts made it all the more necessary for the Government to insist upon Mr. Mousseau clearing his character before he was appointed. It has been Mr. Mousseau's misfortune, since he left this House, to undergo two elections. When he ceased to be a member of this House and became Premier of the Province of Quebec, he had naturally to seek a seat in the Legislature, and he elected to run for the county of Jacques Cartier. As I said a moment ago, he has had to seek election twice, and upon both occasions he was opposed—not by a political adversary, but by one of his own political creed and persuasion. It was a sort of family quarrel, and, like all family quarrels, it was an intensely bitter one. Well, the result of the elections was apparently in favour of Mr. Mousseau. He was elected on both occasions, but on both occasions his election was contested. The first decision was given in the first days of May last. Now, it is a fact of common notoriety, which has been circulated throughout the length and breadth of the land, that Mr. Mousseau was charged with a very grave offence, an offence which exceeds ordinary offences committed in elections, and one which he was charged with committing while running as a candidate in the county of Jacques Cartier. A short time previous to the election three different parties had been prosecuted for a violation of the Revenue Laws in selling liquor without a license. These three parties had been fined and convicted, and their stock of liquor confiscated. It was charged against Mr. Mousseau, that in order to gain the support of these three persons, he had promised them that he would have their fines remitted and their liquor restored to them. It was further charged that the corrupt bargain was carried out, so far at all events as Mr. Mousseau was concerned in it; and that he, being then Premier of the Province, and Attorney General as well, had, in fact, caused the fines to be returned to those men, and their stock of liquors restored to them. Every one will agree with me that no graver charge could be brought against Mr. Mousseau, in his position as Attorney General, than such a charge as this. The trial came off, as I have said, in the first days of May. On May 3rd, one of the parties, who had thus been fined, was put in the witness box and examined. I now quote from the report published

at the time, not by a partisan newspaper, but by an independent newspaper—the *Star*—and the report reads as follows:—

“ Andrew Leger, proprietor of Rapin's Hotel, Lachine, stepped into the witness box to be examined on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Leger being one of the parties who had been fined on three occasions for selling liquor without a license, and whose fines were subsequently remitted by the Government, considerable interest was naturally manifested in the evidence to be given by this witness. His testimony was given in a calm, collected and straightforward manner, and was considered to be of a most damaging nature by all the legal gentlemen present. He deposed to keeping Rapin's hotel, Lachine; to being fined on two occasions \$75, and on a third, \$0 and costs for selling liquor without a license, which fines were subsequently remitted by order of Hon. Mr. Wurtele, Provincial Treasurer. Witness had seen Hon. Mr. Mousseau, the respondent, several times in connection with this matter.

“ Q. You had always, previous to this election, been a Liberal, queried Mr. Mercier?

“ A. Yes, but I voted blue this time, laughingly replied the witness.

“ Q. Did you ever speak to Mr. Mousseau about the elections?

“ A. Oh! yes, when he came to my place with Mr. Wurtele he asked me my name, and asked me if I was a Liberal or a Conservative.

“ Q. And you replied?

“ A. That I could be a Conservative if it was necessary, or a Liberal.

“ Q. Did Mr. Mousseau say anything about remitting the fines then?

“ A. As he said good-bye to me he turned to Mr. Wurtele and told him to do what he could for these gentlemen (meaning the three tavern keepers who had been fined.)

“ Q. Did this have any influence upon you in causing you to change your political views and vote for Mr. Mousseau?

“ A. Of course it always influenced me.

“ Q. When you so voted for Mr. Mousseau, did you believe your fine would be remitted?

“ A. Yes, I did, and I told my friend that I was going to vote for him. My brother-in-law, Mr. Chapman, also had conversations with Mr. Mousseau and Mr. Wurtele about my fine.”

And the report continues in this way:

“The cross-examination of this witness was adjourned until to-morrow to allow him to produce the letters he received from the Provincial Treasurer remitting the fine.”

As stated in the concluding words of the report, the cross-examination was adjourned to the following day for the production of the letter of Mr. Wurtele, Provincial Treasurer, who had remitted the fines and returned the stock of liquors. Yet, strange to say, that letter never was produced, and that witness never was cross-examined. What is the reason why those most damaging statements made by this witness never were contradicted, and why was the witness never cross-examined? The reason is that another witness was shortly afterwards put in the box, and he occupied the same position as Mr. Leger. He was another man who had been fined, and he proved that a similar promise made by Mr. Mousseau had been carried out by the Provincial Treasurer. After that Mr. Mousseau threw up the sponge. He offered to resign his seat if the petitioner would not press his disqualification. I now quote from the report of another paper, the *Montreal Gazette* of 5th May last, which runs as follows:—

“ At this juncture Mr. Lacoste rose, and addressing the Court stated that, on his advice, his client Mr. Mousseau had resigned the contested seat and moved the remaining witnesses be discharged.

“ Mr. Mercier objected, and asked to be allowed till to-day to decide whether to continue this prosecution.

“ Hon. Justice Torrance ordered that the witnesses be in attendance this morning, at 10 o'clock. The Court was adjourned till that hour. His Honour expressed the intention of the Court to maintain the hearing of the case with the strictest regard for fairness. The English Election Law, he stated, required proof not only of transgression of its letter, but also of its spirit, by the party accused, and such a case had therefore to be dealt with in a spirit of the utmost equity.”

On the following day the petitioner had concluded not to prosecute further the investigation of the charges of personal bribery and corruption brought against Mr. Mousseau, but to rest the case on his resignation of the seat. I again cite from the *Star* newspaper of May 5th:

“ After going to press yesterday afternoon, Pierre Godin, hotel-keeper of Lachine, testified that he had been sued by the Revenue Department three times and his liquor confiscated, but that the fines and liquor were afterwards remitted him about election time.

“ A large number of politicians and others were present in Court this morning when Mr. Mercier intimated to the Court that he wished to add the following declaration to his record:—

Mr. LAURIER.

“ ‘ Considering the declaration made yesterday in open Court, by the defendant, to the effect that he agreed to have the election annulled with costs, the petitioner waives that part of his conclusions asking the disqualification of defendant.’

“ This closes the case, which will, however, be called on Monday next.”

I must say that Mr. Mercier subsequently declared, in a public discussion to which I shall have to refer shortly, that he had abandoned the prosecution of Mr. Mousseau's disqualification at the urgent request of Mr. Mousseau's friends, who had appealed to his sympathy and his mercy.

Mr. OUMET. Five thousand dollars; that went a good way in sympathy.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That does not improve the case very much.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) thinks that a man who says he has bribed another is fit to be a Judge, he is entitled to his opinion; at all events, we do not think so. I will come to that point in due time. The warmest friends of Mr. Mousseau, instead of setting up the plea, which he afterwards set up himself, that he had bribed an adversary to prevent his disqualification, should be sorry that Mr. Mousseau did not cause the letter to be filed, the witness to be cross-examined, and especially that the gentleman himself failed to go into the box and give his explanation of the transaction. All those circumstances—the failure to produce the letter, the failure to have the witness cross-examined, and the failure on the part of Mr. Mousseau to enter the witness box and give, like a man, what explanation he had to furnish, left a most painful impression that the charge was true beyond controversy, and that Mr. Mousseau dare not face it. Another election took place, and again Mr. Mousseau was back in his position. He was again elected, and again his election was contested; and his election was contested not only for personal bribery and corruption at the last election, but also—I say it in so many words—for the very charges which had not been investigated at the first trial. It may be said, perhaps, that these charges having been formulated in a former election, could not again be reopened and become the subject of a second controversy. It may be a debatable question whether they should or should not be permitted at a subsequent trial. I have no doubt that the report of the judge would assist materially in settling that point. But what I do leave to the common sense of the members of this House is that, in view of the subsequent conduct of Mr. Mousseau, in view of the subsequent charges and allegations, he could not easily prevent the petitioner from enquiring into the charges which were brought on his first contestation and were not fully investigated. And what is the reason? The reason has just been given by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) that Mr. Mousseau says that if the charges were not enquired into it was simply because there was collusion between him and the other side. At the new election Mr. Mousseau was met by the same adversary as on the first occasion. On the second election trial Mr. Mercier, leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly, and counsel for the petitioner, who had also been engaged in the first contestation, was squarely accused by *La Minerve*, the chief organ of the Conservative party of the Province of Quebec, with having received a bribe of \$5,000 for not prosecuting further the disqualification of Mr. Mousseau on the first petition. In justice to Mr. Mercier, I am bound to say that he has denied the charge, that he has instituted an action to vindicate his character, and that that action is still pending in the Court. But here is an assertion on the one hand, and another assertion on the other; and I shall put the case fairly in the interests of Mr. Mousseau himself. Here is the assertion of Mr. Mousseau, that he paid \$5,000 to bribe Mr. Mercier, and here is the denial of Mr. Mercier; but in what manner does it help Mr. Mousseau in the pre-

sent case? What benefit can Mr. Mousseau receive from his own assertion, if he should come into Court and produce witnesses to prove that a corrupt bargain had been made by himself in his position as Attorney General? Will he say: It is true I have accused him, but I have accused him falsely? But whether he accused him falsely or truly, there is the allegation that he committed a fraud against the law in order to prevent enquiry into the question of his own disqualification. Will he himself come before the Court uttering the self-accusation that he has himself committed a corrupt bargain; that he has committed another crime? If such a position as that can help him, I cannot understand it, for I never saw a case of a man being allowed to come into Court to prove his own villainy, or of a man entitled to derive benefit from allegations of his own fraud. Now, all those facts are notorious. They are all publicly known. They have been stated and reiterated in the press over and over again. I ask if it is not under such circumstances an outrage on public opinion to appoint a man lying under such a self-accusation to the highest judicial office in the Province? I say that the conduct of the Government is without excuse. I do not say that they should not have appointed him under any circumstances, but I say that they should not have appointed him until he had vindicated his reputation, and come out clear of any such imputation against his character. Moreover, if I am to speak my own mind as to the motives of the Government, I say candidly that I do not believe the Government would have made such an appointment under such circumstances, if they had not had a plotting hand in the deplorable state of affairs which now exists in the Province of Quebec. If the Government had not been plotting in order to keep their friends and minions in power, I do not believe they would have appointed Mr. Mousseau. I believe that the sense of propriety which has always animated the Premier, in making judicial appointments, would have been such that he would have insisted that Mr. Mousseau should not have been appointed until his character had been cleared. I do not pretend to affect any Puritanism; I do not parade ostentatiously any pretension of superior virtue. I know the failings to which even well meaning men are liable. I know that the Election Law is stringent and severe, and that many a man has been unseated and disqualified for offences which could not be strictly called offences against morals, but which were offences against the statutory law.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Do hon. gentlemen pretend to say that a man who is called to be Her Majesty's Attorney General, who abuses his authority and commits offences against the law, in order to promote his own corrupt ends, is not guilty of an offence against the moral law? I say it is an unpardonable malfeasance of office, when a man charged with an offence prevented the investigation and refused to take his trial by offering a bribe to the other side. Such a man only seeks to palliate one offence by committing another. I say, furthermore, that the appointment of such a man under such circumstances is an attempt upon the dignity and efficiency of the Bench. Against Mr. Mousseau, personally, I have not the slightest feeling. I would not do him the slightest injury, but I do not affect to be indifferent to the consequences which would follow if such conduct on the part of the Government were not brought to the bar of public opinion. We owe it to ourselves to preserve the dignity and efficiency of the Bench. There are certain things which should never be impugned, and the honour of the Bench is one of those things; and I say it is not sufficient that the Bench should be pure, but it must also be above suspicion. It is not so many years ago that the Conservative party were of opinion that a crime committed, not by the man himself, but by his friends, was a sufficient cause for his exclusion from a judicial office. It

is within the recollection of all that a few years ago, at the General Election of 1878, the ballot boxes in the county of Jacques Cartier were interfered with by some over zealous friends of Mr. Laflamme. It is also within the knowledge of all that Mr. Laflamme himself was not privy to that offence, that he did not even profit by it, that it was done without his participation; but a few days afterwards one of the leading Conservative organs in the Province of Quebec, the *Montreal Gazette*, speaking of reports which were then circulating that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie intended to make Mr. Laflamme a Judge, spoke as follows:—

"Whatever may have been Mr. Mackenzie's intentions in the past, we feel confident that he will never so outrage the public sentiment of the community as to make Mr. Laflamme a Judge, after the exposure now made of the means by which his pretended election for Jacques Cartier was secured."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if gentlemen on the other side still adhere to the opinion which was expressed in their leading organs five years ago, they will not have condemnation strong enough for the present Government of Quebec. As I said a moment ago, that offence was committed—for offence it was—not with any sanction of the man for whose benefit it was intended. In this case Mr. Mousseau himself has been charged in a Court of Justice with having entered into a most corrupt bargain, with having prostituted the office with which he was entrusted; and you have it from his own mouth that his friends bribed the other side, and he benefited by it. Under such circumstances, I repeat that if hon. gentlemen still adhere to the opinion which was expressed in one of their leading organs, they cannot have censure strong enough for that Government; and I hope—it is perhaps a delusive hope—that they will support me in obtaining these papers at the earliest moment possible.

Mr. OUIVET. Mr. Speaker, if I rise to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for Quebec East, I do so not precisely to justify the Government—I suppose they do not need my voice to justify them, for I am sure they will justify themselves at the proper time—but I rise as a friend of one who has been one of us for many years, and whom a great many members of this House have learned to esteem and respect as a man of high abilities, and of high personal character. I am glad, Sir, that the hon. member should have had the courage—I might say the weakness—of ending his speech by saying that he had no personal feelings against the Hon. Mr. Mousseau, against whom, however, he had before made a strong appeal to the prejudices of hon. members of this House, who do not happen to know that hon. gentleman. I say that the personal character of Mr. Mousseau is high above all attacks that may be made upon it in this House, especially in his absence and behind his back, when he is unable to defend himself. I am satisfied that all the members of this House who have known that hon. gentleman, would willingly raise their voices in his defence. Although he has been persecuted and dragged before Courts of Justice for pretended infractions of the Election Laws of the Province of Quebec, although these accusations have been hurled against him for months, and have politically ruined him, I say that many of these hon. members who are around me now would gladly rise and testify to Mr. Mousseau's honour and respectability, and say they know better. They would say that, although he might have happened to come under the extreme severity of the Election Law, Mr. Mousseau, by his legal attainments, by his respectability, by his known honesty and high character, was well worthy of being made a member of the Supreme Court of Lower Canada. Now, Sir, let me say, in answer to some of the insinuations—I will not qualify them—made against the character of Mr. Mousseau, that this evidence which is so much spoken of has been submitted to a Judge of the

land, the Hon. Judge Torrance, who, after having heard all that the witnesses had to say, rendered his judgment, and stated emphatically that if the case had been presented to him, even with the accusations which have been stated by my hon. friend, he would not only not have disqualified Mr. Mousseau, but not even voided his election. That, Sir, is enough to vindicate Mr. Mousseau's legal honour, because his personal character, as I said before, does not require to be vindicated, at least in this House. It is not necessary that I should go any further; but I want to go as far as the hon. member has gone. Not more than two days ago we were discussing in this House a Bill to amend the law of evidence in criminal matters. The object of the Bill was to allow a prisoner to give evidence in his own behalf; and every hon. gentleman who spoke in favour of the Bill—and the hon. member for Quebec East, although he did not speak, voted in that way—claimed that the fact of a prisoner not offering his evidence was not to be taken against him—that it was not even to raise the least suspicion of his guilt. We pretended, on the other hand, that the Judge, and more especially the jury, would consider such a refusal as an admission of guilt; but those hon. gentlemen said with the greatest emphasis: "Oh! it is nothing of the kind, the prisoner is not obliged to give his evidence;" and the fact that he does not give his evidence will not, in the mind of an intelligent man, be taken as a presumption of guilt. What is the argument now before us? It is, that because Mr. Mousseau did not think proper, or convenient, or consistent with his dignity, to step into the box and under oath give his evidence against a man who the hon. gentleman had to admit—although he said he was a Liberal, a member of his own party—boasted of having sold his vote; boasted that he had been corrupted by the friends of Mr. Mousseau—because Mr. Mousseau did not choose to lower himself to the level of that man, an hon. member is found in this House who will say that such refusal by Mr. Mousseau is a presumption of guilt. Evidently the hon. member has forgotten the vote he gave the other day. He has forgotten what he sanctioned only a few days ago; and although he pretends he has no personal feelings against the Hon. Mr. Mousseau, although he says he gets up only for the purpose of vindicating the honour and dignity of the Bench, I say that passion has made him forget the principle he laid down a few days ago. In his own mind, and in his own heart, he has forgotten to apply in practice the very principle he would like to see applied to the lowest grade of criminal on trial, who may be put in the box. The hon. gentleman has spoken of what he calls notoriety, or notorious facts. There are a great many notorious facts in this—I will not say trial, or contestation—but in this persecution, that has been followed up day by day against the Hon. Mr. Mousseau since he was sent down to Quebec to take the leadership of the Government there.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Who sent him?

Mr. AMYOT. Public opinion.

Mr. OUIMET. Who sent him? I suppose that the hon. gentleman who asked this question will never be requested by any party to be sent there or anywhere. The hon. gentleman, citing from old respected maxims of law, has said, with reference to the suggestion that \$5,000 had been paid by the friends of Mr. Mousseau, to have the contestation discontinued, that he never knew a man to plead his own villainy. The hon. gentleman forgot again to apply the principles he advocated the other day. When he declared that the Hon. Mr. Mercier, the acknowledged leader of the Liberal party in Quebec, had accepted as a bribe \$5,000 to discontinue these proceedings, he ought to have been possessed of this indignation which has been shown by him against the enormous guilt of Mr. Mousseau. In insinuat-

Mr. OUIMET.

ing that these \$5,000 were paid by the friends of Mr. Mousseau, and by a particular friend of the hon. gentleman, a leading supporter of his in the county which he has the honour to represent, Mr. Trudel, the hon. member has pleaded the villainy of his own party. It is a family quarrel. I do not know what the hon. gentleman would call it, but he is certainly quarrelling with his own friends, branding his own friends in the same way that he has been branding a man of lower standing—that man Léger—whom he pretends Mr. Mousseau bribed. The hon. gentleman says that the leader of his own party has been bribed, and he brings that up here and pleads the villainy of his own party. Not only do I regret the speech of the hon. gentleman, for the sake of the dignity of the Bench in our Province; not only do I regret it from a national point of view; not only do I regret it as a member of this House, and a friend of Mr. Mousseau, but I regret it for the sake of the hon. gentleman, and for the sake of his friends. On what basis does he make his charges? On papers which are not even before this House; in violation of the first rules of Parliament that nobody is to be allowed to speak, citing papers which are not produced. He ought not to stand up here and make these charges when he knows that Mr. Mousseau cannot be brought before this House, except on a motion for impeachment, when he knows that we cannot try him. But the hon. gentleman's view was to try and strike an old opponent, for, while Mr. Mousseau was a member of this House, he fought against the hon. member for Quebec East successfully. As I have said, we cannot try the Hon. Mr. Mousseau, unless we bring him before us on a motion for impeachment. I say that although there is a moral guilt in the act, if the charge is true; although there is something which the law condemns, the hon. gentleman knows very well that it all the hon. members of this House were to be brought up here and reproached with all the acts they have been committing, wittingly or unwittingly—I say it with intent—how many times during an election contest are we not approached by parties who have nothing else in view than to try and compromise us, than to try and commit us to compromising words, and afterwards, as was the case here, bring them against us. That was another villainy of the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs. Mr. Mousseau was supported by the Liberals in Jacques Cartier; he was supported by Mr. Mercier, Mr. Lafamme, and the leading men belonging to the Liberal party in Montreal, and they gave letters to their friends in the county, not only telling them to support Mr. Mousseau, but urging them to work for him. After they had employed their own agents in favour of Mr. Mousseau, those very agents, with a few exceptions, were the men who turned round and came to declare that there had been corrupt acts committed during the election. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has very bad grace to come up here and bring before this House all the villainy that his party was guilty of in that election. I return to this fact, that the Hon. Mr. Mercier himself gave letters to his friends to support Mr. Mousseau; the Hon. Mr. Mercier himself was the man who helped to get Mr. Mousseau elected, and, after that, he, with his friends, turns round; he takes the case as counsel, he persecutes Mr. Mousseau; and I heard Mr. Mercier say on the hustings, during the last election in Jacques Cartier, that he had been following Mr. Mousseau step by step, and that, if Mr. Mousseau was again elected, the persecution would continue; and Mr. Mousseau would know that, if Mr. Mercier could not impose his terms upon him—because he wanted to be a member of Mr. Mousseau's Government—Mr. Mousseau would pay to the bitter end the penalty for his resistance to accepting him as a colleague and as a Minister in his Cabinet. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is only one of the few features, one of the few disgusting features, of all that per-

secution that has been going on against Mr. Mousseau; and I say, again, that we cannot interfere in that matter. I say that, from his legal attainments, from his personal abilities, from his high character as a man, as a citizen, Mr. Mousseau was worthy of being elevated to the Bench to which the Government chose to elevate him. I say that the Bench has acquired a worthy member, and, although his election is still before the Courts, and although I suppose a few hundred or a few thousand dollars might get him rid of that—because my hon. friends from the other side are always open to conviction, are always open to receive any nice offer—although Mr. Mousseau could get out of that very easily, the Bench is not disgraced, and will never be disgraced, by the presence of the Hon. Mr. Mousseau. And I feel, Mr. Speaker, that, in speaking in that way, I have the sympathies of all the hon. members of this House, not only on this side but on the other side, who have known Mr. Mousseau, and I for one congratulate the Government for having made the appointment.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the speech made by my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Laurier), and I have also listened to the answer which has been made by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet). I do not know if that is the line of defence the Government intend to take upon the subject; but whatever may be the merits or demerits of Mr. Mousseau, the reputation and the name that he has before the Dominion at the present moment is the name he has acquired by his own acts. That these acts urged against him are true or false, is not the point at present for public opinion. There they are, and they are notorious at present before the public. Therefore, Mr. Mousseau enjoys, either rightfully or wrongfully, the name which he has before this Dominion to-day. Now, Sir, it is no use disguising the fact that the line of defence adopted by my hon. friend from Laval, of bribery on the part of the Liberal side, and that bribery made at the instance of his own friends, would in no way at all palliate what I may call, to repeat his expression, the disgusting bribery that has been made from his party on our side. Now, I will take things on another standpoint. The hon. member for Laval has leaked out—the fact is that, as we say, he has let the cat out of the bag—he has said that Mr. Mousseau was sent down to Quebec; and in fact we had Mr. Mousseau, who was then a Minister here, sent down to us from the Treasury Benches in Ottawa to the Province of Quebec, to succeed whom? To succeed the hon. Secretary of State, whom I do not see in his place at the present moment, and who I think ought to be there. If I have anything to say in reference to him, he ought to be there, but I will not be deterred. What was the effect of sending Mr. Mousseau down? It is a notorious fact, and I call the attention of this House and of the country to this: that it is a continuation of this undue interference by the Federal Government in the affairs of the Province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Gentlemen on the other side may laugh at it, but they may believe me when I say so, for it is so. We have had the pleasure of having Mr. Mousseau sent down to us as Prime Minister. He has been excessively successful in the mission he was sent there to fulfil, so much so that, at the moment when his administration was crumbling to pieces, it crumbled down of itself. Then the Federal Government interferes, and says: "We will take Mr. Mousseau under our protection, and find a nice little berth for him, in order that we may see as to the appointment of his successor also." Independently of the direct question as to the appointment of Mr. Mousseau, I say that it was an undue interference with our affairs, and it is a continuation of the interference which took place last year in Ontario.

This Government has a decided hostility, and shows it, to the Local Government of Ontario, and a decided affection for, and care of, the Government of Quebec. I think, when hon. gentlemen on the other side, who boast so much of their Confederation, reflect that this Government is trying to centralize all the power in themselves, and not to have a continuation of the Confederation, but to bring us gradually to a Legislative Union, they will see that they are following the due course which they had in view, or some of them had in view, at the time. Now, I object on this ground to this interference, because, if it continues any longer, it will destroy the bonds of this Confederation. There is nothing so well calculated to break up Confederation as this interference on the part of the Federal authorities.

Mr. LANDRY. Question! Question!

Mr. CASGRAIN. Well, if it is not the question I think it comes pretty near home to you. Now what have we seen? Take the previous Administration, that of Mr. Chapleau—it was merely what we might call a *succursale*, merely an agency of this Government. It is true that they came into power under circumstances that, constitutionally, did not quite meet the views of my hon. friend the First Minister; but then he laughed in his sleeve when he saw how well the game succeeded. Now, Sir, let me refer to the record of the leader of the Government with regard to judicial appointments. I readily grant him that up to this time he has maintained the dignity of the Bench. In one or two cases, perhaps, his appointments did not realize his expectations, but I will not blame him for that. On the whole, I can congratulate him upon having respected the dignity of the Bench; but on this unfortunate occasion, he made, I must say, in my opinion, a grave mistake. Now, as my hon. friend from Quebec East observed, these charges may be brought home to Mr. Mousseau, and then what shall we do in the Province of Quebec? Shall we impeach Mr. Mousseau before this House, in face of the appointment made by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and in face of the large majority ready to support the hon. First Minister? Mr. Mousseau will go on administering justice, but so long as he remains under the imputation of these charges, he will be, in my opinion, a disgrace to the Bench. Therefore, I must demand that all these papers be brought down in order that we may obtain possession of all the facts.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I regret exceedingly that the hon. member who made this motion did not think proper before doing so, to refer to the record in the Court, and thus do justice to a gentleman whom he has so unfairly attacked in this House when he is not here to defend himself. The hon. gentleman has made an *ex parte* statement, he has only produced certain documents, and relied upon them to make a charge against the Hon. Judge, Mr. Mousseau. I will not say the hon. gentleman's neglect was a wilful and deliberate one; but certainly before he brought so grave a charge against a Judge of the land, and before he charged the Government, and especially the hon. First Minister, with having made an appointment which was a disgrace to the Bench, I say the hon. gentleman ought not to have failed to consult every paper in the record, from the first to the last, and not produce here a portion only of the papers. My hon. friend from Laval has quoted the remarks of the hon. Judge Torrance when he rendered his judgment in the case. That was a very important point in the case, and ought not to have been omitted. It should have been laid before the House as part of the evidence, so that Mr. Mousseau might have benefited by it. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal more than that. The hon. gentleman takes the record in the first trial; he takes the petition and the evidence, but he does not speak of the judgment. The judgment was favourable to Mr. Mousseau, but that is

omitted. Then the second trial took place; that is to say, the contestation of the second election, and another petition is brought forward against the Hon. Mr. Mousseau, the elected member. That petition contained everything that is considered to be a violation of the law, and certain charges, I have no doubt special ones, were made. Well, the hon. gentleman refers to them, and he says: "These are the accusations." But, it is said, while these grave accusations, these accusations of personal corruption, are hanging over his head, and while the matter is pending in Court, and before any decision is given, this Government elevates Mr. Mousseau to the Bench. But why did the hon. gentleman go and look at the record and neglect to consult a very important part of it? If he had looked over the whole record he would have found Mr. Mousseau's answer, under oath, to the charges. He would there have found Mr. Mousseau's affidavit, which he ought to have laid before the House, as he has the petition. He ought to have spoken of that, and why did he not? I will not say that he concealed it purposely, because I cannot suppose that the hon. gentleman would do such a thing, but at all events he comes here, he, a member of Parliament, as if he had a brief from the opponents of Mr. Mousseau, to make against him, in this High Court of Parliament, the same charges that were made before the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I say that is very unfair. It is very unjust towards the Hon. Mr. Mousseau—I will not say that it is unjust towards us; but the House will decide whether the hon. gentleman was warranted in bringing these charges before the House—because, of course, we will ask the House to reject this motion. I am sorry that this affidavit is not in English so that every hon. member of this House could understand it. It was drawn up in French, and signed by the Hon. Mr. Mousseau, and is attested by him before the Court. Now, this affidavit, in answer to the charges brought against him must go into the *Hansard*: it must go before the public. I think that is due to the hon. gentleman accused, it is due to this House, and it is due to us as a Government. The affidavit reads as follows:—

(Translation).—The said defendant, Joseph Alfred Mousseau, Queen's Counsel, member of the Privy Council, Attorney General and Premier of the Province of Quebec, and member sitting for the electoral district of Jacques Cartier, being duly sworn on the Holy Evangelists, deposed and saith:

That he is the defendant in this cause, and that on the 26th of September he was elected to represent the electoral district of Jacques Cartier, in the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, by a majority of from 100 to 110.

That he has carried on his election loyally and honestly, without infringing in any way whatever the electoral law—without infringing, in a word, any of the laws enacted against corrupt practices in Parliamentary elections.

That, in view of the uncessing and implacable war waged against him ever since the month of April now last past, he will be obliged to follow himself the trials of this case, step by step, and day by day, wherever such trial will take place.

That it is now impossible for him to attend to the present electoral petition, because the measures which he has to prepare, as leader of the Cabinet, for the next Session, will necessitate almost constantly his presence at the Seat of the Government.

That, without having the least desire to complain, he is bound to say: That when the first electoral petition was introduced against him, as a member representing the electoral district of Jacques Cartier, on account of his having no time to deal with such petition, statements have been made of which he has since discovered the inaccuracy and falsity.

That in this he alludes specially to the evidence adduced about certain words pretended to have been said by him at Lachine, in Léger's Hotel, in August, 1887, at which time he was a candidate for election, as a member to represent the electoral district of Jacques Cartier, in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec.

That from these words attributed to said deponent, it would appear that the said deponent had promised to remit to the said Léger, the amount of a penalty which he had been condemned to pay, if he, the said deponent was elected, which said remittance took place some time thereafter, and which said pretended evidence would have, it would appear, justified even the disqualification of the said deponent.

That the real facts relative to this incident are that the defendant has never uttered the words attributed to him; that, on the contrary, he has told Léger not to speak to him about these things with which he had

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

nothing to do; that in election times it was always dangerous, and that if afterwards the Government remitted to Léger, and to twenty-five or thirty other hotel-keepers of various counties in the neighbourhood of Montreal, it was merely an act of sound policy and of wise administration.

That, in fact, twenty-five or thirty hotel-keepers, against whom there was nothing in the police records, and who had applied in proper time to get their certificates, had been the victims of the slowness with which the Municipal Councils had granted them their certificates, and from the time when these hotel-keepers had so made their application until the time when the municipal bodies had so granted them the certificates applied for, they had been prosecuted for selling without license.

Under such circumstances the Government was bound in honour, in justice, and in equity, with such evidence of good faith on the one hand and of surprise on the other, not to avail themselves of their position and not to exact from honest hotel-keepers, who had acted in good faith, both the price of a license and the price of a penalty for an infringement, which, in reality, was only apparent and not characterized by any evil intention.

That, in the case of Léger, as in that of several other hotel-keepers, application had been made to the Government in the month of July preceding, for a rebate of the amount of the penalty; that the certificate of the granting of the license by the municipal body had been sent to the Treasury Department, along with certain other documents, representing that the Municipal Council of Lachine alone was responsible for the delay, and that the former Government, that of the defendant, had already decided in fact that in such cases the Government ought not to exact the penalty.

That, consequently, in case that the defendant would be obliged to meet the facts of the first electoral petition above mentioned, it becomes more important for him to be at liberty to follow the present cause, as he has already said, step by step and day by day.

That the said defendant has also discovered, since the first electoral petition, a great number of other most important facts which will enable him to come out victorious of the new electoral petition in this cause, inasmuch as it will be allowable to mingle with it the facts of the first petition.

That the expenses of the defendant during the last election have amounted to \$340.65, as appears by the statement received from his agent, M. Louis Allard, by the *Official Gazette*, and which statement is to be published by the said *Official Gazette* next Saturday, to wit: the 5th of January, instant.

That the defendant has made no other expenses for his election, and if, against all probability, he has forgotten any, they must be personal and insignificant expenses, such as telegraph despatches and other unforeseen expenses of that kind. And the above having been read deponent hath signed.

J. A. MOUSSEAU.

Sworn before me at Quebec, this third }  
day of January, one thousand eight }  
hundred and eighty-four.

T. H. OLIVER,  
Commissioner of the Supreme Court,  
District of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, this affidavit of the hon. Mr. Mousseau should at least weigh as much in the scale as the accusation that was brought against him in that petition. It should weigh a great deal more, because he is a man of position; and when he made this affidavit he was not only a Queen's Counsel and a Privy Councillor, but Attorney General of the Province of Quebec, and First Minister of the Province. This affidavit is dated 3rd January last. It is made under oath; and we know the meaning of that. If Mr. Mousseau dared to state under oath what was found out to be an untruth, he would be prosecuted for perjury, and he would deserve it. But the hon. gentleman has not hesitated, but has met the accusation brought against him, especially that accusation in the first petition, and for which three witnesses were brought in the first trial. Mr. Mousseau says he never uttered those words, and never did that act, and that he could prove such by witnesses. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) would not give Mr. Mousseau the benefit of that document, and allow it to go before the House; and that is the reason why I say that the hon. member has not been fair—I do not say he has done it wittingly, or that he did it purposely with the intention of wronging Mr. Mousseau, but whether he had that intention or not, he has wronged him most grievously. He brings these accusations against him and does not allow a word said in his favour in the documents. He brings not only this motion before the House but all the charges, and does not allow a line in favour of Mr. Mousseau. He does not allow the judgment of Judge Torrance to weigh in the scale with the House and the public who will read this debate to-morrow, and he does not allow that

gentleman to have the benefit of it. And, moreover, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) should surely have brought this important document, this affidavit here. He must have known of it, and he will be glad, no doubt, that I have brought it before Parliament, and that it will be published, and will be the justification of Mr. Mousseau, and show, at all events, that there are two sides to this question, and that Mr. Mousseau was not afraid, and is not afraid, of the trial. The fact that the hon. gentleman failed to lay this document before the House shows that the idea is that the trial shall not go on before the Courts, but that as much damage as possible must be done to the reputation of the Hon. Judge Mousseau. I hope this House, after hearing the contents of this document and the explanations offered, will say that Mr. Mousseau should not be blamed, and that the Government has done nothing for which it should be condemned. They have appointed Mr. Mousseau; there is nothing against him. The charge brought against him was laid by one or two individuals, as is the case with all election petitions; and no doubt the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has also suffered from petitions brought against him, and indeed, I have suffered myself. We all suffer from petitions being brought against us; but in the long run the public find that these petitions are in very many cases only brought to try and damage the member or prevent him going on an Election Committee, because that was the idea at that time. If a member's seat was contested, he could not be placed on an Election Committee; it was an easy way of getting rid of a strong man; but that was the way it was done. To-day these trials are held before Courts of Justice; but nevertheless if you want to persecute a man you persistently contest his election. This was evidently the case in regard to Mr. Mousseau. His election was contested in the first case, and it was annulled. In the second case Mr. Mousseau states under oath that the case of Léger could never have been upheld if the contestation of the election had been continued. I will not answer the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), who has thought proper to have a fling at the Secretary of State, in his absence. I hope the hon. gentleman will reserve his attack on my colleague, the Secretary of State, until he is here; then let the hon. gentleman attack him face to face, and my colleague will be able to answer him, no doubt. I hope, after these explanations, that the motion will be rejected.

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not rise for the purpose of adding anything to what has been said with respect to the high character of Mr. Mousseau. Whatever may have been his political faults, I think everybody will admit that he is an honest man, and not only that he is an honest man, but also an able lawyer, and those are at least two qualifications of a good Judge. I rise to corroborate a portion of the affidavit of Mr. Mousseau, which has just been read by the hon. Minister of Public Works. It has been my good or bad fortune to represent in this House the county which Mr. Mousseau represented in the Quebec Legislature. Although I took no part in his first election, being then in the North-West, and although I took no public part in his last election, I think it is due to Mr. Mousseau, not as a friend of his, for we are not speaking here as friends, but as an act of justice, to mention that the story of this Mr. Léger is wrong and that I know it personally. The first contestation of Mr. Mousseau's election took place, I think, at the beginning of May, 1882. This Parliament was sitting when I arrived home—it was, I believe, the very day that Mr. Mousseau had resigned his seat before the Superior Court, and then we heard of this story of Léger's. I was one of the first to mention to Mr. Mousseau that Léger was examined and the settlement of his case was made long before there was any question of Mr. Mousseau coming to Jacques Cartier—was made, in fact, a few days before

my election in 1882, in my own presence, by Mr. Lecavalier, then the local member for the county. I say this not only on my word as a gentleman but as a member of the House, and I assert that these are the facts. Léger had been sued for selling liquor without a license in the preceding winter. The Council had been deliberating whether five, or eight, or ten licenses should be granted in the village of Lachine; and when I speak of Lachine, I know what I am talking about, because I reside there. When the Council was deliberating whether the same number of licenses should be continued, this man, who kept his house open as before, was fined at the Police Court for selling without a license, as were others in that county and in other counties. We found that, under the circumstances, as he had finally got a certificate, it was a case for the Crown to remit a portion of the fine; and about the beginning of July, ten or fifteen days after the 20th of June, 1883, the day the Federal Elections were held, Mr. Lecavalier settled the case in my presence. I may say that I know Léger as well as I know any member of this House. I would not say that he committed a perjury, but I simply think he made a mistake. He may have alluded to the fact of his fine being remitted, but it is impossible that the language which is said to have been used, could have been used, under the circumstances. I say this as an act of justice in favour of a man who has been much persecuted for the last few years—a man who holds an important position in the country to-day. I think it is unfortunate that the member for Quebec East should have brought forward this motion. It is very important that the judiciary should have the reputation, before the whole public, of being pure, and unless a member of the House has the proof in his hands that a Judge is not going to do justice to his fellow countrymen—a member who is not prepared to take that responsibility, should bring such a charge as the one which has been brought forward by the hon. member for Quebec East.

Mr. LAURIER. It must be within the recollection of the House that the gist of the charge which I bring against the Government is, that they have appointed a man to be a Judge who is actually liable to be tried in the Court of which he is to be a Judge. It seems to me that this is the first time in the history of a civilized nation that a man actually charged, if not under trial, before the Court for a violation of the law of the country, has ever been put upon the Bench. It may be possible that Mr. Mousseau is perfectly innocent of all imputation against him, but until that is shown, why should the Government be in such haste to appoint him? Why should not the Government give him the chance of clearing his character before the Courts, before putting him on the Bench? In my judgment, and I believe in the opinion of the public of this country, the appointment of a man to a judgeship under such circumstances is a public scandal. In my opinion it is a scandal to bring a Judge, as Mr. Mousseau may be brought to-morrow, from the Bench and have him called down into the bar to answer the charges brought against him: to be examined and cross-examined. I say that this is lowering the dignity and efficiency of the Bench. This is the gist of the charge which I bring against the Government. I wish there were no more, but what makes the charge still more strong is that, so far, the presumptions are against Mr. Mousseau. The hon. Minister of Public Works said that I presented a garbled report to this House. I am not aware that I garbled any statement, and I am sure I have said nothing which was not a matter of public notoriety, and I have brought forward everything that was known. The hon. gentleman said that I did not bring before the House the utterances of the Judge, but he knows very well that any remarks made by a Judge in delivering judgment do not form part of the record. I have moved for the judg-

ment of the Judge and the report made to the Speaker; and all the utterances of the Judge which I have been able to find will be found in the newspapers, and so far as I know, I have given them all to the House. They do not bear out the construction which has been put on them by the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet.) If we are to believe these hon. gentlemen, Judge Torrance, in giving his judgment, said that if the trial had been prosecuted further there was nothing in the evidence adduced even to avoid the election, to say nothing of disqualifying Mr. Mousseau. I do not know what may have been the views of Judge Torrance, but if such were his views, they were not the views of Mr. Mousseau and his counsel, since, if we are to believe them, they bribed the other side to prevent a judgment being given. If the charges were so frivolous, if there was nothing in the evidence to avoid the election or disqualify Mr. Mousseau, why should they say that they bribed the other side? Why did he resign his seat afterwards? Why did he not go further? Why did he not wait for the judgment, after which the Government could have appointed him a Judge without objection from anybody? The hon. gentleman also said that I should have given the affidavit of Mr. Mousseau himself. This affidavit was not given at the trial. What was the object of it? When Mr. Mousseau was petitioned against the second time, he applied to the Court for a postponement of the trial, and then it was that he presented his affidavit. He stated to the Court that the business of the country would not allow him to go on with his trial at that time. In that affidavit he attempts to justify himself to some extent; but in my opinion his explanation is somewhat lame. In speaking to Léger he said, "Do not speak to me now, because there is an election; wait till the election is over." These are the words, so far as I remember the affidavit, and if they mean anything, they do not bear a favourable construction. There is in them an innuendo which is not altogether in favour of the Judge. And what took place? The motion of the hon. gentleman was granted; the trial was postponed; the investigation was not to take place; the charges were not enquired into; and in the meantime the hon. gentleman was appointed to the Bench. Under such circumstances, I think the affidavit will not go far towards justifying Mr. Mousseau. The hon. gentleman said that this motion should not be made, because the trial was not to be continued. I do not know what the intention of the petitioner is, but it is open to Mr. Mousseau to have a trial if he thinks it is better for him. Before I sit down, I wish to say a word with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet). The answer he made was not even an attempt to justify Mr. Mousseau; but he tried to cast a slur upon the Liberal party. He said the Liberal party had accepted a bribe, and that I condemned my own friends as much as his. I do not care whether, in saying what I did, I condemned my own friends or not. I say if the Liberal party are guilty of bribery, the sooner it is investigated and proven, the better. The hon. gentleman says we are always open to conviction. The Liberal party from Lower Canada is not numerous in this House, but if it is not, it is because the weak-kneed in our ranks have found seats on the other side. If they can get any more of the same kind, they are welcome to have them.

Motion negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Allison (Lennox),	Fisher,	Mulock,
Auger,	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Platt,
Bechard,	Geoffrion,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Blake,	Gunn,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),

Mr. LAURIER.

Burpee (Sunbury),	King,	Springer,
Cameron (Huron),	Kirk,	Thompson,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Laurier,	Trow,
Cartwright,	Lister,	Vail,
Casgrain,	Livingstone,	Wells,
Catudal,	McCraney,	Wilson, and
Charlton,	McIntyre,	Yeo.—47.
Davies,	McIsaac,	

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil)
Allison (Hants),	Dugas,	McCallum,
Amyot,	Dundas,	McCarthy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McDougald,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	McLelan,
Bell,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	McNeil,
Benoit,	Ferguson (Welland),	Messue,
Bergeron,	Fortin,	Méhot,
Billy,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Blondeau,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bourbeau,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Bowell,	Grandbois,	Quimet,
Brecken,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Bryson,	Hackett,	Pope,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hall,	Reid,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hay,	Robertson (Hastings),
Campbell (Victoria),	Hickey,	Rykert,
Carling,	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Caron,	Houde,	Sproule,
Cimon,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Coursol,	Landry (Kent),	Tilley,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper (Pictou),
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	White (Hastings),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Renfrew),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wood (Brookville), and
Desaulniers,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Wright —89.
Desjardins,	Mackintosh,	

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Statement showing the number and the amount of fishing bounty claims which have been paid in 1882; and a similar statement for 1883; also, a statement giving the names of the fishermen and owners of boats who received the said bounty, the fishing places they belong to and the kinds of boats or vessels for which they received the said bounty. Also, a statement of the expenses attending the distribution of the bounty claims, and all correspondence relating to these bounty claims.—(Mr. Fortin.)

Return showing receipts and expenditures out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the 10th day of February, in each of the fiscal years 1883 and 1884.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and any person or persons, respecting the filling of the vacancy caused at Morristown, Nova Scotia, since last Session, by the death of Archibald McGillivray, late Preventive Officer of that place, together with all other papers and documents relating to the same.—(Mr. McIsaac.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock, p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 7th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 53) to authorize the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce the number of their directors.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 54) relating to the New Brunswick Railway Company and the railways leased to the said company.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Live Stock Insurance Company.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 56) to empower the Bondholders of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company to vote at meetings of the company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 59) respecting the Northern and North-Western Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 60) to increase the harbour accommodation of the city of Toronto, to extend the Esplanade, and to provide for the control of the use thereof by railway companies.—(Mr. Small.)

#### SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LANDRY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a school of navigation at Quebec; and if such is the intention of the Government, whether the school will go into operation during the course of the present year.

Mr. McLELAN. That is a matter which is now being considered by my Department and by the Government, and an answer cannot be given at the present time, it being under consideration.

#### PUBLICATION OF DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS IN NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I desire to call the attention of hon gentlemen opposite to an irregularity which now seems to have become chronic. A few days ago the Minister of Militia presented the Report on the Militia for the year, and in one of the Ministerial papers appeared, the day previous, a statement that the report had been presented on that day, and a *résumé*, written I suppose by prescience, of that report. To-day, the Minister of Railways and Canals has presented some most important papers to Parliament, and I find in the same Ministerial paper a despatch, dated yesterday, containing the substance of those returns. That, Sir, does not do. Either these returns are to be kept sacred from the journalists of both political parties until they come before Parliament, or an arrangement must be made by which all the journalists of both parties shall have access to them. When I find the Report of the Minister of Militia in a newspaper one day, and these very important returns another day, I think it time to draw attention to an impropriety that is growing into a practice.

Mr. CARON. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentleman, and I hope the hon. gentleman will understand that the irregularity to which he has drawn the attention of the House can only have happened by a misunderstanding. My attention was drawn to it, and I ascertained that, in the Department, from the fact of my having been away one day, it was supposed that the Report of the Minister of Militia had been placed upon the Table of the House, the day before it was really placed upon that Table, and, in consequence, a copy of the report was given one day sooner than it should have been given.

Mr. BLAKE. To one person?

Mr. CARON. Well, the hon. gentleman has asked for explanations, and I take it for granted that he will believe the statement I am making. The mistake occurred, and I hope he will not consider that I meant any disrespect whatever to the House of Commons.

Mr. BLAKE. There is one other subject to which I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen. I moved some time ago for papers with reference to the appointment of the High Commissioner, and also for some information with reference to the contingencies and expenses attached to that office. I intimated the intention, and the gentleman said he expected, that that question would become the subject of further discussion when the material was brought down. I asked that it might be brought down early; but it has not been brought down. I find that the Minister of Railways and the High Commissioner are at present both in the House. I hope there is no difference between them. If there be, I hope they will agree together and settle it, and that the papers will be brought down to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are in perfect accord.

#### PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION, &c., BILL.

Mr. CHARLTON, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to provide for the punishment of seduction and like offences, said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill, I am free to confess that the Bill has imperfections. It is not a Bill covering as wide a scope as I should desire. It is confined within narrow limits, and applies only to two or three of the most grievous of a class of crimes that all, in my opinion, should be dealt with by the Criminal Code. The Bill provides for the punishment of seduction under promise of marriage, of a feigned or mock marriage, and of enticement into houses of prostitution. I think the Bill perhaps is also deficient in the fact that possibly too much care has been taken to shield the male offender from any possible charge that is ill-founded. It may be doubted whether he, as a criminal, should be allowed to give his evidence, whether the provisions in regard to corroborative evidence are not too strong, so strong as in a measure to defeat the purposes had in view by the Bill. However, if the House accepts the Bill in its present shape, the principle, at all events, is admitted, and, in future years, experience and the wisdom of the House will dictate such changes as may be necessary in the law. This Bill, two Sessions ago was referred to a Special Committee. It was then a Bill of much wider scope than at present. That Special Committee reported the Bill in substantially the same shape that it is presented to the House to-day. Last Session the Bill was again introduced, and again referred to a Special Committee, whose labours were completed at a single sitting, and who reported the Bill with very slight amendments to the terms in which it was introduced. The Bill, as now submitted, has one or two trifling changes from the Bill of last Session. There are two additions, one making feigned or mock marriage a crime, and one making subsequent marriage of the parties or a *bonâ fide* offer of marriage a bar to conviction. The latter clause was in the Bill as reported last Session. It was struck out in Committee of the Whole in this House, but I find the advocates of the Bill in the Senate were almost to a man in favour of this provision. I have inserted it again. If it does not meet with the approval of the House, in the event of the Bill passing the second reading, it can be struck out in Committee of the Whole. There is one change made, one clause dropped out the clause with reference to the punishment of teachers. There was perhaps no feature of the Bill that met with more universal approval of the Committee than did this

feature. It was held that, teachers having peculiarly intimate relations with their pupils, it was proper to incorporate in the Bill a clause making the seduction of a pupil by a teacher a criminal offence. This clause, Sir, seems to have met with the disapproval of that respectable and honourable class of the Canadian public, and some meetings were held denouncing it. I must confess it has a somewhat invidious look, although it was not aimed at the good teachers, at those who had never been guilty of the offence, but at those who abused their privileges and trust as teachers. However, the clause has been struck out. I would have been glad to insert a clause with reference to guardians, a clause with reference to overseers, a clause with reference to minors, but the same objection might be urged. In the case of guardians, it might be said it was an invidious attack upon them, and the same in regard to overseers, and, perhaps, it might be a difficult matter to insert a clause with respect to the seduction of minors. Therefore, the Bill is presented in the shape it now stands. The Bill provides that the evidence of the female, in respect of whom the offence is alleged to have been committed, shall be corroborated as to the offence first mentioned, both as to the promise of marriage and the seduction; as to the offence secondly mentioned in the first section, both as to the feigned or pretended marriage and the sexual intercourse, and as to the second section, concerning inveiglement or enticement, by other material evidence. The fourth section provides:

"In every case arising under this Act the defendant shall be a competent witness in his own behalf upon any charge or complaint against him, and upon his trial for such offence may, on such charge or complaint, insist that his evidence be taken."

The fifth section provides:

"No prosecution under this Act shall be commenced after the expiration of one year from the time of committing the offence."

The punishment provided by this Act is that any person who shall be convicted of any offence declared to be a misdemeanor under this Act, shall be imprisoned for two years in a penitentiary, or for a less term in any other prison or place of confinement. It will thus be seen, Mr. Speaker, that the term of imprisonment, the degree of punishment, is in the discretion of the court. The imprisonment may be for a limited period—the maximum is two years, the minimum is in the discretion of the court. The other features of this Bill met with the universal approval of the House last Session, and it is unnecessary for me to deal at length with them upon this occasion. Various objections have been urged, Mr. Speaker, against this Bill. One of the objections urged against it is that both parties are necessarily guilty. Well, Sir, I cannot conceive that in any case both parties are equally guilty. The man is the active, the woman the passive, agent to a great extent; and I must hold that in almost every case the man is much the guiltier party. However, the Bill provides only for cases of seduction under promise of marriage, for cases where the most cruel deceit is practised, and for punishment in cases of feigned or pretended marriage. Another objection that has been urged is that this Bill may compel a man to marry a woman of loose character. Now, Sir, the Bill provides punishment only for the seduction of a woman of previously chaste character. If she is a woman of loose character the provisions of this Bill will not apply. That provision punishes a man who seduces a woman of chaste character under the promise of marriage. If the woman is good enough to be engaged to him, she is good enough to be married to him; and this objection certainly does not apply against the Bill. I am one, Mr. Speaker, who believes, whether rightly or wrongly, that women are, as a rule, better and more virtuous than men. I believe that they have a higher moral organization, that they are not ex-

Mr. CHARLTON.

posed in the same degree to the temptations that beset men in life; that they grow up in a more refined condition, and that their natural tendencies are better than the natural tendencies of men. I believe this to be the case, and I think that society believes this to be the case. Society, moreover, demands that woman shall be purer than man. It demands, on the part of the woman, greater care in her conduct than it does on the part of the man. Men may do with impunity many things that would blast the character of a woman. Society recognizes the fact that the good of the community, the good of society, the well-being of the family, rest upon the virtue of the female portion of society. And this being the case, society inflicts a sterner punishment upon the female than it does upon the male, in cases of the infraction of the seventh commandment. A female, if guilty of a violation of the seventh commandment, is driven from society. Her character is blasted; she has no place for repentance, even though she seeks it with tears. An offence of this character on the part of a man is considered one of a venial nature. He may still hold up his head in society, and with a certain class of men this offence is even considered creditable to him. But society visits its vengeance upon the woman; she never can recover her position. This is probably right, because society appreciates the necessity for female virtue; it appreciates the necessity that those who educate our children, that those who preside in our home, should be above suspicion. The estimate that society instinctively places upon this matter, Mr. Speaker, is very correctly indicated in the feelings that are evinced when a man becomes the avenger against one who has committed an outrage upon female virtue. Where a husband, or a father, or a brother girds himself to avenge the seducer of his female relative, the instincts of society prompts it to take that man's part. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, there can be found a single instance in the history of Canada, or in the history of Great Britain, or of the United States, or of any other civilized community, where a man who has avenged a dishonour of this kind has been punished. There was a case in an adjoining township last year where a woman, seduced by a man under promise of marriage, and betrayed, and deserted by him, shot that man dead. She was tried for murder and the jury pronounced her not guilty. A few days ago a case occurred in the State of Pennsylvania, where a young man shot the seducer of his sister on a public street, shot him repeatedly. He was tried for murder, but the sentiment of the community was such that the man was acquitted upon a flimsy plea of emotional insanity. But in no cases of this kind that have ever come under my observation, has punishment been inflicted upon the man who has visited with vengeance the seducer of a female friend. I saw the other day a case in our Canadian newspapers, of a young woman of attractive appearance, a Swede, an orphan girl, without friends, and without knowledge of the customs of society in this country, who was betrayed in this manner. After betrayal she received a letter from her heartless seducer, informing her that he had concluded not to marry her. This girl, after the birth of her child, became insane, and was brought before the court and committed to an insane asylum. Now, Sir, that young man goes at large, there is no law in this land to punish him; but, Sir, the equatorial regions of inferno are too cold for his eternal residence, or the residence of any such dastard. It is a shame upon our civilization that there is no law upon our Statute Book that will punish cases of this kind. It has been urged against this Bill that you cannot make men virtuous by law. Well, Sir, if that is an argument against a law of this character, it is an argument against any law of the Criminal Code. The object of laws providing for the punishment of crime is not, primarily, to make men virtuous, but it is to hold up the terror of punishment over those who may be disposed

to be otherwise than virtuous. We do not make men virtuous by enacting laws against the crime of murder, against the crime of theft, and we do not make men virtuous, primarily and necessarily, by a law against the crime of seduction under promise of marriage; but we propose to punish those who are guilty of this offence in order to deter others from committing it. The hon. the Minister of Justice, in the other Chamber, when this Bill was under discussion, gave it as his opinion that women who deserve sympathy would not enter court. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that that cannot be urged as a sufficient reason why a woman who deserves sympathy should not have a remedy provided for her by law in case she did choose to enter court. I am able to understand why the Bill should be opposed by the libertine, by the man who believes, as the Mahomedan does, that woman is an inferior being, that she was created as the legitimate prey of man, created for his gratification—that she, perhaps, is destitute of a soul. I can understand how a man holding such sentiments would trample upon a woman's rights, upon a woman's life—who would cruelly betray her and then ruthlessly cast her aside—I can understand how that man would oppose this Bill, and I would naturally expect to have him criticise it in a sense the reverse of complimentary. But, Sir, I am unable to understand how a father, whose daughter is the pride of his life, the hope of his family, beautiful and beloved—how a brother whose sister fills the horizon of his hope, who is all that is lovely in womanhood—I say, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how either that father or that brother can vote against this Bill, can vote against the clause which provides that a man who cruelly seduces the daughter, or the sister, by deceit, under promise of marriage, or after a mock marriage, should vote against a provision of this kind, proposing to fix a penalty to that crime. I noticed the other day in a newspaper which offered some criticisms upon this Bill, an assertion that it is a Bill to encourage the brazenness of disreputable females. On the contrary, it is a Bill to discourage the manufacture of brazen females; it is a Bill to discourage those crimes against society that result in making females of that character. It is said that this Bill renders men peculiarly liable to false charges, to charges made for the purpose of levying blackmail. Well, Sir, I suppose that men are liable to false charges in other cases, they are liable to be charged with other crimes they have never perpetrated. I can name an infallible preventative, if men will live pure, chaste lives, if they will live in accordance with the seventh commandment of the Decalogue, there will be very little danger of their being exposed to false charges and attempts to levy blackmail. The paper to which I referred a few moments ago criticises my views with reference to this matter as the "crystalization of the meanest form of cant." Well, Sir, I will set over and against the opinion of the eminent editor who wrote those lines, the opinion of an editor scarcely less eminent—that of Horace Greeley. Horace Greeley gave it as his deliberate opinion that the man who seduced an innocent woman was worthy of the punishment of death. On the one hand, we have the opinion of the flagellator of bull-pups and sluggers; on the other hand, we have the opinion of the prince of editors in the nineteenth century; and somewhere between the two extreme views represented by those two men, are the provisions of this Bill. This Bill is about as far removed from the opinion of the one as the opinion of the other; it is a compromise between the extreme opinions of those who believe that seduction under all forms should be most severely punished, and those views held by the editor of the *Mail*. But Horace Greeley was not the only man who did not believe that such opinions were the "crystalization of the meanest form of cant." The Roman Senate did not hold that view. The Roman Senate, centuries ago, provided a

law much more severe with respect to seduction than any law upon any modern Statute Book. The Roman law provided, and that law remained in force for centuries, that the punishment of ordinary seduction should be the confiscation of half the estates of the offender, if of the better class, and if of the lower class, it should be corporal punishment and imprisonment. The canon law provided that the seduced should marry or settle a dowry upon his victim. The law of France contains the same provision, that either the victim of the seducer shall be married by him or that he shall settle a dowry upon her. The law of Germany punishes seduction with hard labour and imprisonment for six months. As I said in the course of the last discussion on this Bill last year, twenty-seven States of the American Union—I do not know about all of them, but this number, at least—have laws with respect to offences of this character. These laws vary in their nature in the different States, but there is not a solitary State in the whole number that does not punish offenders of the character mentioned in this Bill. In the State of New York, a law of this character was placed on the Statute Book thirty-six years ago, and it was placed there after years of agitation. One of the most potent arguments in favour of making this a crime, and the offender subject to punishment, was the fact that crimes of this character were usually avenged by the murder of the perpetrator of the outrage; and it was felt that when no jury could be found to convict those committing such murders, it was proper and just that the law should reach the crime of seduction, and accordingly the Statute was passed. That Statute in New York State provides a punishment for seduction under promise of marriage, by imprisonment for five years and a fine of \$5,000, one or both, in the discretion of the court; and this law has been upon the Statute Book, as I have said, for thirty-six years. The constitution of the State which embodies that law has formed the model for the constitutions of various States to the west of New York. Very many of the western States have framed their constitutions on the constitution of the State of New York, and in all those States this provision is incorporated in the law. If this law were open to the objections urged against it, to the objection that it leads to false charges for blackmailing purposes, that the interests of the male are not sufficiently protected, and that the male is made the victim of adventures and procuresses—if cases of hardship had occurred under this law, are we to suppose there would be no movement seeking for its repeal? And yet there has not been a breath urged against the law, no movement for its repeal, no demand for its repeal, no sense of hardship felt under its operation. The law has been just, beneficial and salutary in its operation in all those States, and after 36 years' experience in one of the greatest States of the Union, and many years' experience in other States, we are warranted in the assertion that the law in its operation was conducive to the public good. We have in Canada a law with regard to seduction, a law providing that seduction on shipboard shall be punished. I am unable to understand why seduction on shipboard should be more heinous than seduction on land. I am unable to understand why a provision applicable to ships on the high sea should not also be made applicable on land; and the fact that the Government has passed such a law with respect to offences of this nature on shipboard on the high sea, is a sufficient reason for making it applicable to cases of a similar character occurring upon land. One of the opponents of this measure in the Senate last year, stated it as his deliberate conviction that, if this Bill became the law, the first attack which would be made against it would be on the part of mothers, whose innocent sons had been made the prey of designing females. I think the hon. the First Minister of the Crown in this House made a statement of a somewhat similar character. He said, I think, that within his own practice he had known numerous instances where young men had been keenly

harassed and driven from their native land by the fear of false accusations on the part of designing females. I must confess I never have seen a case of that kind. I have seen cases, however, of quite a different character. I have a case in my mind at this moment of a young villain who seduced two girls under promise of marriage, who communicated to each of them a loathsome disease, and who fled his country, probably in fear of being harassed by accusations on the part of those girls. Such is usually the character of the offences committed by young men who abandon their country; but I have no fear whatever that innocent men, under the operation of this law, will have reason to regret its passage. I believe the offences named in this Bill are crimes. I believe they are crimes of greater gravity than larcenies or robberies. I believe it is a reflection on our civilization that there is no law adequate to the punishment of offences of this character, and believing this to be the case, believing that justice demands that offences of this kind should be made criminal, I move the second reading of the Bill.

Bill read the second time.

### DUAL REPRESENTATION.

Mr. OUMET, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 13) to repeal an Act to render members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included, or which may hereafter be included, within the Dominion of Canada, ineligible for sitting or voting the House of Commons of Canada, said: The House will allow me a few minutes to explain the bearing of this Bill. In 1872, there was an Act passed, chap. 15, to compel members of the Local Legislature in any Province where dual representation was then allowed, to resign their seats before becoming candidates for seats in the Dominion Parliament. As the title of this Act shows, all members of the Local Legislature, where dual representation was not allowed at the time, were disqualified to be candidates for, or to be elected to, this House. I may say that at the time this Bill was passed some Provinces had abolished dual representation. Some of them, however, had thought better to preserve it, and it was with a view of preventing the members of those Local Legislatures, where dual representation had been abolished, from running the risk of being elected as members of this House, and if they lost their election, continuing to remain members of the Local Legislature, that this Act was passed. Such candidates caused a good deal of trouble to the opposing candidate, without incurring any risk themselves. In 1873, another Act was passed which contains some more sweeping clauses. It was entitled, chapter 2 of 36 Vic., "An Act to render members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies now included, or which may hereafter be included, within the Dominion of Canada, ineligible for sitting or voting in the House of Commons of Canada." This Statute abolished dual representation *in toto* for this Parliament, not only for those Provinces which had deemed it expedient to repeal dual representation, but it prevented entirely all members of Local Legislatures from being eligible as members of this House. The Bill, whose second reading I am now moving, only repeals the last Act which I have mentioned; that is to say, it leaves the Provinces to say for themselves whether it is better, in their interests, to preserve dual representation or abolish it. If the present Bill passes, the other Act abolishing dual representation for the Provinces in which it is not allowed will remain in force. Thus the Provinces will be enabled by this Bill to judge for themselves whether they should have dual representation or not. The reason for this is that this Parliament being the larger and stronger Parliament, has nothing to fear from local interference or local influences—nothing, to be afraid of, by allowing

Mr. CHARLTON.

members of the Local Legislatures to sit in this House, in the way of these members bringing provincial influence to predominate in this Parliament. Another reason why I should like this change—for my own part it will not be for my benefit, for as I shall explain, I do not appreciate very much the privilege of being a candidate for both Legislatures—is that it would allow the Local Legislatures to take from this House, in moments of emergency, members who could render some service to them. On the other hand, it will enable men who believe they have some disposition for public life to devote themselves entirely to politics. I should say, although there is a strong prejudice against what we call politicians, that a man who gives himself entirely to politics, if he has the other qualities which enable him to render service to his country, if he is intelligent, honest, and patriotic, will be enabled to render greater service to his country: to make himself more prominent, more learned in the different questions which interest the Dominion or the Provinces, and therefore it will give to our country a greater number of men competent to deal with political questions and promote the prosperity of the people. On the other hand, I may say that if the number of men who are dragged into politics by necessity, sometimes by party necessity, were lessened it would be better for the country. At present, in some counties, the people, finding their liberty of choosing a candidate limited by the abolition of dual representation, are very often obliged to select men who do not feel qualified and do not care to go into public life. Such men are very often compelled to leave their business, which suffers in their absence, and after a few years of public life, they may happen to be defeated; so they find themselves almost ruined and they become a charge on the party and a charge on the country. That is not their fault. Political exigencies—and I think it is true of both parties—frequently require men of that stamp to enter a life which they are not qualified for and do not care for, and which after a few years leave them almost ruined in their private business. Although there are plenty of men who are willing to take the risks of public life, and although the number would be limited by this measure, I contend that it would be for the greatest benefit of the people. What I am going to say may seem to be a very sweeping assertion, but I believe that one of the evils of our political life at present is that there are too many men in politics, either as candidates or in some other way. These men either live from politics, or expect to live from it. If their party come into power they expect to live at the expense of the country. With the small population of this Dominion, the fact of there being so many men in public life is a real plague. I would not go so far as to say that we are too much governed; that we have too many Governments, or too many people in charge of those Governments; but I say that if we could limit that evil, it would be for the greatest good of the country. This is the principal reason why I ask this House to pass the present Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that we ought to hear from the Government what their views are on this important question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the House will be very much gratified to hear the opinion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. My opinion is unchanged.

Motion for second reading negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:		
Messieurs		
Abbott,	Dugas,	Moffat,
Amyot,	Dundas,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Quimet,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Leslacs & Green),	Pinsonneault,

Benoit,	Gagné,	Riopel,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bergin,	Hesson,	Rykert,
Bourbeau,	Ives,	Small,
Bowell,	Kilvert,	Stairs,
Bryson,	Labrosse,	Tassé,
Cameron (Victoria),	Landry (Montmagny),	Tilley,
Carling,	Langevin,	Tupper (Picou),
Caron,	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Cimon,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Valin,
Coursol,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Vanasse,
Cuthbert,	McDougald,	White (Cardwell),
Daly,	McGreevy,	Williams,
Daoust,	McNeil,	Wood (Brockville),
Dawson,	Massue,	Wright.—59.
D'sjardins,	Méthot,	

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	McIntyre,
Allison (Hants),	Forbes,	McIsaac,
Allison (Lennox),	Fortin,	McLelan,
Armstrong,	Foster,	McMullen,
Auger,	Goeffrion,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Paint,
Baker (Victoria),	Gordon,	Paterson (Brant),
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Platt,
Béchar, d,	Guillet,	Pope,
Bell,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bernier,	Hackett,	Reid,
Billy,	Hall,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Blondeau,	Hay,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Brecken,	Hilliard,	Somerville (Brant),
Burnham,	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Homer,	Springer,
Cameron (Huron),	Houde,	Sproule,
Cameron (Inverness),	Irvine,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jamieson,	Thompson,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kaulbach,	Trow,
Cartwright,	King,	Vail,
Casey,	Kirk,	Wallace (Albert),
Casgrain,	Krarr,	Wallace (York),
Catudal,	Landry (Kent),	Watson,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Wells,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Wheler,
Davies,	Livingstone,	White (Hastings),
Dickinson,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Renfrew),
Fairbank,	McDonald (Cape Bret'n),	Wigle,
Farrow,	Mackenzie,	Wilson,
Ferguson (Welland),	Mackintosh,	Wood Westmorl'd), and
Fisher,	McCallum,	Yeo.—102.

## FRAUD IN SALE OF PATENT RIGHTS.

Mr. MULOCK, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 26) for the better prevention of fraud in connection with the sale of patent rights, said: I would desire to mention some of the considerations which induced me to introduce this Bill. It must be within the knowledge of many hon. gentlemen that for a long time frauds have been perpetrated throughout the country, especially in the rural districts, in connection with patent rights, whereby many innocent and trusting people have been serious losers. The patent laws were never intended to provide an instrument by which fraud might be perpetrated; but the patents themselves, although in many cases most useful, open the way to fraud, and often they have no practical value, but are only useful in the hands of designing agents. Artful men are able, frequently, by the use of cunning arguments, to make use of the rights they have acquired from the Department, to receive valuable securities from people not sufficiently skilled either in law or in fact to determine whether these patents have in themselves any legal or practical value. The course commonly pursued in such cases by the agent who desires to sell—not the article patented, but the mere right to use this patent right—is to tempt an unsuspecting person into a purchase, giving him, as an inducement, credit for payment, and as part of the designed fraud, he takes security that is ultimately negotiable. He sells his right to make use of the patent, and receives in return a promissory note from the purchaser, perhaps under

circumstances that between the two parties would be sufficient to prevent the vendor ever recovering on the note, but he is still able to negotiate, and as a rule does negotiate, such note before maturity and defeat the purchaser in any defence he would otherwise have. I do not think it is necessary to further argue the merits of the question than to simply say that in regard to this class of transaction the Bill provides that notes, given for such consideration, shall be marked across the face with the words, "given for a pat nt right," so that such notes shall bear on their face evidence as to the consideration for which they have been given. If, then, any valid defence should exist against payment, it will be continued against the purchaser, who, in fact, takes the note with such notice. In order to enforce this measure, there is a clause in the Bill providing that it shall be the duty of persons so transacting business to so mark the notes taken in security, and in default of so doing be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Mr. POPE. I suppose it is the intention of my hon. friend that this shall go to a Select Committee, is it not?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. MULOCK moved that the Bill be referred to a Committee consisting of Messrs. Haggart, White (Renfrew), Hall, Laurier and the mover.

Mr. POPE. I would ask my hon. friend to put the hon. member for Jacques Cartier on the Committee.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

## THE ESTIMATES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency, the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

## LANDSDOWNE.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending the 30th June, 1885, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
Ottawa, February 7th, 1884.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the Message, with the Estimates accompanying it, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

## APPOINTMENT OF MR. S. J. ST. ONGE CHAPLEAU.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Mr. Speaker moved for: 1. Copies of all Orders in Council or departmental orders, and all communications and correspondence respecting the appointment of Samuel J. St. Onge Chapleau as a sheriff in the North-West Territories; 2. Copies of all complaints or charges made against the said Chapleau while he was an employé in the Department of Railways and Canals; 3. Copies of all Orders, decisions or resolutions of the said Department dismissing or dispensing with the services of the said Chapleau; 4. Copies of such portions of the evidence taken before the Railway Commission, as relate to the conduct of said Chapleau while he was such employé; 5. Copies of all correspondence between the said Chapleau and the Government, or any member of it, respecting the said complaint and charges, or respecting in any way his conduct while such employé, respecting his quitting the public service and respecting his appointment as such sheriff. He said: I would ask to have the motion amended by the addition after "Railways and Canals" of the words "Public Works." I am not sure, from the evidence given before the

Royal Commission, whether the official was an employé in the Department of Railways and Canals, or in that of Public Works, or both, because one of the witnesses states he was a clerk in the Department of Public Works, and also a corresponding clerk in the Department of Railways and Canals. I suppose there can be no objection to adding the words I have just mentioned. Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be in the recollection of those of us who were in Parliament in the Session of 1879, that the Government advertised for tenders for the construction of a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They called for these tenders for that portion of the road between the English River and Keewatin, and that portion of the road was divided, as I gather from the public documents, into two sections, and the tenders were in three different aspects. There was Section "A" extending from English River to Eagle River, Section "B" extending from English River to Keewatin, and Section "C" embracing both sections in one contract. That was the advertisement calling for tenders for the construction of the work. Now, the parties tendering were required to fill in two columns. The first column was for the completion of the work by the 1st July, 1883, and the second column for the completion of the work by the 1st July, 1882. Several parties, in pursuance of the advertisement submitted to the public by the Government, tendered for the construction and completion of this work. I only propose referring to three of the tenders, and I only do that with a view of leading up to the question that I propose very shortly discussing before the House. The lowest tender for the work, as I observe, was that of a firm called Morse & Co., who agreed to finish the whole work by the 1st of July, 1882, embracing the two Sections "A" and "B" for \$5,699,707; or to finish it by the 1st of July, 1883, for \$5,937,732. You see that they charge a larger sum for the completion of the work at the earlier period. Now this firm of Morse & Co., for some reason unknown to me—and that I do not propose to discuss at present—were passed over by the Minister of Railways; and the only tenders that were considered were the tenders of the other parties which I shall refer to in a moment. Now, the next lowest tender, and that for the whole work, was of Andrews, Jones & Co. Their tender was for \$5,062,559, and the work was to be finished by their tender on the 1st July, 1883. These were the only tenders for the whole work that I propose to refer to. Then there was the tender for Section "A" by a person named Marks for \$2,203,896. There was also a tender from a certain firm of Nova Scotia contractors called Fraser, Grant & Pitblado, for \$4,130,707, for Section "B." Now, these two tenders for Sections "A" and "B" separately, in the aggregate amounted to \$6,334,603. You will recollect I mentioned that Andrews, Jones & Co.'s tender was for \$5,062,559—in other words, Andrews, Jones & Co.'s tender was less than the tender of Marks & Co. for Section "A" and of Fraser, Grant & Pitblado's tender for Section "B" both together, by the sum of \$272,044. Now, this being the fact, one would naturally suppose—the usual course would be—that the man making the lowest tender would get the contract. I apprehend that is the way an honest Government always does—that it gives the contract to the man who puts in the lowest tender. Now, Andrews, Jones & Co.'s tender was \$272,044 less than the other two tenders combined, but they did not get the contract. You will not find, perhaps, the reason why they did not get the contract, but you will find a sort of historical sketch of the facts in the public documents. From these we learn that on the 26th of February, 1879, the Minister of Railways and Canals notified Andrews, Jones & Co. that their tender was accepted, and he gave them a period of three days to put up their security. The cash deposit that he required as a security was \$200,000. Now, Sir, these men appear to have been Americans, and their backer, that is, the financial man of the concern,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

was a person named Smith, who, I believe, lived in the city of New York. The Minister of Railways, as I gather from the documents, though I may be wrong in my impression—but I gather that he was aware of this fact, aware of where they lived, aware of who the man was that was putting up the money, and aware that communication had to be held between Ottawa and New York, aware that word had to be sent from Ottawa to New York, and from New York to Ottawa, before the sum of \$200,000 could be put up. That these men were acting in good faith, I think, is beyond doubt; and the Minister must have been aware of all these circumstances. Now, Mr. Fraser, of Nova Scotia, the Minister's own friend, when he was before the Railway Commission, swears that the moment the contractors, that is Andrews, Jones & Co., received the notification, Mr. Jones started for New York to make arrangements to put up the money. The House will understand that the very moment they were notified by the Department that they were to get the contract, the business man of the firm—not the money man, because the money man was in New York, but the business man—starts for New York. He goes there with a view of having this money put up in time. Now, the Minister must have known that perfectly well, and anybody must have known just as well that allowing a man three days to go from Ottawa to New York and to come back again, for the purpose of getting his money, was an unreasonably short time. Mr. Fraser again stated in his evidence before the Railway Commission, that three days was a very short time. Now, Sir, I say that the Minister must have known that the time was short. He must also have known that these men were acting in good faith; because, in the three days allowed by the Department of Railways and Canals, they put up \$48,950 security, and they asked the Minister for two or three days longer time to put up the balance. They did not get an hour; they could not get an hour; but within the three days that they asked for they put up an additional sum of \$48,450, nearly \$100,000 altogether, within four or five days; and they asked for two or three days more to put up the balance, but they did not get an hour. Well, I am not going to discuss at this moment why they did not get it, that is a matter that, perhaps, deserves discussion at a future period. Now, these things must have been known to a large extent to the Department. The facts that the money could not be put up within so short a time, and that these men asked for two or three days longer, must have been known to the Department. I do not say that the hon. gentleman knew it, I do not say the Government knew it, but it is a singular thing that at the very moment these men were begging for three days further time to put up the additional security, Fraser, Grant & Pitblado were negotiating for the sale of this very contract to McDonald, Manning & Shields, of Toronto, for the sum of \$50,000: and they did, I believe, sell it to them for that sum. Now, Sir, you will understand that, in the first place, the two contracts—that of Marks & Co., and that of Fraser, Grant & Pitblado—amounted together to \$272,044 more than that of Andrews, Jones & Co.; but Fraser, Grant & Pitblado sold their contract to McDonald, Manning & Shields, and the very moment Andrews, Jones & Co. were begging for time to put up the balance of the security, that very moment this negotiation was going on. Now, as I have said, there are some things that must have been known to the Department. There is something that, perhaps, was not known to the Department, but it turns out to be the fact all the same, by subsequent investigation. I presume, however, that the Minister at the head of this Department knew nothing about it. But it appears to be the fact, nevertheless, that at the very moment these negotiations were going on for the sale of this contract, at the very moment when these men were begging for two or three days further time to put up

their security, an employé, high in the Department of Public Works or in the Department of Railways and Canals, or in both of them—this confidential servant of the Government, was doing—what, Sir? acting in the interest of the Government? in the interest of the Department? in the interests of the country? Not at all, Sir. At the very moment, I say, when these men were begging for more time, and when the other men, Fraser, Grant & Pitblado, were negotiating for the sale of the contract, at that very moment, this employé in the Public Works Department, was secretly, behind the back of the Government, and, perhaps, behind the back of those he was pretending to be friendly with, namely, Andrews, Jones & Co., was secretly colluding with a rival company to prevent what? To prevent the man that was putting up the money for them, their financial man, from coming to the Government and putting up the \$200,000. That is the fact disclosed by the evidence, Sir. The individual to whom I have referred was an ordinary employé of the Government, who was in one of the Departments as confidential clerk, a corresponding clerk in the Department of Railways and Canals, a man who was living at the public expense and feeding at the public crib, who owed undivided allegiance to the Government which appointed him, and to the Department which he was called on to serve, a man whose sworn duty was not to betray the trust the Department reposed in him—that man at that very time was negotiating with Mr. Smith, the financial backer of Andrews, Jones & Co. to prevent him putting up the money, and have the contract pass to Fraser, Grant & Pitblado, and from them to Manning, Shields & McDonald, by which the country would lose \$272,044. That is what he was doing, and what I state the evidence shows he was doing. Let us see what is the evidence upon that subject. I refer to the evidence taken before the Railway Commission as it is called, and, at page 305, you will find the account given by Mr. McDonald of this transaction. The evidence was taken in question and answer from under oath; and I am going to trouble the House by taking up a little time in reading some of the questions and answers, because I think this is a very serious and important case, and one which the country should understand. Mr. McDonald is asked the following questions:—

“4622. Have you knowledge of anything being given to any person not connected with the works?—Yes; I have promised to give something to a person myself.

“4623. In what shape?—If I succeeded in doing the work I would do something for him.

“4624. Have you succeeded in doing the work?—If I succeeded in getting the contract.

“4625. In what shape were you to do something?—I was to give him something.

“4626. What was the something?—A certain amount of money, if I succeeded.

“4627. Where does he live?—He lives in Ottawa.

“4628. What is his name?—Chapleau.

“4629. Which Department is he in?—He is in the Public Works Department. It was for nothing in the Department that I was to give it to him.

“4630. What were you to give him?—\$4,000

“4631. Then, according to your promise you would now pay him \$4,000 for having got the contract?—He was a personal friend of Mr. Smith's in New York. He told me that Mr. Smith could not come to put up the money, and I said: ‘Well, if he does not come to time and put up the security, I will give you \$4,000.’ Whether he saw Smith or not, I do not know, but I know they were personal friends. He used to stop with him in New York, when he was there. I do not know whether he had any influence over Smith or not; I was led to expect so, as I was told that they were personal friends.

“4632. Was there more than one Chapleau in that Department?—No; not in that Department. He is the Secretary of Public Works at present, so it is very easy to know who he is. At that time he was correspondence clerk, I think, in the Railway Department, or copying clerk, or something, I do not know exactly his position, but he was in one of those Departments, writing all the time.

“4633. That was before the change of Department?—Yes.

“4634. So that, at that time, he was connected with the Department which had charge of those contracts?—Yes. He was in the Department, but not in the office where tenders were opened. He had no connection with the Department where the tenders were opened. The tenders never came before him.

“4635. You mean that your promise had no effect upon the ranking of the tenders?—No; what I did it for was: if Smith did not appear there (because I knew he was a moneyed man, or I understood so)—if he did not put in his appearance there the others would not put the money up, and I knew Chapleau to be a personal friend, and I asked him if he could do something for me.

“4636. Did he inform you that he had any reason for supposing that \$4,000 would silence Smith?—No; he did not lead me to believe that.

“4637. It was by way of a proposition?—I do not for a moment suppose that Smith was getting any of this money.

“4638. You supposed it was for Chapleau's own benefit?—Yes; if he would influence Smith not to come forward.

“4639. From his own personal friendship?—Yes; that is it exactly.

“4640. Have you paid any part of this money to him?—I gave him \$500.

“4641. No more?—No.

“4642. When was that given?—It was given perhaps within the last six months. I cannot say exactly the date. I could find out by hunting up my cheque book.”

Here is the whole story out of the mouth of Mr. McDonald. He says that he agreed to give Mr. Chapleau \$4,000, and the service he was to render for that sum was to prevent Mr. Smith putting up security for Messrs. Andrews, Jones & Co. This was given for an improper purpose, for a corrupt purpose. Why should a clerk, an employé in one of the Departments, lend himself to any contractor to use his personal or political influence with another man to prevent a firm from putting up money as security on a contract. That is not all. We have something further. We have the evidence of Mr. Chapleau himself, out of his own mouth. Let us see what he says on the subject. He says:

“12744. What do you say was the effect of this offer from other persons?—They were telling me that if I would only use my influence in that way with Smith it would be worth my while to do it—that I had a chance to make \$5,000, and might as well do it.

“12745. Proceed with the evidence.—On the 26th day of February, Andrews, Jones & Co. were informed that their tender was accepted for section B, and a stated time was given him to deposit the acquired 5 per cent. security. Smith immediately left for New York. I may as well state here that previous to his leaving for New York he sent for me and asked me to inform him of the decision which the Government should arrive at in the matter of the application which he had made for an extension of time to put up that 5 per cent. security.—

12746. Was it arranged how you were to be informed of the decision on that subject?—No; as I was in the Department he asked me if I would ascertain whether the time was extended or not, and to telegraph him accordingly.

“12747. How did he suppose that you were to ascertain?—By enquiring.

“12748. From whom?—From the Secretary of the Department.”

I do not think it was any part of his duty as an officer to go to the Secretary of the Department and fish out information, and communicate that information to an American in New York, who had put in a tender here. He undertook to do that, and according to Mr. McDonald he was to receive \$4,000, and according to his own testimony, \$5,000, for doing so. This witness further says:

“12765. Proceed.—I have never entered into any agreement with McDonald for any compensation for dissuading Col. Smith to withdraw from the tender of Andrews, Jones & Co. When I returned from Washington, however, he told me he would see that his firm should pay me \$4,000, which I regarded as an expression of the exuberant feelings of a contractor at having secured a large contract, causing him to profusely scatter promises—the probability or possibility of the fulfilment of which he had probably never considered at all. Some months later, when I had received a cheque for \$500 from him, there was no explanation accompanying it at all.—

“12766. Was that from him personally?—Yes.

“12767. He handed it to you?—He sent it to me.

“12768. I mean was it from him personally or by letter?—It was sent by letter.”

Here is an employé of the Department acting in collusion with one contractor against another contractor, and obtaining a promise of \$4,000 for his services, of which he got \$500 at the time; and he tells us in his innocent way that this was given in the exuberance of the feelings of the firm of contractors who had put in a tender which happened to be \$272,000 more than another tender for the work. One is not surprised that there should be a little exuberance upon the part of the contractor at the prospect of thus secur-

ing the contract, because \$272,000 are not picked up every day on the streets of Ottawa. The promise was made to Mr. Chapleau, and the promise was implemented; and this servant of the Government, this man who owed allegiance to the Government and the country, was guilty of that which, in my judgment, was a grave and serious offence. That is not all. We have the evidence of a member of Parliament on the same subject, who tells us something of the character of the operations in the Department. Mr. Haggart, the hon. member for South Lanark, gave evidence as follows:—

"14792. Are you aware of any person in any of the Departments of the Government being benefited by any transactions with others connected with the Pacific Railway?—No.

"14793. Either as Minister, Member or clerk or secretary?—No; nothing that I have heard of, except Mr. Chapleau's matter.

"14794. Do you know of anything, as far as he is concerned, beyond what has appeared in the papers arising out of the evidence before this Commission?—Nothing.

"14795. Have you any other information which you could give us by way of evidence concerning the transactions of the Pacific Railway or any of them?—Well, I am pretty thoroughly acquainted with the whole of the transaction, I should say, in reference to it between Winnipeg; and the letting of the contracts, the manner in which they were awarded and everything of that kind, I know everything pretty generally about it.

"14796. Is that knowledge which you have derived from investigating the records of the Department?—Partly so, and partly from conversations from Ministers and other things that way.

"14797. Was there any particular conversation that you think you could enlighten us upon?—Well, no; nothing particular.

"14798. Have you heard any Minister say anything about the letting of those contracts, about which there have been rumours of improprieties?—I have had conversations with them on the subject. There are charges of improprieties in reference to the letting of contract B. I have had conversations with Ministers on the subject."

Mr. Chapleau, I understood, from some of the contractors in Section B, had made a demand upon them for some money that had been promised him by John J. McDonald before the evidence was given. It is clear from this evidence that the hon. member to whom I have referred had the run of the Department in the way of getting information. Now, there is the evidence and the statement from the Blue Book, given on oath, that this man was in the pay of these contractors, that he was colluding with one of them for the purpose of getting the contract out of the hands of the other man. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what you would expect of a man whose duty it was to deal fairly and honestly with the public, and yet who acted in the manner I have described? But that is not all, though it is enough to damage the reputation of any man. It is enough to prevent this man from ever being received into the public service again, enough to have severed his connection with the Government and the service of the country, but it is not all. Not only was this Mr. Chapleau in the pay of McDonald & Co. receiving or being promised \$1,000 or \$5,000 to prevent another firm of contractors from putting up their money, but at that moment he was paid a monthly salary, he was a feed official of an American contractor to give information from Ottawa to that American contractor of what was going on here. What was the evidence on that subject? Here is the evidence of Mr. Chapleau. I am quoting out of his own mouth; I am not giving hearsay evidence, for he was called upon before that Commission to disclose the startling condition of affairs which was existing in connection with these contracts, a condition of affairs which aroused the indignation of every person of the country—not simply of every person opposing the Government, but the indignation of their own warmest friends and most devoted organs. What does Mr. Chapleau say about his being a paid monthly salaried clerk of an American contractor? He says this:

"12876. Do you know any person who manufactured explosives living in the United States?—Yes.

"12877. Who is that?—I know a Mr. Mowbray.

"12878. Where does he live?—He lives at North Adams, I believe.

"12879. Has he had any business transaction with any contractors of the Pacific Railway as far as you know?—From hearsay I understood that he had.

Mr. CAMERON (HURON).

"12840. Had he some arrangement with you at one time about helping him in his connection with these people?—Yes.

"12841. What was the nature of the arrangement?—The nature of that arrangement was that whenever a contract was given in which there happened to be a great deal of rock work I was to notify him, so that he could come to meet the parties and try to make arrangements with them.

"12842. How did he compensate you for that?—I do not exactly remember. He gave me so much a month for a while, I believe.

"12843. Do you remember how much?—I could not exactly say—\$30 or \$40, may be.

"12844. \$75 has been mentioned?—I am sure it was not that much.

"12845. How did you get the information for him?—After the contracts were awarded.

"12846. I did not know that they had been awarded: how did you know?—As soon as a contract is awarded it is published in the press.

"12847. That is not answering my question, Mr. Chapleau. I am asking you how you know the particulars of the information which he desired to get from you, and I suppose he desired to get them as early as possible?—The information I was to give him was this: that when any work was awarded to anybody I was to notify him, and give him the names to whom the work was given.

"12848. Don't you know why he selected you in preference to somebody else?—I have not the slightest idea.

"12849. Don't you think it was your connection with the Department which had to let the contracts?—It might have been that.

"12850. Do you not understand that that was supposed to give him an advantage over people who did not derive their information from the Department, and that it was for that advantage he was paying you \$40 a month?—I do not know that it would. Other parties had the same opportunities to find out that I had.

"12851. How much do you think you have received from him altogether for those services?—That I could not exactly say.

"12852. About how long has it been continued?—It is only three or four months probably."

There is the admission of this employé of the Government that he was in the monthly pay of this American, Mr. Mowbray, a manufacturer of explosives, and the duty he was called upon to perform for that monthly dole which he was getting from a foreign contractor was that he should give him notice of when the Department should have anything to set afloat before the people in the shape of contracts. Now, why should Mr. Mowbray get Chapleau and employ him at a figure ranging from \$30 to \$75 a month? Might he not have got in the newspapers the information as it appeared there? No, Sir. Everybody knows perfectly well, and nobody knew it better than Mr. Chapleau, that the object for which he was employed was that he might get the figures from the Department, so that he might reveal them to this foreign contractor. This is a position of affairs not creditable to any man, and not creditable to any man or set of men who would tolerate it. I am glad to say that the Government did not tolerate it, but put an end to it as soon as it came to their ears. Now, whatever may be said of Mr. Chapleau, there is one thing that can be said of his evidence: it is plain, it is open, it is above board, but it is daring and audacious. He deliberately discloses that he got this money from those contractors, and apparently he justifies the transaction. There is that merit if there is none else. When this matter became publicly known throughout the length and breadth of the country, it excited the greatest possible indignation; in fact so strong and powerful was that indignation that it reflected itself in quarters where you never heard of indignation being reflected against the Government before—I mean the *Montreal Gazette* and the *Toronto Mail*. Nobody ever heard of the *Gazette* or *Mail* saying anything against the Government or against any action of the Government except on this occasion. Let us see what they said on this subject. I shall first quote from the *Mail*, because it is the more modest of the two. The *Mail* says:

"Mr. St. O. Chapleau has tendered his resignation. In the face of the late revelations, in the face of his own evidence before the Commission, it was impossible that he could have remained in the service. His cause may serve as a warning if there are any who need warning."

Just here let me ask what was the result of these disclosures? Was he dismissed from the Department? Were his services dispensed with, or did he leave of his own motion,

as the hon. gentleman says? Or does the *Montreal Gazette*, which is always posted on such matters, tell us the truth about it? Let us see what the *Gazette* says:

"Mr. Chapleau was entitled to the fullest opportunity of making explanations; on oath before the Commission. The moment he made them, it became evident that the transactions in which he had been engaged made it impossible that he could continue in the public service, and his resignation was required."

Required by whom? Now, we have these contradictory statements—the *Mail* says it was impossible that he could have remained in the public service; the hon. Minister says he left of his own motion; the *Montreal Gazette* says his resignation was required. Which is right? I leave the *Mail* and the *Gazette* to reconcile between themselves this little difficulty, leaving out of consideration the other parties connected with the matter. However, it appears that he ceased to be connected with the public service. One would naturally suppose that that would have been the proper conclusion of the whole matter, and that the place that once knew him would know him no more. But he turns up again—where? As the high sheriff of the great Province of Assinibois. After having been either dismissed as unworthy of the confidence of his employer, or having resigned because he could not help himself, this man is promoted to one of the most important offices in the gift of the Crown, and he is up there now. I should like to know what the people of the North-West Territories have done that they should have inflicted upon them, a man who was not considered fit to serve the public in Ottawa. I want to know what all this means. Is there any truth in the rumours that we heard in the corridors and in the streets of Ottawa, last Session, that this man Chapleau knew so much that it was not safe for him to be at large? Is it true that in order that the Department of Railways and Canals might be carefully and properly managed, it was necessary that Mr. Chapleau should be appointed to a high and important office? What does it all mean, I ask again? Do the Government rely upon their numerical strength in this House—do they rely upon their supposed popularity in the country, to set at defiance with impunity every rule and every principle of honesty and honour?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMERON. I know this does not suit hon. gentlemen opposite. I know that if there is a vote on this question, every one of them will vote to sustain the Government in what they have done. But that does not lessen the heinousness of the offence in the slightest degree. I say that no Government is justified in placing in a high office in the North-West, a man who has been guilty of the conduct proven against Chapleau; and I shall be very much surprised, not at the vote in this House, but if the sentiment expressed outside of the House does not convey a solemn warning to the Government that this sort of thing is not to be repeated, and if the appointment of Chapleau as high sheriff in the North-West Territories is not universally condemned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to granting this motion and bringing down the papers. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell me that he was going to make some observations upon the appointment of Mr. Chapleau, or rather on the occasion of making this motion. When he commenced his speech, I thought the hon. gentleman was about to use the motion as a means of bringing up the subject of the contracts on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I find, however, that that is not the case; the hon. gentleman says that is to be reserved for a future occasion. We shall be very glad, I have no doubt, to hear the hon. gentleman on that as on all other subjects. He is so kindly and pleasant in his manner that even those who do not agree with him always listen to his speeches with pleasure and instruction.

The attack he has made on the Government is simply this: that Mr. Chapleau, who was formerly Secretary of the Public Works Department, and who resigned his office, was afterwards appointed sheriff in the North-West Territories, and that it was improper to make that appointment. I have no hesitation in saying that Mr. Chapleau was guilty of a grave and gross indiscretion in his acts, when he was Secretary of the Public Works Department. It is true that on looking at the papers you will find that he betrayed no confidence, gave no evidence, was of no assistance to any of the innumerable contractors running about the Department—that he gave no information that was in any way of any value to any one who was trying to be a contractor. We know that it is an improper practice, but we know it is proved—I have known, and I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite have known—that employes in the Civil Service have been occasionally giving information that they pick up in Ottawa through various sources. We know, for instance, and the hon. gentleman opposite knows, of various clerks who have been paid correspondents of newspapers in New York and elsewhere, and have been giving information to those papers. We know that, and they know that; and they know those men have not been removed, but it is an improper practice which should not be encouraged but which should be suppressed. But the gravamen of the charge against Mr. Chapleau which, I think, rendered me warranted in stating that he committed a grave indiscretion, was that he, being a clerk in the Public Works Department, allowed these contractors to approach him, and he rendered himself liable to the charge, and the supposition that he was open from pecuniary and mercenary motives to give information which he ought not to have given. In any other Department I do not approve of it, still we know it has been done, and perhaps is going on now, for all we know, and cannot be checked, that any clerk would write to a newspaper or to a New York contractor that such and such events are going on here. And Mr. Chapleau, being in the Department of Public Works, ought to have kept himself aloof from the very suspicion of giving to anybody information, even information which was open to the public, as he himself says this was open to the public. I shall not trouble the House with reading Mr. Chapleau's long explanation. It is in the evidence and hon. gentlemen can read it. I would invite the members of this House to look at his long statement. I think it shows this, that he was guilty of a grave indiscretion in allowing these people to approach him at all. It is clear from the whole volume of evidence that he did not betray one single confidence of the Department. He did not convey any matter or thing that could be of the most remote assistance to any one of the contractors that were at all interested in those contracts. The charge against him is that although he did not give them assistance, these men thought that they might be getting his assistance, might get behind the scene and might perhaps have an advantage over others, but that did not happen. Still it was a grave indiscretion. My hon. friend who was at the head of that Department censured him in conversation very severely. He spoke to him in such a manner that Mr. Chapleau thought it well to resign. He did resign, or most probably would have been removed from the situation he held. He is a man of great ability, a valuable public servant, a man of family, and it was ruin to him with his ability, with his position, the important position of Secretary of Public Works. He had every chance—a young, able, active, energetic man—of rising as high in the Civil Service as the Civil Service can allow. Though he resigned of his own motion, though there was no communication that he must resign he knew perfectly well that the matter was before the Government and he sent in his resignation, to use his own words, in order to avoid the necessity of any further investigation, any

further embarrassment with respect to his appointment. He was thrown upon the world. He was under the censure of the world. There he was with his family thrown on the world, and I think his punishment was as great as he deserved. For two or three long years he was thrown upon his own resources. He had committed a grave indiscretion and his punishment was very severe, and after that warning the Government did not think that man was beyond the pale. He had committed grave indiscretions, but he had committed no crime; and the Government thought the punishment quite sufficient for the offence and they sent him to the office—the hon. gentleman says to the high and important office—of High Sheriff of Assiniboia. He was sent up there to the office created by the hon. gentleman. But there was the small salary of \$1,000—\$1,000, up there; \$1,000, to live at Battleford—the salary was not nearly equal to that he had at the time he resigned. Not only is the salary inferior but he has no hope of any further salary from holding that office. It is a sinecure which was created by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why did you not abolish it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because we are Conservatives and we desire if possible to have no great innovations in matters introduced by such a Reformer as the hon. member for East York. Mr. Chapleau succeeded Mr. Richard, a gentleman who sat in this House, a most respectable representative of the people, and he received his reward. He went up there to the North-West. He lived a little while at Battleford—the seat of Government of the North-West. He did not like the place and as there was nothing to do he saw no necessity of remaining there. He removed down to Winnipeg and when we came in we found that he was living there. After making a few enquiries we found that during the three years he had been in office, he had never been there. He found there was nothing to do except to draw his salary, and he came down to Winnipeg and made his fortune by speculating in town lots. So that the office is not so important as yet, it is not more important than the salary—a salary on which a person could drag out a miserable existence in the North-West. Though by-and-bye, I dare say, there will be some duties attached to the place. At this moment he lives at Regina where he may have some processes to serve, for contracts are being made there, and he will not have occasion to give information as to them. He will have to serve writs and attend to the different functions of a sheriff as the country advances. But, Sir, we considered that this officer, by the ruin of his hopes, by his practical dismissal from office, his resignation to avoid dismissal, by his remaining for two long years without anything to live on, had been sufficiently punished, that it was a sufficient warning to him, it was a sufficient warning to the whole public service, to the Civil Service; and yet it was not acting, I think, with undue lenity to give him one more chance of supporting his family. And I repeat that it was with very great regret that the Government ascertained that he had committed these faults which have been mentioned by the hon. gentleman, that he had acted as he had done, because those who knew his abilities looked forward to his being of the very greatest service to the public, from his energy, his ability, his wonderful skill and talent. The advantage of all that, he lost, and the Government are quite willing to take the responsibility of saying that, while that man was punished, while he was dismissed from a responsible office, and cut off from all chance of rising in the future, yet he was not to be made an outcast for the remainder of his life, and had received a sufficient punishment in the loss of his hopes, the loss of his salary, the loss of his office, the loss of his position. We did not think that we were committing any great sin, that we were committing any sin, in saying, "Go and sin no more; go up there: try and earn your position

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

back again." He has got that position, and I have no doubt, whenever that office becomes, with the growth of the country, an important office, he will be found equal to the performance of the duty, and I do not envy those who sneer at the conduct of the Government in taking that charitable course towards this man. At all events, we are able and willing and capable of receiving that censure. The hon. gentlemen sneered when I said, "Go and sin no more." I would not give them that advice, because I do not think they would take it. They have no confidence in me, and they would have no confidence in the advice, however good it might be. We considered the man had been sufficiently punished, that the country had not lost anything by the impropriety of which he had been guilty. Therefore, after a very severe punishment, we have given him one chance more, and I believe it will be found hereafter that he has taken advantage of the warning, and will prove an able officer, ready and willing to perform his duty, and that he will never again appear liable to the censure of this House, of the hon. gentleman, or of the country. There can be no objection to the motion.

Motion agreed to.

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

#### After Recess.

#### READJUSTMENT OR INCREASE OF SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES.

Mr. OUMET (Translation), in moving for an address to His Excellency the Governor General, for copies of all correspondence between the several Provincial Governments and the Dominion Government, respecting the readjustment or increase of the money subsidies, paid by the latter to the former, in pursuance of the Confederation Agreement, or of any other arrangements since made; also, copies of all petitions from the several Provincial Legislatures to the Government, or to the Parliament of Canada, and of any memorials received by the latter from the several Provincial Governments, asking for aid or assistance in money, or otherwise; also, a statement showing all that has been granted, in money or otherwise, by the Government of Canada to the several Provinces since 1867, said: Mr. Speaker, before delivering this motion into your hands, I beg to crave the indulgence of this House, while I submit to their consideration certain remarks respecting the financial arrangements entered into at the time of the inauguration of Confederation, between the Provinces and the Government of the Dominion of Canada. When the Provinces agreed to the Federal compact, when they consented to associate, so to speak, they agreed to vest certain powers in the Federal Government, but to retain all the other powers, which they, the said Provinces, had previously enjoyed. In order to carry out this agreement, it was necessary to provide for the division of the revenue then accruing to each one of these Provinces. The main sources of this revenue were the Customs and Excise; but, as these sources formed the most important part of the revenue of the various Provinces, and as what remained was inadequate to meet the requirements of legislation, and other expenses of the Government, it was agreed that a proportion of those revenues which were to be collected by the Federal power, should be remitted to the different Provinces, to be used towards defraying their expenses. I have not with me the statement of the total amount of receipts for the year 1867, but after the first fiscal year, in 1868, the revenue of the Dominion, in Customs and Excise duties, amounted to \$11,580,968.25, which sum, apportioned to a population numbering 3,090,561 souls in 1861, made \$3.75 paid per capita by the Provinces to the Federal Government. It

was agreed that the Provinces would receive out of the revenues a sum of 80 cents per head, which made an average of 21½ per cent. paid back to the Provinces by the Government of the Dominion. This proportion was established for two reasons, the first of which was based upon the fact that it was feared that, after the establishment of Confederation, the expenditure of both the central Government and that of the different Local Governments put together would greatly exceed the revenue then raised by each of the Provinces. On the other hand, it was feared that the increase in the expenditure would involve an increase of taxation. Actuated by these two motives, which we find reported in the debates on Confederation, and especially in the speeches delivered later on at Quebec and at Sherbrooke, by Sir Alexander Galt, who was then Minister of Finance, the Government decided that the proportion granted to the Provinces out of the revenue of each of them would be 21½ per cent., that is to say, 80 cents per head. I think I am justified in saying that the Provinces expected this proportion to remain always the same. In fact, Sir Alexander T. Galt, speaking at Sherbrooke, in answer to those who complained that the new system would necessitate an increase in the tariff, and that the Provinces would then be called upon to furnish to the central Government a greater proportion of revenue, pledged his word that such a thing would never happen. Well, I now wish to point out that this proportion has since been changed; that the revenue arising from Customs and Excise has greatly increased; that the tariff has been increased and that the proportion paid by the people of the Provinces has also increased. If we take the amounts stated in the Public Accounts, we find that in 1883 there has been collected in Customs and Excise duties, a total amount of \$29,269,698, so that each person in the Dominion of Canada, according to the figure of the population, as stated in the census of 1881, that is to say, 4,324,810, contributes to these two sources of Federal revenue the sum of \$6.80. As will be seen, Mr. Speaker, these sources of revenue to the Federal Government have increased in a proportion which is surprising. Now if we try to explain the increase of that revenue we find that it is due mainly to two causes: first, the rise in the Tariff and secondly, the increase of the population and of the amount consumed by the population. I submit that in both cases the terms or rather the conditions of the agreement entered into by the Provinces and the Federal Government in 1867 or 1865, are changed. Against their expectations, the Provinces are now paying a great deal more than they expected to pay and receive a great deal less than they expected to receive; thus, instead of receiving, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, a percentage of 21½ per cent. on the revenue of the Confederation, in 1883 the Provinces only received 10 per cent., or a little less than 10 per cent. of this revenue. Well, Mr. Speaker, when we find that to be the case, it seems to me that the Provinces have a right to ask themselves if, in view of this change of circumstances, they have not the right to alter the terms of the agreement entered into between them and the Federal Government, especially when these Provinces find that the population of the country as well as the increase of the Federal revenue, must be attributed to the expenditure made by them to develop their resources and to increase their population and their trade within the limits of their respective territories. I will say even more, when we know that in proportion as the Provinces make sacrifices to increase their own resources and revenue, that same revenue is diminished more and more, as it does not increase in the same proportion as their expenditure. For instance, this rate of 80 cents per head, according to the language used by the Minister of Finance, ought to be used especially towards defraying the cost of the administration of justice, the maintenance of hospitals and the subsidies granted to charitable institutions. Well, Mr.

Speaker, it is useless for me to tell this House that, as the population increases the expenditure must increase in proportion. In 1867, for instance, when the Province of Quebec had only a population of 900,000 and some hundred souls, the cost of the administration of justice in that Province was \$322,236.24, and the maintenance of asylums only cost \$97,946. It will be easily understood that in 1881—which is the most recent date covered by whatever accurate data are in my possession—when our population had increased to 1,350,000 of inhabitants, that expenditure naturally increased also. It is found that in 1881, the cost of the administration of justice was \$437,000, and that for asylums the expenditure had increased from \$97,946 to \$213,828, so that during that period there had been on these two branches of the administration an increase of \$231,135. Now, if I may be allowed to say a few words with regard to what the Government of the Province of Quebec has done towards the increase of population within the limits of their territory, the development of colonization and agriculture, the increase of trade generally, and the building of its various railways, I will say that the Province of Quebec has, perhaps, contributed in a greater measure than any of the other Provinces towards the increase of the Federal revenue, and during that time, what we received out of that revenue, which we enlarged through our sacrifices, practically decreased constantly, inasmuch as this resource remained always unchanged, while our expenditure constantly increased. I shall specially mention the expenses which the Province was obliged to incur for the special object of colonization. Our Province is not altogether in the same position as the other Provinces. Immigration, for which, however, we are paying our good share, yet without begrudging it in any way, the position of our Province is such that we reap but little benefit from the immigration coming from foreign countries into the Dominion of Canada, and in fact our Province has hardly been increased by immigration since 1868. So that we Quebecers are left to ourselves, and thus our Province is obliged to incur heavy expenses to open out new farms and improve those already cultivated. Now, then, those expenses necessitated by immigration and which have a direct and beneficial influence on the increase of the revenue of the Federal Government, do not hardly yield any profits, or rather any compensation, to our Province on the part of the Dominion Government. Well, the consequence which, to my mind, evidently flows from the facts I have just mentioned is this, that we have a right to compensation in proportion to what we furnish to the Confederation as a whole. And I speak from a general point of view; I make no exception in favour of the Province of Quebec. I do not ask for that Province anything that could not be fairly granted to her or to any of the other Provinces. I may say here, with a feeling of pride, that although our Government may be at the present time in a rather difficult position, the Province of Quebec is not obliged to come begging at the door of the Federal Government. We simply come here to ask what we consider to be our rights, and we are ready to uphold in any circumstances whatsoever, what we consider to be the rights of other Provinces. Considering that there has been a change in the circumstances under which the Government of the Dominion were to pay the subsidy to the various Provinces, I say that the subsidy ought to be changed also. I maintain that this subsidy ought to be increased so as to enable the different Provinces to command the resources required to maintain their independent existence, to develop their resources, increase their wealth, and by so doing increase the wealth of the Dominion. The practical suggestion I intend to submit, is not to ask the Government to give us the same proportion of 21½ per cent. of the revenue of the Government of the Dominion, but I should ask that the small proportion of 14¼ per cent. of this revenue be

assigned to the different Provinces. This proportion is equal to \$1 per head of the population, as given in the last census. This amount should be paid per capita, and should be made liable to change every ten years, according to the changes in the population, as it increases or diminishes. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is useless for me to draw the special attention of the Government on this matter. I shall utter no complaint. I will only say that the old Provinces of the Confederation have an undoubted right to claim such an increase, the more so since to-day, more than ever, we make enormous sacrifices to develop the new territories which form part of the Dominion. It is useless for me to say that I do not begrudge what is paid for others. We pay it because we think that it is in the interest of the Dominion of Canada, and we do not complain, but "charity begins at home," says the old French proverb, and I think the Government ought to consider it to be an act of justice towards the old Provinces, who are making such heavy sacrifices in the interest of the new ones, to give them a small share of the increase of taxation with which they are now burdened, so that they may use it to promote the development of their own resources. And, Mr. Speaker, while giving my views here, or rather while pleading for the old Provinces, I think I may speak from a general standpoint. Is it not desirable that these Provinces should have the means to increase their population, and to increase their wealth, so as to be able in the future to control, and offer a resistance sufficiently strong against those influences which we are creating in the new Provinces of the North-West, by pouring in our millions and pouring in all the immigration which we bring from abroad? I presume, Mr. Speaker, that these new Provinces will have enough of courtesy and of common sense to gratefully bear in mind who were the people who made those pecuniary sacrifices on which will be based their future prosperity and welfare; but, in politics, as in many other transactions in life, it is not prudent to depend too much on the gratitude of people to whom we have extended a helping hand, and we may have occasion to regret, by and by, that after having diminished our resources in the old Provinces, we shall have expended too much of our surpluses and of our money for the advancement and improvement of the new Provinces. From these various points of view, I think the House will receive with favour the idea I now express respecting the readjustment, on a fair basis, of the Federal subsidy to the different Provinces. It is not, as some of the newspapers have put it, a raid we are making on the Federal Treasury. We simply come to ask what belongs to the old Provinces, what they have a right to claim; not what belongs to other Provinces but what belongs to the new ones, because it is they who are paying the enormous amount which go to make up the Federal revenue. Another consideration is that the various Provinces now have to drain all the sources of revenue at their disposal. One of these sources—I am speaking especially of the Province of Ontario and of the Province of Quebec—consists of what is drawn from the price of timber limits to meet their necessary expenses. They are obliged to overdrain them a good deal more than would be consistent with prudence, and I think I may safely say that the same thing is done in the Province of Ontario as well as in the Province of Quebec. Well, would it not be desirable to put at the disposal of the Provinces a little more resources so that they may save the important source of national wealth contained in our forest lands? From a general point of view, speaking for the Dominion, I think that it would be very important that the Federal Government should take it upon themselves to give to the Provinces the means of avoiding and imprudently pushing to the extreme limits the sale and cutting down of timber in our forest lands. If we continue to drain this source of revenue as we are doing to-day, in ten years hence the ex-

Mr. OUIMET.

portation of lumber will be a thing of the past; in ten years from now our forests shall have ceased to exist, and this source of national wealth of which we now boast so much shall have disappeared from our country. Therefore, I think, that having in view the best interests of trade and the prosperity of the Dominion, it is important to give the old provinces their due, viz., the fair proportion accruing to them from the revenue they have helped to create.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding the motion just made by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), because, if the views expressed by him are adopted by the Government, and if they are followed by the practical measure they suggest, they indicate a sure way of reestablishing the equilibrium sought to be created in the early days of Confederation, and which is now disturbed by the addition of certain new Provinces and by the very material changes in the Tariff. In 1867, when the four Provinces joined together to lay the basis of Confederation, it was agreed that the Federal Government would take upon themselves a certain fixed amount of their indebtedness. If we refer to the Federal compact we find that this sum amounts, for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, to \$62,500,000; for Nova Scotia, to \$3,000,000, for New Brunswick, \$7,000,000. But as these two last mentioned Provinces were not really indebted for these amounts there was inserted in the Act the following proviso:—

"In case the public debts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick do not, at the Union, amount to \$3,000,000 and \$7,000,000 respectively, they shall respectively receive, by half-yearly payments in advance from the Government of Canada, interest at 5 per centum per annum on the differences between the actual amounts of their respective debts and such stipulated amounts."

By this provision of the law, Mr. Speaker, all the Provinces of Confederation have been put on an equal footing. By dividing each provincial debt, thus assumed by the Confederation, by the number of the inhabitants, we find an average of so much per head, which is about the same for each Province in the Dominion. But this equilibrium was soon disturbed, and as far back as the following year we see by 32-33 Victoria, chapter 2, that Nova Scotia has filed a claim here, and by this legislation, instead of being put at \$8,000,000, as had been stipulated by the Union at Confederation, the debt of Nova Scotia was fixed at \$9,186,756. Apart from this increase in the amount of its debt, Nova Scotia was to receive, during a period of ten years, beginning on the 1st July, 1867, a subsidy of \$82,698 per annum over and above all other sums payable to that Province under the Act of British North America; and it was enacted as follows:—

"And such allowance shall hereafter be paid by half yearly payments in advance from the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, the arrears thereof, up to the day last mentioned, being capitalized either in whole or in part, as the Governor in Council may determine, and the interest on the part capitalized being payable until the end of the said ten years, when the principal shall be paid."

Later on, in 1870, Manitoba entered into the Confederation. The Act which was passed on this occasion, 33 Vic., chap. 3, lays down the following conditions for that new Province:—

"Inasmuch as the Province is not in debt, the said Province shall be entitled to be paid and receive from the Government of Canada, by half-yearly payments in advance, interest at the rate of 5 per centum per annum on the sum of \$472,090."

That was the amount required to put Manitoba on an equal footing as regarded the debt whose burden was felt by the other Provinces, and for which the Confederation had become responsible. There was also given a sum of \$30,000, payable yearly, by Canada to the Province for the maintenance of its Government and Legislature. Here is what is said in clause 25 of the same Act:

"The sum of thirty thousand dollars shall be paid yearly by Canada to the Province for the support of its Government and Legislature, and an annual grant, in aid of the said Province, shall be made, equal to

eighty cents per head of the population, estimated at seventeen thousand souls: And such grant of eighty cents per head shall be augmented in proportion to the increase of population, as may be shown by the census that shall be taken thereof, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one and by each such subsequent decennial census, until its population amounts to four hundred thousand souls, at which amount such grant shall remain thereafter, and such sum shall be in full settlement of all future demands on Canada, and shall be paid, half-yearly, in advance, to the said Province."

This last part of the clause I have just quoted, and which relates to the sum of \$30,000, is similar to what we find in all the legislation made, as one Province after another joined the Confederation. As to the annual subsidy destined to the maintenance of the Local Legislatures, it already existed as far as the other Provinces were concerned. In the Act of British North America we find that Ontario received for its legislation expenditure \$30,000; Quebec, \$70,000; Nova Scotia, \$60,000; New Brunswick, \$30,000. Later, on in 1871, British Columbia joined us, and among other conditions of its admittance, we find the following:—

"1. Canada shall be liable for the debts and liabilities of British Columbia existing at the time of the Union.

"2. British Columbia not having incurred debts equal to those of the other Provinces now constituting the Dominion, shall be entitled to receive, by half-yearly payments in advance, from the General Government, interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum on the difference between the actual amount of its indebtedness at the date of the Union and the indebtedness per head of the population of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick (\$7.77) the population of British Columbia being taken at 60,000.

"The following sums shall be paid by Canada to British Columbia for the support of its Government and Legislature, to wit, an annual subsidy of \$35,000, and an annual grant equal to 80 cents per head of the said population (60,000) both half-yearly in advance, such grant of 80 cents per head to be augmented in proportion to the increase of population as may be shown by each subsequent decennial census, until the population amounts to 400,000, at which rate such grant shall thereafter remain, it being understood that the first census be taken in the year 1881."

Among the other conditions imposed by British Columbia, when it entered into Confederation, let me mention the building of a railway to connect that Province with the other Provinces of the Dominion, a half-yearly postal service, between Victoria and Olympia, a naval station at Esquimalt, an additional yearly subsidy of \$100,000, in consideration of twenty miles of land given to the Government on each side of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government agreed to build a graving-dock at Esquimalt—at least they gave their security at 5 per cent. on a sum of £100,000 sterling for the purpose. Later on, by 36 Victoria, chapter 30, all of these original conditions were modified. There was a surplus to be divided between the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario amounting to over \$10,000,000. The Provinces could not come to an agreement, and in 1873 the Government, by an Act sanctioned on the 23rd of May, assumed this debt of \$10,506,088.84. The assumption of this debt by the Government rendered it necessary for them to give a compensation to the other Provinces which formed part of the Confederation, and here is the clause which provides for this compensation:

In the accounts between the several Provinces of Canada and the Dominion, the amounts payable to and chargeable against the said Provinces respectively, in so far as they depend on the amount of debt with which each Province entered the Union, shall be calculated and allowed as if the sum fixed by the one hundred and twelfth section of the "British North America Act, 1873," were increased from sixty-two million five hundred thousand dollars to the sum of seventy-three million six thousand and eighty-eight dollars and eighty-four cents, and as if the amounts fixed as aforesaid, as respects the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the "The British North America Act, 1867," and as respects the Provinces of British Columbia and Manitoba, by the terms and conditions on which they were admitted into the Dominion, were increased in the same proportion."

Prince Edward Island had not yet entered into the Confederation; but it was not long before it came to us, and on the 28th of June, 1873, I believe, an Order in Council was passed decreeing its entry into the Dominion, and under its provisions Prince Edwards Island was entitled to a debt equal to \$50 per head, that is to say \$4,701,050. The Gov-

ernment agreed to pay to that Province the interest on that amount, besides an annual subsidy of \$45,000, of which sum, however, the Government was to deduct the interest at 5 per cent. on a sum not exceeding \$300,000, which the Government was to pay for lands, as Prince Edward Island had no public domains. But as long as the amount was not paid, the Government was to pay the whole of the yearly subsidy of \$45,000. There was a second subsidy of \$30,000 for the maintenance of the Legislature; then there was the annual grant of 80 cents per head, the population of the Island being estimated at 32,020. This grant of 80 cents per head was to follow the increase of the population as long as the population did not exceed 400,000 souls. We must not forget the interest on \$4,701,050, the amount accepted as being the debt of the Island. There were also other conditions to which the Government acceded. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, if we refer to the last Public Accounts, we find that the Province of Ontario has received \$1,196,872.80 as a Federal subsidy. If we divide that sum by the number of the inhabitants we find that Ontario receives 62 cents per head. This amount of \$1,196,872.80 comprises not only the grant of 80 cents per head of the population of 1861, but also the sum of \$80,000 for the Local Legislature. The Province of Quebec has received \$952,252.80 for her share of the Federal subsidy, that is to say \$839,252.80 for the grant and the balance \$70,000 for the maintenance of its Legislature. By dividing this amount by the actual number of the population we find that the Province of Quebec receives 70 cents per head. Nova Scotia has received lately, according to the accounts for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1883, the sum of \$393,753.01. If we divide the amount by the number of its population we find that it is now receiving 89 cents per head. New Brunswick has received \$456,971.23. Divide this amount by the number of its population and you will see that it has received a proportion of \$1.42 per head. Prince Edward Island, the sum of \$161,674.07, which makes a proportion of \$1.51 per head if you divide this amount by the number of the population of the Island. British Columbia has received a sum of \$207,995.66, divide that sum by the figure of its population, and you will find that it receives annually a sum of \$4.22 per head. Manitoba is now receiving \$3.47 per head, that is to say the total amount of \$227,153.04. Such, Mr. Speaker, is the actual proportion of the sums received by each Province forming part of the Confederation. At first sight, the discrepancies seem somewhat large; thus you have Ontario receiving 62 cents per head of its population; Quebec, 70; Nova Scotia, 89; New Brunswick, \$1.42; Prince Edward Island, \$1.51; British Columbia, \$4.22, and Manitoba, \$3.47. I know that in several of these Provinces, as New Brunswick for instance, a certain amount has been allowed by virtue of the 36 Vict., ch. 41, because, by the Treaty of Washington, the duty on the exportation of lumber has been abolished, and to indemnify New Brunswick for the loss it then sustained, there was voted for that Province out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, over and above the subsidy to which it was entitled, an additional subsidy amounting to \$150,000 per annum. At the present moment we have yet to learn what different other moneys have been expended for each of the Provinces. I have a motion on this subject, and I think in a few moments I shall give new figures. But taking the question from a general standpoint, as the hon. member for Laval has done, I think the Government ought to do something for us. Let them examine the figures I have just given and they will see that the thing is becoming necessary. The position in which the two oldest Provinces of the Dominion now find themselves is such, that it seems to point out the necessity of a remedy. While I consider the question from the standpoint taken by the hon. member for Laval, I think

that the intention of the fathers of Confederation, when they established the amount of 80 cents per head, was to remit to the Provinces the 21½ per cent. on the revenue which Canada could obtain by means of the Customs and Excise duties. Well, as the hon. member has said, and said so truly, this proportion is completely destroyed, and instead of giving this amount to the different Provinces forming part of the Confederation, the Federal Government only gives them 10 per cent. What the hon. member for Laval wishes to do is to strike an average, and I hope and trust that the Government will comply with the demand of the hon. member, a demand which, I hope, will be upheld by every member of this House. In view of this act of justice, whose beneficial effects would be felt, not only by the Province of Quebec but also by all the other Provinces of the Confederation. I second the motion made by the hon. member for Laval.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not rise for the pleasure of speaking in English, but I think it only fair and just to those hon. gentlemen who do not understand the French language, that I should explain to them in a few words the position of affairs as they have been set forth by the mover and seconder of this motion. When the Province of Quebec entered our great Confederation—and I may say that I am very happy to see before me the fathers of Confederation—it was understood between the several contracting Provinces who joined the scheme that sufficient revenue should be allowed the Local Governments to enable them properly to perform the functions which were allotted to them by the Confederation Act. The amount of 80 cents per head of the then population was thought sufficient for that purpose. At that time it represented about 21½ per cent. of the total revenue, and for the first years of Confederation that amount proved sufficient. Let us first enquire, what are the sources of revenue for the General and Local Governments respectively. To the General Government was given the power of raising money by any mode or system of taxation. To the Local Governments were given 80 cents per head from the Dominion revenues, and besides, the power of direct taxation within the Province in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes; also the revenue arising from Crown Lands. Now, Mr. Speaker, by giving to the General Government the power to raise money by any mode or system of taxation, we abandoned the Customs and Excise duties—that very easy and ample means of raising a revenue—while we reserved an income of 80 cents per head and the power of direct taxation for provincial purposes. But since then the Courts of Justice have frequently declared that the Local Governments have no such power, or at least have practically so decided, and the Provinces have been to a large extent deprived of that source of revenue which was supposed to be a very fruitful one for the Local Governments. As to the Crown Lands, it is a well known fact that in Ontario and Quebec the revenue from that source is constantly diminishing. Allow me to remark here, Mr. Speaker, that I am not speaking as a representative of the Government of Quebec, but I come here as a member of this House, elected by a county in the Province of Quebec, and I may be supposed to be better acquainted with its affairs than with those of the other Provinces. In Quebec, as I said, the revenue from Crown lands is constantly diminishing, and it will be especially the case this year. The position of affairs is this: The revenues of the Local Government are constantly diminishing; the payment of 80 cents per head is still made on the basis of the census of 1861; the power of direct taxation is declared illegal; and the revenue from Crown lands is diminishing. Now let us look at the expenditure. If you take into consideration, Mr. Speaker, the numerous functions and duties that have been left to the Local Governments, you will find them to require great and constantly increasing expenditure.

Mr. LANDRY,

The fact is that the more this Dominion grows the more it develops in extent, the more do the expenses of the Local Governments increase. On the one side their revenues diminish, and on the other side their expenses increase. For instance, we have to support the provincial offices, and to provide for their officers; make arrangements for the sale of the public lands; establish, maintain and manage public and reformatory prisons; establish, maintain and manage hospitals, asylums and charitable institutions in and for the Province, other than marine hospitals; establish municipal institutions, &c. The Local Government is also charged with the administration of justice, including the maintenance and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and of criminal jurisdiction, including procedure in civil matters in those courts, and all the other matters of a merely local nature in the Province. I need not remind you, Sir, that *pari passu* with the increase of population is the increase of expense of the civil and criminal administration of justice. I need not remind you that with the extension of commerce there is an increase in litigation, and in the consequent expense of the civil administration of justice. In the first years of Confederation our expenses were not so large but that they were covered by the ordinary revenue; and the Province of Quebec even had a surplus for a few years of somewhat over \$200,000. But in spite of the strictest economy and the utmost care, notwithstanding the efforts of the best men of both parties, our provincial expenses have become too large for the revenue; and it appears by the Public Accounts that for several years the provincial Budget has shown a growing deficit. I may, perhaps, be told that if the Provincial Government had not undertaken to build railways this difficulty would not have occurred. Well, Sir, last year we passed an Act in this House declaring that all those railways were for the general good of the Dominion. But, the revenue would still have been insufficient, even if we had not built those roads. It must be admitted, also, that all those railways contribute to the wealth and prosperity of the whole Dominion. Every piece of iron that was used in their construction, all the articles that were consumed or used by the workmen on those roads, contributed to the trade and general prosperity of the whole country, and assisted the Federal Exchequer. That, Sir, is the position to-day that the Province of Quebec occupies under Confederation. Our revenues are diminishing and will continue to diminish; our expenses are increasing and will continue to increase. All the successive Governments in that Province of both political parties agree as to the increasing cost of the administration of justice. Now, what is the position? Before throwing our millions into a new country, undoubtedly for the good of the whole Dominion, before creating new Provinces and bringing in ten, twenty or perhaps thirty millions of people, who will overwhelm the inhabitants of the old Provinces, we should pause a moment and look at this great work of Confederation, and ask ourselves in the face of the country—is our work good and is it sufficient? If we find it good, all right; if we find it not sufficient, we should make it sufficient. The time has arrived to do so, when we see large surpluses and prosperity; when we see the hope of good years in the future. When we see that some Provinces of the Dominion have not under the Confederation Act the necessary means of doing their work in the Confederation, we should pause and remodel that Act in such a way as to render it possible for them to do what they have been directed to do by the Confederation Act. We have said to them: administer justice. Let us give them the means of doing so. We have said to them: take charge of gaols and asylums. Let us give them money for that purpose. We have said to them, look after the education of the people. Let us give them money to do it. What would this Government do if the Provinces had not the necessary means to teach their people? What would become of Canada if the

Local Governments had to close their schools? What would become of this great Confederation if we had to shut our asylums and leave the unfortunates without help? Are we in such a position, at this stage of the Confederation, that we are not able to repair a certain mistake that may have been committed? I do not accuse the good faith of the fathers of Confederation, of the great work which will always be quoted as the product of genius, but so long as man is man he will fail. It was not foreseen that when our expenses would be expanding our revenues would be diminishing. We address the fathers of Confederation and ask them to pause a moment in order to remodel the subsidies given to the Provinces, on a fair and proper basis, so as to give to every Province of the Confederation the means of accomplishing the objects for which they were created. I do not, Sir, appear here as representing the Government, only as a representative of my country, and I state here publicly in the face of the House and the country, the policy which I think should be adopted by this House. We must save every Province of the Confederation; we must save the Confederation itself. We have accepted the great scheme on the understanding that each Province will have sufficient means to carry out the objects for which it was established. That was the understanding. The good faith of the whole country was pledged to the Provinces, and we ask to-day the necessary means to carry that understanding into effect.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE EXCHANGE BANK OF CANADA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved the following Resolution:—

That it appears from papers laid before this House, that the Minister of Finance on the 12th and 16th days of April, 1883, advanced the sum of two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) to the Exchange Bank of Canada, and thereafter, on the 12th day of May, 1883, advanced a further sum of one hundred thousand dollars to the said Bank, for which latter amount a letter of guaranty was taken from the Hon. A. W. Ogilvie, a member of the Senate of Canada, agreeing to indemnify the Government for any loss arising from the said advance.

That it further appears that the Minister of Finance was aware at the time of making the said advance that the said Bank was embarrassed.

That the said Exchange Bank of Canada had already within two years previously, been compelled to suspend specie payments and to reduce its original capital by one-half.

That it does not appear that the Minister of Finance took proper precautions or instituted adequate enquiries into the affairs of the said Bank prior to making the said advances.

That the said Exchange Bank of Canada has since become insolvent, and that a large sum of public money has in consequence become imperilled and will probably be lost.

That it was not expedient that the Minister of Finance should have advanced the said three hundred thousand dollars.

That it was not expedient that any sum of money whatever should have been advanced upon personal security, and especially on the security of a member of the Legislature.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it will be very easy to surprise me by any act of omission or commission which hon. gentlemen opposite may choose to perform; but I am free to confess that on the present occasion I am very much astonished indeed at the facts which the papers that have been laid on this Table disclose. I believe, Sir, that that feeling of astonishment, when the facts come to be thoroughly understood, will be shared by every man of business in this House, and by every man of business in the country. Now, Sir, I want it to be thoroughly understood as to the fault which I think the Minister of Finance has committed. Had this act been done in the ordinary course of business, had the Minister, after enquiry, after taking fair precaution and satisfying himself that it was consistent with public safety, made a deposit in this bank in due and ordinary course of business, and had thereafter a loss ensued, I would not for one have been disposed to censure him too severely, because, by reason of an error in judgment, an injury had happened to the public. But I contend that the case in the present instance is wholly and entirely different. What the Minister has done, as these papers disclose, as the official returns

disclose, and as the whole evidence shows, is this: The Minister of Finance chose, after full knowledge and warning, to risk a large sum of public money in the attempt to maintain a bank which he was thoroughly aware was in a most dangerous position. From that, two very evil results have occurred: A serious loss to the public; and, as I shall presently show, I fear considerable loss may have occurred to innocent parties who, trusting the knowledge and experience which the Minister of Finance might naturally be supposed to possess, have, on the faith of the Government deposits, imperilled their property in this bank subsequent to the date of this advance. Now, Sir, the facts are substantially recited in the motion in your hands; but in order that there may be no mistake, I desire to call the attention of the House to a statement coming from the Department of the hon. Minister himself, which I find in these very papers. I find, Sir, that on the 13th of November last the Deputy Minister of the Department of Finance addressed the following letter to the Department of Justice:—

“ OTTAWA, November 13th, 1883.

“ Sir,—I have the honour to call your attention to the following facts:—

“ On the 12th April last, the Exchange Bank of Canada, Montreal, being in difficulties, Mr. Greene, one of the Directors, came to Ottawa to ask for assistance, and it was agreed that the sum of \$100,000 should be advanced the Bank on deposit, and if that proved insufficient another \$100,000 should be advanced it. Accordingly on that same day the sum of \$100,000 was placed in the Bank on Special deposit withdrawable on thirty days' notice and bearing interest at 5 per cent., the Bank sending its deposit receipt No. 323 on the receipt of the amount. This sum did not, however, prove sufficient, and accordingly on the 16th April the president wrote asking for the advance of the other \$100,000, which was paid to the bank on the 17th through the C. & D., Montreal, on the same terms as the first advance, and for this deposit the Bank sent its deposit receipt No. 328. On the 21st of the same month the President of the Bank wrote to me asking for the advance of another \$100,000, to which I replied on the 23rd that the Government had fixed the limit at \$200,000, and that I could not exceed my instructions. Afterwards Mr. A. W. Ogilvie, one of the Directors of the Bank, came to Ottawa, and on his written guarantee, herewith enclosed, the Government on the 11th May advanced another \$100,000 to the Bank on the same terms as the previous advances, and the Bank sent its deposit receipt No. 346 in return for the same.”

Then he goes on to narrate certain transactions of the bank not immediately pertinent to the matter, and proceeds:

“ I have now received a letter from the President of the Bank asking for the return of the guarantee of Mr. Ogilvie on the ground that the amount guaranteed by him has been paid, and I have to request you to advise me whether under the circumstances above cited the guarantee has been discharged and should be returned, the amount paid by the Bank being applied by the request of the President thereof to the payment of the first and unsecured advance given to the Bank, deposit receipt No. 346 representing the amount secured by Mr. Ogilvie being still held by us.

“ I have the honour to be, Sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

(Signed) “ J. M. COURTNEY,

“ Deputy Minister of Finance.

“ The Deputy Minister of Justice, Ottawa.”

Now, Sir, here we have the facts stated on the authority of the hon. gentleman's own deputy, confirmed in every detail by the other letters which have been brought down, and I want the House to consider what these facts disclose. It is perfectly clear that before the first initial transaction took place the Minister of Finance was doubly warned of the un-sound condition of this bank. The president of that bank does not, nor do the directors who had interviewed the hon. gentleman, at all appear to have concealed the fact that they were in difficulties. It is apparent that the hon. gentleman knew right well that the deposit he was asked to make was not a deposit in the ordinary course of business, but that he was asked to interpose the credit of the Government of Canada to save the Exchange Bank from closing its doors. This is perfectly plain and clear—no man with these papers before him will deny, nor, I think, can he pretend to deny it. I might say that the confession of the president contained in these papers was quite sufficient. But, Sir, there were other means in the hands of the hon.

gentleman of ascertaining, and ascertaining thoroughly and correctly, what the true condition of this bank's affairs were. That, I fear, was thoroughly concealed from all parties until that bank closed its doors. But, Sir, there was most ample proof in the hands of the hon. gentleman, published in the *Gazette* of the 7th of April, a week or nearly so before these advances were made, in the official statement open to all the world, and specially brought under the cognizance of the Minister of Finance, that this bank was in a most desperate condition, and I use the words advisedly. This official statement of the *Canada Gazette* shows that at the time the Minister of Finance was called upon to aid it, this bank with a paid up capital of \$500,000 owed \$2,980,000 liabilities, all told, or as nearly as possible, \$3,000,000, and that it had in specie and Dominion notes, to pay this \$3,000,000, the sum of \$78,000. Now, Sir, I need not tell the House, I need not tell the hon. gentleman, I need not, I think, tell his supporters, that a bank which owes \$3,000,000 and runs down its specie and Dominion notes to \$78,000—and anything it had available was very small, as these returns show—that such a bank was in an exceedingly perilous position. The hon. gentleman must have known that fact. He must have seen that in the ordinary, natural course of circumstances that bank, on the very lightest demand made upon it, would probably have to close its doors. I say the hon. gentleman was doubly warned. But there was more than this. Had that bank's previous record been one of a kind to inspire the confidence of the public, I might have understood better than I do the course which the hon. gentleman saw fit to pursue. But this bank, which came with such an exhibit as I have pointed out; this bank, as the hon. gentleman right well knew, within about two years previous, had suspended specie payments, and reduced its total capital by one-half. I have here the Statute passed under the special inspiration and direction of the Minister of Finance, to whose office it specially belonged to see if this was granted, that it was a proper demand to grant; and I find that this Act, chap. 36, of the Statutes of 1881, states:

"Whereas, the Exchange Bank of Canada, by its petition, has represented that it has sustained heavy losses in the course of its business, whereby the value of the paid up capital stock thereof has been largely reduced, and that in order to enable it advantageously to continue its business and to realize the largest possible return for its shareholders, it is necessary that it should be authorized to reduce its capital stock by reducing the number of its subscribed shares."

There is the Statute showing that two years ago that bank was in difficulties and was obliged largely to reduce its stock. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman under these circumstances was in all conscience bound to take very special and extraordinary precautions, if he were convinced that it was clearly in the public interests that the public credit should be pledged to sustain the Exchange Bank. In the few words of explanation which the hon. gentleman gave on the occasion of moving to bring down these papers, he made use of an expression which I was sorry to hear from him. The hon. gentleman intimated that this was done—because that was the natural construction which ought to be placed on his words—under the advice of his Deputy Minister. Here is what he said:

"The bank applied to the Government, and the Government, after consulting the Deputy Minister of Finance, and looking into the matter, thought it safe, and in the interest of the public, to advance \$800,000 to the bank at 5 per cent. interest, and on conditions similar to those on which advances were made to the Ontario Bank two years ago, and the Consolidated Bank."

Now, Sir, that is a remarkable statement. It is remarkable in two ways. The hon. Minister, in the first place, attempts, or appears to attempt—I should be very glad indeed to hear him correct me and say I am wrong in so understanding him—attempts to shield himself by intimating that this was done after consultation with his deputy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Now, Sir, I do not think it is fair or right for a gentleman in the position of Minister of Finance to attempt to throw a responsibility of this kind upon any subordinate; but, Sir, having chosen to do so, I say, as a matter of practice, as a matter of sound constitutional precedent, he should at least have taken the precaution of officially instructing his deputy to report on that bank, and that report should have been put in writing and laid before us. Now, Sir, I have a high opinion of the hon. gentleman's deputy. I believe he is a very efficient and very excellent officer. But I say it is not a fair thing to ask a Deputy Minister to report upon a matter of this kind. It is outside of his proper province. It is a thing which requires an expert. It is not a thing which could be done by any man, no matter how competent, in the course of a short trip from this city to Montreal or elsewhere. But we do not find one word to show that there was any report at all. I cannot admit that there would have been a sufficient excuse for this—which is the very highest exercise of Ministerial responsibility—even had the Deputy Minister officially reported that he thought the bank was safe and that the Government might risk this deposit—particularly, under the circumstances, which were patent to the hon. Minister of Finance—which I conclude must have been before him at the time he made this special advance; and, Sir, I think the House and the country will agree with me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Possibly the House may not. It is my business to lay the case, with the facts and arguments, before the House. Hon. gentlemen must vote as their consciences and their ideas of duty to their constituencies require them, and I hope they will.

Mr. RYKERT. So they will.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt. In these remarks of the hon. gentleman there is an allusion made to a matter which I think requires the attention of the House. Apparently, Sir, this is not the first time that the Minister of Finance has interfered to protect banks. He states in the extract which I have read that this was done in the same way as it had been done twice before,—in the cases of the Ontario Bank and of the Consolidated Bank. Now, Sir, if that was done—if the hon. gentleman, under similar circumstances, believing that those banks were in peril, advanced, out of the ordinary course of business, large sums of money to them to assist them over a crisis, all I can say is that I think the hon. gentleman should have told the House that he found it necessary to do so; and he should—for reasons which I shall presently state—have asked indemnity for having so done. What the hon. gentleman has done in this matter, I repeat, is wholly and entirely apart from the ordinary course of his duty—is an exercise of a responsibility of the very gravest kind, and not at all a thing to be lightly done or to be lightly passed over by the House when it is done. I do not at all desire to deny that occasions may possibly arise when, to prevent great public disaster, the Minister of Finance and the Government may find it their duty to interpose, for the protection of a particular bank or banks; and I will say that if, after sufficient enquiry, and after sufficient cause shown, the Minister should do a thing of that kind, and should afterwards come down to the House and state the case fairly, I would be the last to oppose unnecessarily granting to the Minister or the Government, such indemnity as might be necessary in such a case.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware, Sir, that hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of treating the public funds of which they are the trustees, not as trustees usually treat funds entrusted to them, but for the advance-

ment of their own private ends and purposes. We had an example this afternoon of the sort of way the hon. gentleman regards the charge of great sums of money belonging to the people of Canada. But what I am now discussing is a totally different question. I am discussing what ought to be the course of a Minister in an emergency when it may be proper to interpose the public credit for the prevention of public disaster. First of all, I say that is a case of rare occurrence. I say that no Minister should interpose the public credit unless on very grave grounds. In so doing, he undertakes about as grave a responsibility as any Minister ever can assume; and I am sorry to say, apparently, from the demeanor of the First Minister, that neither he nor his colleague properly appreciated their responsibility in this matter. As a rule, it is far better for a Minister to let a bank like this alone. As a rule, if banks make mistakes, there is no reason why the Government should interfere to save them and their shareholders from the consequences of their mistakes. Like private individuals, they must bear the penalty of their misdoings—and in time past, that was the practice of the Government of Canada, as no one knows better than the hon. gentleman who sits opposite me. I say that the Minister of Finance should interfere only in cases of very great gravity. I say, too, that if this was a case of very great gravity, he ought to have consulted his colleagues, and have obtained the sanction of an Order in Council.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did he consult his colleagues?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I consulted my colleagues.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did he obtain the sanction of an Order in Council?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think he did; I do not see evidence of it in these papers; but I think that in a case involving the credit of the Dominion of Canada, he might have obtained the sanction of an Order in Council, which is necessary for the appointment of the most petty official in the Civil Service. However, I am glad to hear—as from these documents I thought he had acted upon his own account alone—that he took even the moderate amount of caution which he says he did. But, Sir, my point is this—I say there was no sort of reason why the credit of the Canada should have been pledged in the case of the Exchange Bank. This was not a great bank, having very extensive transactions. It was a bank with a total capital of \$500,000. We have, I suppose, at present some forty or fifty banks scattered throughout this Dominion. Is the hon. gentleman going to establish the precedent that whenever a bank gets into trouble, through mismanagement, as in this case, the Minister of Finance is to rush to the rescue, and interpose the credit of the Dominion in order to save the bank from the consequences of its own misdoings? We must remember, that on the face of it, at the time this advance was asked for, that bank was within an ace of closing its doors. No man who knows anything of banking affairs can look over that statement without seeing that the bank was *in extremis*, and if the hon. Minister chose to interfere in such a case, it was his bounden duty to have taken extraordinary precautions to avoid loss resulting therefrom to the public. I do not believe that the Minister of Finance fully understood the effect of his action. It is a grave thing for a Government to interfere; it is a grave thing for a Government to deposit a very large sum of money, and this is a very large sum of money relatively to the capital of the Exchange Bank, because I see that, at the time, the Minister had about \$350,000 of public

money, not to speak of deposits, held as security for contracts, deposited in this bank, whose total capital was only \$500,000. Did the hon. Minister consider this? Did he consider that when he, the Minister of Finance, the man who has special opportunities of knowledge, who is supposed to be thoroughly conversant with all these affairs, more than any other member of Parliament, came forward and deposited the large sum of money—a deposit which was at once blazoned abroad—did he reflect that he was thereby—innocently perhaps, but still that he was—contributing to deceive all the other creditors of that bank? Did he consider that? I am afraid that did not occur to the hon. gentleman. I would be most unwilling to suppose that the hon. gentleman had contemplated the results of his action. Now, all the time, as this very correspondence shows, large sums of money were being paid into that bank on deposit, and the result of the hon. Minister's action was this, in all human probability, that a large number of persons put in money after the 12th of April, who never would have put their money in jeopardy but for the example of the hon. the Minister of Finance. Now it is quite possible that some, well advised, withdrew their money after that deposit. Such instances have been mentioned to me. As I say, I am not at all disposed to charge the hon. Minister with intentionally misleading the public, but I point out to him and the House, that the inevitable effect of his action was to deceive the public. The public thought, on seeing this deposit of \$300,000 made, that the hon. Minister had surely satisfied himself that everything was correct in the case of the Exchange Bank. They could not avoid drawing that conclusion. Why, the hon. Minister's eyes ought to have been opened, I think, by the language that was used by Mr. Craig himself on this very subject. I notice that on the 21st of April Mr. Craig writes to the Deputy Minister as follows:—

"I find that I shall require another sum of \$100,000 to place me in an independent position. I have paid \$365,000 on deposits since the first of the month and have notices of withdrawal of \$60,000 more. Most of the money withdrawn has gone into the Bank of Montreal, at least two-thirds of it. The drain on ordinary deposits has stopped,"—

Remember this was the 21st of April—

"but I must meet the deposits of which I have received notice, therefore I will have to trespass on your kindness once more. The knowledge that the Government were assisting me has had a wonderful effect in quieting matters."

Naturally, no man can wonder that the knowledge that the Government of Canada had chosen the Exchange Bank to deposit \$300,000 had a wonderful effect on the minds of the depositors. But what has been the result? So far as it is possible to see now, the result of that unhappy action on the part of the hon. the Finance Minister on the 12th of April was this, that he enabled the bank to stay open until about the end of October; that in the interval very large sums of money were squandered by the officials of that bank, and those people who obtained deposit receipts after the 12th of April might most justly say to the hon. the Finance Minister and the Government, that they were deceived by their action. More than this, there is the strongest proof possible, in looking at the securities of that unlucky bank, that had that bank been wound up on or about the 12th of April, many hundreds of thousands of dollars would have been saved to the depositors which have been since lost by the shrinkage in stocks and securities which they held, apart from the misconduct of the officials. That was a misfortune. I am sure the hon. Minister will agree with me in deploring that that should have occurred, but those are precisely misfortunes which constantly happen when rotten banks are enabled, by adventitious assistance of this kind to keep open their doors after they ought to be suspended. Nor does it mend the matter very much when we recollect that several of those who are most intimately connected with the affairs of this

bank were prominent supporters, two or three of whom I believe had seats in this or the other Chamber. So far the case is very bad, but it remained with the hon. the Minister of Finance, with marvellous ingenuity, to contrive to make the case considerably worse, and this was the way he selected to do it. After the \$200,000 had been paid into the bank another demand was made. Now it is quite clear that by that time there must have dawned on the mind of the hon. Minister the conviction that he had been rash and reckless in making this advance to the Exchange Bank. We have proof of that here in the fact that he refused to advance another farthing without taking personal security—a letter of guarantee from the hon. A. W. Ogilvie, Senator of this Dominion. Now, let me pause for one moment to ask the hon. Minister what he considers his plain duty as a public man was when, on or about the 11th of May, he came to the conclusion, as he evidently did, that the \$200,000 of public funds he then had put in the bank were imperilled and that the security of the bank was not good enough. His duty was to do his best to save for the public the \$200,000. Instead of that, he advanced another \$100,000, and to make himself safe he takes a personal guarantee from a member of the other Chamber. I say that was a most improper transaction. I say that if there be any man in the whole connection who deserves pity, it is Senator Ogilvie. I believe that he is a very heavy sufferer by this unfortunate bank. I believe he is a large stock holder and that the double liability is not likely to be enough to pay off the depositors, and in that way he will be a very heavy sufferer. He will also, if the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice prevails, be a still heavier sufferer on account of this bond, this letter of guarantee. Does the hon. Minister of Finance think that is a proper position for a member of the Senate to occupy towards the Government, that he should be the guaranty of an advance of \$100,000 from the Government of Canada to a bank? I do not know how far Mr. Ogilvie has imperilled his seat by his action. I do not know whether he is liable for legal proceedings in having become the guaranty or the surety of the Government. That is a matter for the legal gentlemen of the House to settle. But I say there is no use having an independence of Parliament Act on the Statute Book if such transactions as this are to be allowed to take place between the Government and their supporters. I say that the Minister has set a most mischievous precedent and that it is in the highest degree in the interest of the House and the interest of good Government that that principle should be reversed by the action of this House and by the tone of public opinion which, I have no doubt, whatever will condemn even more severely than I have denounced it—the placing of a member of Parliament and a member of the Senate in the position of guaranteeing that advance to the Government. I do not want to insist on the legal difficulties which may arise. That is an accident of the transaction; but, whether Mr. Ogilvie prove responsible or not, I say that the whole relation is utterly improper as between a member of the Senate and the Government of this country. Now, Sir, there is another consideration, not of so much importance, perhaps, as the considerations I have alluded to, but yet of some importance. Here we have about \$237,000 of the public money locked up in the Exchange Bank. When are we going to get that back? The hon. gentleman, I fear, does not know. I do not think the liquidators know. We have not, that I am aware, any special lien on the assets of that bank. On the contrary, the circulation, by an Act of the hon. gentleman, is a first mortgage before all claims. That, I believe, is the position. Now, Sir, at this present moment, I believe, the deposit receipts of that bank, that is to say securities of exactly this class, are selling at 65 cents or 60 cents on the dollar on the streets in Montreal. That may be taken as a fair criterion of what is the general value of our deposit; and, if that be the case, we have to pay for

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

our folly in this transaction—besides utterly failing to save the bank, besides hurting these unfortunate depositors as I have shown—a fine of not far short of \$100,000. Does the hon. gentleman tell us that he believes that the bank is going to pay in full, or that he thinks that, in that case, their deposit receipts would be saleable on the street in Montreal at some 65 cents in the dollar? That, of course, we know, will await the pleasure of the lawyers who have got the matter in charge. Years may elapse before the actual results are ascertained. Some of us can recollect what was the fate of other Government deposits in other banks that suspended long ago, and I do not think that I am much out of the way in saying that the hon. gentleman will be very fortunate indeed if he escapes with a loss of only \$100,000 on this transaction. Now, Sir, this is a plain question. This is a matter that any business man can understand and express an opinion upon. I do not think that the members of the Government—gentlemen who have anything to do with banks, gentlemen who have anything to do with large business transactions—I do not think that any of them, after looking at these papers, after hearing what the position of the bank was when this advance was made, will say that due or proper precaution was taken to prevent a serious loss arising to the public. I do not think that, on the question of policy, many will be found to rise and say that it was a wise thing for the hon. Minister to step in in such a case, and to pledge the public credit for the purpose of sustaining a small bank like the Exchange Bank under those circumstances. But, Sir, I point out that, if the hon. Minister is to be allowed to deal with the public money in this fashion; if this is to go unchallenged; if it is to be understood that a Minister of Finance is at liberty, when a bank is in trouble—when prominent supporters come to him, when they plead that they or their friends will be ruined if he does not assist them—if we are to understand that the hon. Minister of Finance considers it part of his duty to come to the relief of banks which get into trouble, he will add a very grave responsibility to the already grave enough responsibilities which attach to his office. I repeat, the hon. Minister of Finance, in dealing with public moneys, is simply a trustee of those public moneys. He has no right to deal with them as if they were his own, or rather to deal with them as he would never dream of dealing with his own; for I have far too great an idea of his acuteness to imagine that he would have put any of his own into the Exchange Bank under the circumstances. He is simply and solely a trustee of the public funds. He has no right to do with those public funds, to assist this or that friend, or this or that political supporter, anything which a trustee could not lawfully and rightfully do in dealing with trust funds put into his hands. What would the courts say to a private man who, having trust funds in his hands, had deposited them in the Exchange Bank with the full knowledge of the facts which the hon. gentleman possessed, which the *Gazette* returns alone disclosed? It may be creditable to the hon. gentleman's good nature, it may be creditable to his kindness of heart. I know well enough that it is a difficult thing, when friends and supporters come to a man, when they press him and appeal to his generosity, I know it is hard to refuse; but that is part of the duties of his office. A Minister of Finance must learn how to refuse to allow public funds to be endangered, and it is a very great misfortune that the hon. gentleman, on this occasion, was not sufficiently determined in so doing. Now, Sir, it seems to me that there is only one atonement possible for the hon. gentleman. I do not think, in such a case, that he is going to better himself by throwing the responsibility elsewhere. That is a responsibility which most properly and necessarily belongs to the hon. Minister himself. It is one of the highest exercises of his ministerial responsibility. I think that when, as these papers show, he chose to risk the public money in dealing with a bank which he knew to be

in unsound condition, the least he could have done would have been to come forward, state the case frankly and honestly, and ask the House for a Bill of Indemnity for the error he had committed; and, if he had done that, Sir, I do not think that the House, particularly the hon. gentleman's supporters, would have dealt very hardly with him, or been difficult to persuade to grant it to him. Now, I hope—against hope, perhaps, but I hope—that the hon. gentleman is going to do that. I hope, as I say, he is going to make what atonement he can; that he is going to promise amendment; that he is going to submit to reasonable admonition in the matter; that he will pledge himself never to do it again. I hope so. In the hope that that may be the case, I have worded this motion in the mildest possible shape that the well-known facts will admit. I advise him to take example by the hon. gentleman who sits beside him, who told us this very afternoon that it was best to encourage men to sin no more. True, I did not quite agree with the hon. gentleman in thinking that we were to carry our ideas, in the way of encouraging men to sin no more, to the extent of looking upon it as a qualification for public office that a man who was selected for an important office in the most important section of the Dominion—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hal conspired to rob the country of \$260,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I am out of order, I apologize, and that may be considered unsaid; but I entirely agree with him that this is eminently a case in which he may apply to the colleague beside him the advice he was going to apply to a subordinate—the advice to sin no more.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think this House will have concluded, when they heard the closing remarks of the hon. member, feeling that it was necessary to abandon the question that he had brought before the House to refer to what took place before we adjourned, that his case was not a very strong one. Mr. Speaker, it has been said by the Opposition press and by gentlemen in the Opposition—we have heard it before Parliament met and since Parliament met—that this was to be a stormy Session and a long Session. Well, we had one vote of want of confidence yesterday. We had the foundation laid for another vote of want of confidence this afternoon, and an intimation that a third was to follow shortly after; and now, Sir, we have a motion of want of confidence in the Government at present, and especially in the Finance Minister. I think, Sir, I will be pardoned by the House if I take a somewhat different course in replying to the hon. gentleman from what I would have taken under other circumstances. I had sent to me to-day a cablegram from London—not from the High Commissioner's representative there, not from Sir Alexander Galt—but from a gentleman occupying a high financial and important position, referring to a telegraphic despatch that was sent by Reuter and published in London to-day, that I was to be impeached to-day in Parliament, and wanting to know what answer I had to give, what explanation I could make. And this party says:

"These telegraphic despatches, coming through these sources, and from the United States, are always unfavourable to Canada. Some steps should be taken to prevent this unfair representation of the affairs of Canada on this side."

Well, I could not understand it; but when I left the House I was told that a telegraphic message had been sent here after the papers were laid on the Table, and after I had made my remarks here—reflecting upon me personally. The whole line that has been taken

by the hon. member is of a somewhat personal character. He says he is very glad to hear that I did consult my colleagues; but when the hon. member got a little excited, when he got angry, he said just what the press in New York has been saying, and what the telegraph in England has been saying—

Mr. BOWELL. And just what he would do himself.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY—that advances for private ends and purposes were made. Now, Sir, under these circumstances, I feel called upon to narrate what took place with reference to this matter, and the reasons that influenced the Government in taking the course they did. I think on the 10th or 11th of April, Mr. Greene called at my house. I was ill, and was detained in the house for two or three days. He came to me early one morning and stated to me the object of his mission. He stated that owing to one or two circumstances that had taken place in Montreal, there was some distrust on the part of the depositors and note holders with reference to the condition of the bank; that it was expected there would be a run made upon the bank that day and probably the next day, and he came up here to see if some arrangement could not be made with the Government by which their position would be strengthened, and by which the run would be prevented. He also stated that the run might reach half a dozen other institutions of the same kind in the city of Montreal and in the Dominion of Canada, by which the public interests would be imperilled—by which the trade, commerce and business of the country would be imperilled. And I suppose, Sir, judging from the anxiety of the hon. member and others on the opposite side, that they would like to have seen that state of things, and would like us to have refused any application that would prevent such a calamity under such circumstances as these. Sir, I said to Mr. Greene: "I am confined to my bed; I cannot deal with this matter to-day; you must leave it a day or two; I hope to be out in a couple of days, and I will then bring this matter under the consideration of the Government." He then went on to explain the position the bank was in, its perfect solvency, and the returns the hon. member has referred to. I said: "Well, I cannot, without communicating with my colleagues, do anything." He said: "But to-morrow the difficulty might have occurred, the crisis might have arisen, and a delay of twenty-four hours may be most disastrous." I said: "Under these circumstances, I will send for the Deputy Minister of Finance and consult with him about it." I did send for the Deputy Minister of Finance; and I do not desire to avoid,—nor did I in the remarks I made—any responsibility, or shield myself in any way from any responsibility. I repeat here that my motive in sending for him was to obtain information as to the security, he having had more direct communication of these matters than any body else; and I wished to get his views with reference to the safety of the step which the Government was asked to take. I sent at once for the Deputy Minister and conferred with him upon the subject. I asked him, is this a proper policy? Is it quite safe? at least, is there any doubt about this money being repaid? In conversation with him I recalled the circumstance that two years previous the President of the Bank of Ontario, and the President of the Consolidated Bank, came to the Government and stated their position. It was then in the month of February or March. They spoke of the difficulties they were in, and said they would be relieved the moment navigation opened. This was the representation they made to me. They said that if we could give them assistance for three or four months, until navigation opened, they would be able to tide over their difficulties. That representation was made to the Government, and the Government gave the advance. The Bank of Ontario did go through, and paid back the advance with interest at 5 per cent.

The other bank also later on paid back every dollar and the 5 per cent. they agreed to pay us. Yes, and talk about our political friends! These were gentlemen that had no claim upon us as political friends. Sir William Howland was the gentleman who came here representing the Bank of Ontario. We did not look at it from a political standpoint; we looked at it in the light of the interests of the country, and we gave that assistance. In making my statement in regard to the Exchange Bank, I threw no responsibility on the Deputy Minister of Finance; I shirked no responsibility on my own part, nor on the part of the Government, in the matter. But I said, and say still, that I sent for the gentleman who had the means of knowing far better even than I did, the condition of these banks; who had been in confidential communication with them two or three days previously; who possessed the most reliable sources of information—I consulted him, and what did he say? He said that he thought there was no danger, whatever, in our making this advance. I then said: "I cannot leave my room. You go with Mr. Greene to the leader of the Government and communicate to him your views with reference to this matter, and he will confer with his colleagues and be able to decide as to what it is best to do. And you may say to the leader of the Government, and to my colleagues, that if they think that it is in the interests of the banks of the country, in the public interest, and in the interest of the commerce and trade of the country, that this assistance should be given, they have my support with reference to it." The Deputy Minister did go to the leader of the Government. I have not communicated with him since, but I have no doubt that he stated to him, as he stated to me, his perfect confidence in the safety of the bank; because he had said to me: "There is \$500,000 of capital; there is \$300,000 of a reserve"—though I see by the returns it was \$400,000 at that time. "Then you have the double security of the stockholders;" and he considered, and I considered, that there was no risk. That money was advanced. It was understood that \$200,000 would be the maximum that would be given. The hon. member says we ought to know that that bank was in difficulty; that as a member of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, I ought to have known it. We did know that they came to that Committee, and asked that their capital stock should be reduced. In order to assure ourselves of the position of the bank, we appointed a sub-committee of four or five leading men. Mr. McLelan, Mr. Weldon, Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Desjardins, I think, were on that sub-committee, together with the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Commerce. They were instructed by the general committee to send for persons, papers and documents in connection with that institution, and ascertain whether the reduced rate at which the stock was placed was one which was perfectly safe; and that sub-committee reported—and the hon. gentleman opposite was a member of that committee—and its report was adopted by that committee on the report of the sub-committee, which had made a most searching and thorough investigation. We had reason to suppose, such being the case, that with \$500,000 of capital and \$400,000 of rest, it would be perfectly safe to make that advance of \$200,000, which the Government agreed to give at that time as a maximum. \$100,000 were paid with the understanding that the bank should not come back if that amount would carry them through. But sooner than the object for which those \$100,000 were advanced should fall through, the Government would extend the amount to \$200,000. A few days afterwards they came and said the bank was still in a tight place, though the pressure had been checked, and they obtained another \$100,000. The effect of that advance was, no doubt, to quiet public anxiety; at all events, they met all demands made on circulation and deposits, and things went on. The pressure afterwards increased. Then the bank applied to

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

the Government, asking for another \$100,000. Its representative came to myself personally—Senator Ogilvie, who was a director of the bank—and Mr. Buntin, I think, came with him. They said they knew all about the bank, because they were directors—I am sorry to say they did not know all about it, and I mention this as evidencing that they thought they knew all about it—and they were prepared to give their personal security for \$100,000 over and above the security we had under the position—we would occupy as having a claim on all assets under the double liability, which amount they said would carry the bank successfully through. Those gentlemen spoke in the most confident terms respecting the bank, and offered, as I have said, to give their personal security for \$100,000. When Mr. Greene came to me, I said this was a matter for which I cannot assume responsibility. I said that this was outside the ordinary transactions of the Finance Department. Our money comes into the different banks in a variety of ways, reaching in the shape of revenue either from Customs, Excise, Post Office or other sources, the banks doing our business in different parts of the Dominion; or, as has been the case in the last year or two, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company paid in \$3,200,000, for which we agreed to give 4 per cent. interest, and it became our duty to see that we did not lose anything, then we sought deposits in the banks and obtained 4 per cent. to cover the interest we were paying on the money of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and in that way a considerable amount of money was on deposit in the banks. When this advance was made to the Exchange Bank, it was felt, on the part of the Government, that it would sustain the institution and carry it through, prevent a crisis and relieve the pressure on other banks in the Dominion; for we all know how sensitive public opinion is respecting the stoppage of a bank. The hon. gentleman says a bank may suspend for a time. It may; but will he say that a bank may not be placed in a sound position afterwards? Another bank which suspended and had its capital reduced, stands to-day in the position that its stock is quoted at 100 per cent., though unfortunately that institution was some time ago in difficulty. Under those circumstances, the advance referred to was made, and it was supposed that it would carry the bank through, and that the Government would be perfectly safe. I do not entertain the opinion that the Government is not safe now. It is true the money may be locked up for some time, though we might desire to use it three or four months hence. When I left for England we had \$300,000 deposit in the shape of Canadian Pacific land grant bonds which we had to pay out as they were earned. We had to pay, owing to the rapid progress made with the work, large sums, and accordingly we had to draw on our deposits. I telegraphed to the deputy that: "The moment you reduce the deposits, not paying interest, down to a safe sum, call on the banks having money at interest." The House is aware that we cannot take it all out with safety, as we are always open to a call for \$500,000 or \$1,000,000 of gold. In statements made in New York and elsewhere, it is asserted that when a difficulty occurs, when it was found that the Government were being censured for having money there, I called on this bank to pay up when it was too late, and in order to accommodate my political friends, I gave them the opportunity of paying the amount by \$5,000 and \$10,000 at a time. This was done when I was in England, and it was done by the deputy, who took a lenient view of the case, and accepted \$5,000 and \$10,000 payments instead of demanding \$50,000. And yet I am charged, though I was in England at the time, with having used my political influence to let the bank off, and thus sacrificing the public interest. Sir, this is a matter to be regretted. Knowing all that has transpired, the circumstances in which the bank is placed are to be regretted. We

made the effort to save the bank and to prevent the difficulty that occurred. I will tell the House what was one of the results of the Government's action. The trouble arose in April and May, before the opening of navigation, and by postponing the crisis until later in the season—August, September and October—the difficulty was less than it would have been otherwise, because the other banks were stronger and in a better position than they would have been earlier in the year, when their liabilities were maturing and their creditors were not in a position, before the opening of navigation, to sell Exchange. The very fact of postponing the crisis a few months made the difficulty less than it would have been if the crisis had occurred in April. I never attempt to take responsibility, except in concert with my deputy, of placing money at interest and adopting a course to make the country safe. If we are paying interest to Savings Bank depositors, we endeavour to be recouped the 4 per cent. by making arrangements with the banks—to a large extent with banks possessing a large capital—because if we require the money they can repay it with less difficulty than small banks that have their funds loaned out to customers, and which would have to recall those amounts to make repayment. For the sake of safety, and other reasons, we seek banks with large capital, and endeavour to obtain interest on the deposits. There have only been three cases in ten or eleven years, and in those cases the Government felt they were perfectly safe, and in two cases they obtained one per cent. additional. But the money was not deposited for that reason, and when Sir William Howland, representing the Consolidated Bank, came to us, we thought, though we were obtaining 4 per cent., we should ask something more, and we asked 5 per cent. We obtained in the other two cases the principal and interest, though one was delayed somewhat, and in the other case I am not without expectation that every dollar, with interest, will be repaid to us from the securities we have, and the position we occupy with respect to the loan. I admit, with the hon. member, that it is not desirable to do it in every case, and I do not hesitate to say that, in cases, the Government hesitated considerably and reflected a good deal as to whether, in the interests of the whole Dominion, and of the commerce and trade of the country, as well as of the banks of the country, they should take the step which they finally decided to take. Before many days we will have an opportunity of discussing the effect of the failure of that bank on the stocks of other banks throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, but I say that when you touch one of these banks we know how sensitive all the other banks are in matters of this kind. I think, however, that the House and the country will sustain the Government when, under such extreme circumstances, and for the purpose of preventing a run on the bank we took this step; because we all know, by looking at the returns, that if, to-day, two-thirds of the banks in the Dominion were suddenly called upon to redeem their circulation, where those banks would be, and where the business of the country would be. Under these circumstances, we felt that we were perfectly justified—feeling, at the same time, that we were safe in doing so—in endeavouring to save the country from the consequences which would follow from the breaking down, it might be, of two, or three, or four, or five of the banks. I feel the matter the more keenly because it has come more as a direct attack on myself. That, however, I can bear, but I know there is behind it an attack upon the Government. Though the hon. gentleman and myself are represented in *Grip* as rushing so lovingly into each other's arms upon his return to Parliament—I say, notwithstanding these cordial relations which exist between us, I do not think the hon. gentleman would strike me if he did not think he was striking the Government and those who are behind us. Under these circumstances and after this

explanation, I feel confident that the House will consider that these resolutions should be voted down, and that the Government—whatever may have been the misfortunes of the bank—feeling that they were perfectly safe, as I believe now they are, were perfectly justified in dealing with the funds at their disposal in the best interests of the country and in the best interests of its banking and commerce.

Resolution negatived on the following division:—

## YEAS:

## Messieurs

Allen,	De St. Georges,	McMullen,
Allison (Lennox),	Fairbank,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Fleming,	Platt,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Ray,
Béchar, d,	Geoffrion,	Rinfret,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Blake,	Gunn,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee (Sanbury),	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Thompson,
Cartwright,	Kirk,	Trow,
Casey,	Laurier,	Vail,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Watson,
Catudal,	Livingstone,	Wells,
Charlton,	Mackenzie,	Wheler,
Cockburn,	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Davies,	McIsaac,	Yeo.—60.

## NAYS:

## Messieurs

Abbott,	Farrow,	McLellan,
Allison (Hants),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McNeil,
Amyot,	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Bain (Soulange),	Fortin,	Moffat,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Foster,	Paint,
Baker (Victoria),	Gagne,	Pinsonneault,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Pope,
Beaty,	Girouard,	Reid,
Bell,	Gordon,	Robertson (Hastings),
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Rykert,
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Shakespeare,
Bergin,	Hackett,	Small,
Blondeau,	Hay,	Sproule,
Bossé,	Hesson,	Stairs,
Bourbeau,	Homer,	Tassé,
Bowell,	Houde,	Taylor,
Bryson,	Jamieson,	Tilley,
Cameron (Inverness),	Kaulbach,	Tupper (Pictou),
Campbell (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Carling,	Kranz,	Valin,
Caron,	Labrosse,	Vanasse,
Cochrane,	Landry (Kent),	Wallace (Albert),
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Coursol,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	Lesage,	White (Hastings),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Renfrew),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wigle,
Dawson,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Williams,
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dugas,	McDougald,	Woodworth,
Dundas,	McGreevy,	Wright.—97.
Dupont,		

## WORKS IN EACH OF THE PROVINCES OF THE CONFEDERATION.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny)—(Translation)—in moving for a statement setting forth, in separate columns:—1. The amount of money expended in each of the Provinces since Confederation, or their entry into Confederation, up to the 30th June, 1883, on works of a strictly general character, distinguishing the sums chargeable to capital from those chargeable to income; 2. The amount of money expended in each of the Provinces since Confederation, or their entry into Confederation, up to the 30th June, 1883, for works of strictly local character, distinguishing the sums chargeable to capital from those chargeable to income; the statement to show for each of the Provinces in the Confederation, separately, the exact amount expended in each of them,

said: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make a speech in support of the motion I have just made, but the explanations just given by the Government, in answer to the hon. member for Laval, have encouraged me so much that I think it my duty, in the present instance, to call the attention of the Government on the motion I am now making. I have not been able to procure all desirable details, but by referring to the documents of last Session, vol. 17, page 143, I find the following figures indicating the amounts expended since Confederation, in public works, chargeable both to capital and to revenue: For the Province of Ontario, \$39,019,673.46; in the Province of Quebec there has been expended \$27,356,324.37; in Nova Scotia, \$16,669,231.56; in New Brunswick, \$23,768,019.61; in Prince Edward Island, whose entry into Confederation took place on the 1st of July, 1873, there has been expended since that date \$2,301,561.51; in Manitoba, which entered Confederation on the 15th of July, 1870, there was expended since that date the sum of \$6,802,038.18; in the North-West, which entered at the same date, \$2,984,828.03; and in British Columbia, which came to us on the 20th of July, 1871, there has been expended \$5,454,207.09. Thus we have a total of \$124,656,743.32. If we divide this amount by the population of the Dominion, which amounts to 4,324,810 souls, we find that there has been expended on an average a sum of \$28.52 per head. Now, if we examine in detail the amounts expended in each of the Provinces, we find that they average the following sums per head: In Ontario, \$20.30; in Quebec, \$20.12; in Nova Scotia, \$37.83; in New Brunswick, \$77.41; in Prince Edward Island, \$21.13; in Manitoba, \$103.12; in the North-West, \$52.78; and in British Columbia, \$110.23. Among these works are comprised the construction of the Pacific, of the Intercolonial, the improvement of our canals, and all public undertakings of a general interest to the country. From this standpoint, the Province of Quebec would still be entitled to an additional sum of \$12,823,534.90, which should be expended within its limits. We do not intend to ask this amount to-night, but we hope that demands will be made to the effect that the Province of Quebec may have in the distribution of public patronage the fair share to which it is entitled and which rightly belongs to her. Now, if we consider those expenses from a mere local point of view, if we deduct from those expenses what has been expended until this day for the Pacific Railway, if we deduct the cost of the Intercolonial and of the improvement of our canals, we have as a result the following figures: There has been expended since Confederation in the Province of Ontario for works of a strictly local nature a sum of \$6,289,035.94, which, in proportion to the population, makes a sum of \$3.27 per head; in Quebec, for the same object, there was expended \$1,871,094.83, or an amount of \$1.37 per head; in Nova Scotia, \$774,823.82, or \$1.75 per head; in New Brunswick, \$757,461.81, or \$2.35 per head; in Prince Edward Island, \$139,304.03, or \$1.27 per head; in Manitoba, \$256,593.89, or \$3.89 per head; in the North-West, \$141,799.97, or \$2.51 per head; in British Columbia, \$226,928.19, or \$4.58 per head. By adding together these various amounts, we arrive at a total sum of \$10,497,625.64, and if we divide this amount by the population of the Dominion, we have \$2.42 per head. Now, the Province of Quebec has only received \$1.37 per head, or in other words, for works of a purely local nature we are entitled to an additional sum of \$1,426,978.35, or to a sum of \$1.05 per head. This, Mr. Speaker, comprises all the expenditure made since Confederation, up to the 30th of June, 1882. My motion asks for a statement of that expenditure up to the 30th of June, 1883, and it is to obtain this statement that I put the motion into your hands. I hope that the papers will establish the justice of the claims of our Province and that the Government will remember it in proper time.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may state to the House, that the return asked for by the hon. gentleman will be brought down as soon as possible, but it is one which must be prepared with great care. I suppose each member will have to see in each case, whether the work is of a local or of a general character. As I said before, the return will be carefully prepared and brought down as speedily as possible.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 8th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### PRESENTATION OF PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. BEATY, in moving that the time for presenting Private Bills be extended to Friday, 15th February, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, said: I may mention that the time for presenting petitions expires to-day; but, from a misapprehension, the Banking and Commerce Committee recommended that the time for presenting Bills be extended only till to-morrow, and we now recommend that it be extended till Friday next. The time for presenting petitions expires to-day, and will not be further extended.

Mr. BLAKE. This is also to be the last extension, I suppose?

Mr. BEATY. That is the end of it.

Motion agreed to.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 61) to amend the Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the River St. Clair Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Macmaster.)

Bill (No. 63) to consolidate certain railways therein mentioned under the name of the Eastern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macmaster.)

Bill (No. 64) to amend the acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 65) to reduce the capital stock of the Maritime Bank of the Dominion of Canada, and to make other provisions respecting the said bank.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

Bill (No. 67) further to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Gunn.)

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Quebec Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Bosé.)

Bill (No. 70) to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. Allen.)

Bill (No. 71) to provide for the distribution of assets of insolvent debtors.—(Mr. Curran.)

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

The Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Charles Tupper, "That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions (page 84) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway," being read,

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, in continuing the debate upon the important Resolutions before the House, I shall endeavour to avoid, as much as possible, touching upon those points which were so ably and exhaustively treated by the hon. Minister of Railways in his speech of Tuesday last. But if, Sir, for the sake of the continuity of my argument, I should have to touch briefly upon some points to which he alluded, I trust I shall have the forbearance of the House. It will be my endeavour to lay before the House some additional reasons why the Resolutions should be adopted; and, at the same time, I shall refer to some portions of the speech of the hon. member who last addressed the House upon this important subject. Sir, the statesmen who promoted the great scheme of Confederation had in view a much more important object than the union of the four Provinces originally confederated. They had in view, Sir, the foundation here on the northern half of this continent, of a great power, of a great people, a power and a people that at some future day might be in a position to take rank among the great powers of the earth. Confederation itself, the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, the acquisition of the North-West Territories from the Hudson Bay Company, the encouragement of immigration, the improvement of our canals and water ways, the adoption of a national trade policy and the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway, are all steps in the same direction, and mile stones, as it were, marking the progress we have made towards the acme of our ambition. It was early seen and recognized that the resources of the four original Provinces, and the area of those Provinces, were not sufficient to justify our hope of being able to accomplish the great object of our ambition. It was early recognized that it was necessary that we should have additional territory and additional resources. Looking to the history of the unexampled success of the United States to the south of us, our statesmen could not fail to recognize the great element of prosperity which their great West had been to the nation at large, as affording a field for the development of great agricultural resources, and offering a market for the manufactures of New England. And, Sir, hardly had Confederation been consummated when our statesmen, who had charge of affairs, took up the question of acquiring a great West for Canada. Though I was not a public man at that time, I remember very well that a large number of public men did oppose, and most strenuously oppose, the acquisition of the Hudson Bay Territory; but, Sir, I venture to say that you could not find, to-day, a single man of those who opposed that measure at that time, who would be willing to stand up in this House, or in any public assembly in Canada, and acknowledge that he had opposed the purchase of the Hudson Bay Territory. Well, Sir, after acquiring the great North-West, it was soon seen that it would be comparatively useless to Canada until it was peopled; and it was at the same time discovered that it could not be peopled without it were opened up by the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. In fact, Sir, I may say that it was part of the scheme adopted at the conference at Quebec, the acquisition of the Hudson Bay Territory and the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. And, Sir, both parties from the first have been thoroughly and firmly committed to the construction of this railway; and not only to its construction, but they have been committed to the construction of it by the same

method and in the same mode. Both parties have declared it to be their preference that the railway should be constructed by a company, subsidized by Parliament; and both have declared, both by word and act, that in default of a company strong enough to construct the railway, the Government should continue the work to completion as a Government work. The Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1878, entered into an arrangement with Sir Hugh Allan, and his associates, for the construction of this railway. Sir Hugh made an effort to raise the necessary capital; but, as every one knows, he failed. He was met by much the same opposition which has turned up against the present Company, and he had also to contend with this: that the country was then a comparatively unknown wilderness. Soon after his failure the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald resigned, and the Government of Mr. Mackenzie was formed, and continued in power for a period of five years. Mr. Mackenzie's Government at once set to work to find a company that would undertake the construction of this railway. He asked the public for tenders for its construction. He offered a large amount in land and money, and asked how much additional assistance in the way of guaranteed bonds any one would require to undertake its construction. But not receiving any offer, he continued the work, during the whole term he held the reins of power, as a Government work. On a change of Government taking place in 1878, and the return to power of Sir John A. Macdonald, our present leader, his Government at once set to work to find a company that would undertake the construction of this railway; and in the Session of 1880-81 Parliament approved of a contract which had been made between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government for the construction of this railway. The leading features of that contract were, that the Government were to complete and hand over to the Company, as part of their subsidy, 432 miles of completed road between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg, 213 miles between Kamloops and Port Moody, and 65 miles of the Pembina branch, which was then completed, and in addition a cash subsidy of \$25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land. The Company was to complete, equip and operate the line from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, 2,555 miles, before the end of 1891. Of that total distance the Company had to build 1,910 miles of a main line. I have made this brief *résumé* of history for the purpose of emphasizing the statement that this railway is an enterprise in which Canada is specially interested, an enterprise that the Dominion of Canada and all parties in Canada are specially pledged to complete. A very obvious criticism upon the speech of the hon. member who last addressed the House (Mr. Blake), arises right here. Sir, he treated this question as if this railway were an ordinary railway; one to which, perhaps, the Government had given some assistance, in which the country was in a measure interested; but he did not speak of it as a railway which is a national necessity, as a railway, the completion of which, and the early completion of which, is a national necessity; nor did he speak of it as if it were a railway to which the country was pledged for its completion. I undertake to say that if strangers, unacquainted with the history of this enterprise, had been in the House the other night, and heard the hon. gentleman's speech, they would have gone away with the impression that this work was not one of any very particular or great interest to Canada. The course which Parliament should take with respect to the Resolutions before the Chair, depends very greatly upon this one consideration which I have been trying to insist upon. If this work is an important work; if the construction and early completion of this railway is a national necessity, then hon. members will be disposed to treat the Resolutions and propositions of the Government in a very different way from

what they would if it were an ordinary railway, a railway in which Canada had some, but no especial interest. I undertake to say, therefore, that these Resolutions commend themselves to our favourable consideration; because, by some way or other, either by assisting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or by doing it as a Government work, Canada is bound to complete this railway. The Company at once set to work in 1881. The first year they constructed 165 miles west of Winnipeg; in the summer of 1882, 420 miles; in the summer of 1883, 377 miles, and 66 miles of siding; making the total of main line in the West, already completed, 962 miles, or, with sidings, 1,028 miles. And this line has been well constructed, constructed not as a cheap colonization railway but as a first-class railway, as high in character as any railway ever estimated upon by any hon. member in this House. I was surprised to learn on investigation that the work west of Winnipeg for 900 miles had been as heavy as 16,320 cubic yards to the mile; this, of course, being caused by the determination of the Company to construct the railway high enough above the level of the prairie to render its operation not affected by the snow. The very greatest care has been taken in the construction of the railway to prevent difficult grades, and, except one short grade at the crossing of the Saskatchewan River, the maximum grade of the line west for 958 miles is only 40 feet to the mile; and the very best of material, including rails, has been used. In the West, also, the following branches have been completed: From Winnipeg to Pembina Mountain, 100 miles; from that line to Gretna, 13 miles; from Winnipeg to Selkirk, 22 miles; and from Emerson to the Pembina Branch, 23 miles, being a total of 158 miles, which with 1,028 miles, including the sidings, gives a total of 1,186 miles of railway constructed west of Winnipeg. At the close of the present season the Canadian Pacific Railway Company constructed and laid track for 101 miles from Port Arthur east on the eastern division, and also from Callander 100 miles; leaving the gap remaining to complete the eastern section only 447 miles, and the western division 290 miles. It is gratifying to know that even during the course of the present winter the work is being vigorously prosecuted; no less than 9,000 men are being actively engaged on the construction of the railway. The rate of progress which has been made justifies the House in the hope that the whole work, if there is no suspension, will be completed by the autumn of 1885. In addition to what I have mentioned on the eastern division, the Algoma branch, 96 miles, has been built, and three steel steamships placed on Lake Superior for the purpose of doing business between Algoma Mills and Port Arthur. Now, Sir, while the Company have been so energetic and active in the prosecution of railway construction, they have not been less active and energetic in their endeavours to induce immigrants to come to the North-West. I find, Sir, on investigating the matter, that an office has been established by the Company in London in charge of Mr. Begg, who reports that during last summer alone he answered no less than 18,000 letters of enquiry about Canada; distributed over 2,000,000 of maps, folders, and pamphlets, printed in twelve different languages; that he has established 5,000 centres for the distribution of immigration literature in Great Britain alone; that he has four travelling agents constantly upon the road, and that the Company is advertising in four hundred different newspapers, and are themselves gratuitously publishing an illustrated newspaper. Another very efficacious step was taken by the Company during last season, and that is they have exhibited the products of the North-West at important public gatherings, notably at Amsterdam, the Royal Agricultural Show at York, the Highland Show at Inverness, the great Liverpool and Manchester fairs, the fairs at Birmingham and Smithfield, the

Mr. Ives.

Fisheries Exhibition at London, at Canterbury, and at a large number of county fairs. All the work which has been done so thoroughly and efficiently in Great Britain, by a London office, is being done on the Continent by a continental office established there. Further, as if to carry the war into Egypt, the Company have kept agents travelling in New England and other portions of the United States, circulating immigration literature for the purpose of inducing immigration from the United States to the Canadian North-West; and I am happy to learn that at the exhibition of North-West products, made at the Boston annual exposition, last fall, much interest was excited, and good results are likely to follow. All this, with the unprecedentedly cheap rate which has been arranged for going into that country, should induce a very large immigration to the North-West. Now, Sir, I propose for a moment to make a comparison between the progress made by the Government on this railway, and the progress made by the Company. The Government commenced work in August, 1874, and, on the 1st of July, 1882, a line had been completed from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, a distance of 435 miles, which, with the Pembina Branch, which had been completed in 1874, a distance of 65 miles, made a total of 500 miles. West of Red River, the Government had completed 60 miles, which the Railway Company afterwards tore up and built on a new location, making altogether completed by the Government in eight years, a total of 560 miles, or 70 miles per year. The Company commenced work in the spring of 1881, and have completed to this date, of main line, 1,155 miles, and of branches, 256 miles, making a total of 1,411 miles, or an average of 470 miles a year. But the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House makes an objection here. He says that the rapid construction of this railway necessarily means increased cost. I do not believe that, under the circumstances of the case, the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway has meant increased cost. It is true that larger wages have been paid to the workmen and the navvies who have been employed on the railway. It is quite possible that the large demand for labour has raised the price per day per man above what it would have been if there had been a smaller demand. But that, Sir, is in keeping with our policy of increasing the price of the labouring man's wages, and on our side of the House we are not accustomed to object to anything which has that effect. But, Sir, there have been large offsets, large savings, by the rapid construction of this railway. It is a well known fact that steel rails have been cheaper during the last three years than they were ever known to be before, or are likely to be again. If the construction of the road had been proceeded with slowly, if the Company had intended to spread the work over the whole period covered by the contract, they would either have had to purchase rails at a cheap rate and hold them and pay interest on the cost, or to purchase them as they required them, in which case they would most likely have had to pay a much larger price. I contend that there has been in the saving upon rails alone, a sufficient sum saved to more than cover all the increased cost which has resulted from the more rapid construction of the railway. But, Sir, there has been a much greater saving than this. There has been the saving of six years of interest during construction; interest which amounts on the capital stock to no less than about \$2,500,000 a year; and I claim, without fear of contradiction, that the saving in interest on construction for the six years, during which the road will be completed before the contract required it to be completed, is a much larger amount than anything which can be made out as the increased cost of construction. But surely, Sir, the House should not complain that the road has been constructed more rapidly

than the contract required—this House should not complain even if there has been some increased cost to the country. The country will certainly settle more rapidly with a completed line than with a partly completed line; and it is perfectly evident that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with a complete line, with an independent communication between Montreal and the West, can give better rates out of and into that country than could be obtained when we had to use the United States system in connection with the Canadian Pacific. Then, Sir, there is another point of advantage in the rapid completion of this enterprise. We have been observing, many of us with alarm and certainly with sorrow, evidence of discontent in the Province of British Columbia, over the fact that the railway was not going to be completed as soon as had been promised in the original convention; and surely it is a matter of congratulation that an earlier connection by six years between the remainder of the Dominion of Canada and British Columbia is obtained. Then, Sir, as was said the other evening by the hon. Minister of Railways, the phenomenal rapidity of the construction of the road is of itself a valuable advertisement, and draws the attention of the world, not only to the railway, but to the country. Another advantage is that we have six years sooner a continuous road, over which our immigrants can go from the east to the west; and though the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House said he felt humiliated when he heard this argument used, I am obliged to use it again to-day. He seemed to think it was speaking but lightly of the attractions of the great west, to say that immigrants coming from England or Scotland could be induced by American agents to stop short of Winnipeg or the North-West. I undertake to say that when a man living in the old country comes into this country, of the geography of which he is ignorant, not understanding in many cases the difference between the United States and Canada, it is possible for him to go to Dakota instead of to Winnipeg. It is saying nothing against the advantages of the North-West to say that our immigration is not safe so long as it is sifted through United States routes. Then, Sir, the last reason I shall mention why this House should rejoice at the early completion of this railway, is that it furnishes an earlier opportunity, by six years, for the commencement of the development of the trans-continental trade between China and Japan, and America and Europe. In six years sooner it gives us an opportunity of beginning to find an outlet for our manufactured goods in the world of demand which exists in Asia. There is no question but that a very large trade, in cotton goods especially, may be done in Japan and China by our merchants and manufacturers when they have equal facilities with the merchants and manufacturers of other countries. Sir, for a moment compare our position with the line completed throughout Canadian territory, with what it would be if we were building this railway slowly during the next six years. We are saving expense in sending immigrants to the North-West; we are saving the danger of losing them; and we are also saving the risk of the trade of the North-West being handed over to United States cities and United States merchants. To my mind, this of itself is a very important consideration. It seems to me that if we compel Winnipeg merchants, and the other merchants in the North-West, to open up accounts in Chicago, St. Paul and New York, it will be more difficult than the hon. gentleman seems to think to dis sever that connection, and afterwards obtain the trade for our own merchants and manufacturers. Sir, I ask, who should find fault with the early completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in fact as well as in name—that is, of a railway north of Lake Superior? I can understand that the Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company and its shareholders, would find fault; I can understand that the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, the Chi-

cago and North-Western and the Grand Trunk, and their shareholders, would not like this arrangement. I can understand that the cities of St. Paul, Chicago and New York, the New England manufacturers, and the people of the United States, would not rejoice; and I can understand that the hon. gentleman himself would not rejoice, provided he is acting in the interests of his clients—the Grand Trunk Railway Company. But, Sir, if he is acting, as we are to presume he is, in the interests of the Dominion of Canada, he is bound to rejoice at the early completion of that road, as are the Parliament and people of Canada, and as are our merchants and manufacturers, at securing a direct connection with the rapidly increasing population of the North-West. The hon. gentleman contended that if the Company had proceeded more slowly with the construction of the railway, they might possibly have completed it from the proceeds of the sale of their lands, without coming to Parliament for this loan. That is quite probable. It is quite probable even now that, by suspending operations for six years, they might accumulate enough money from the sales of their land to complete the railway in two years, and thus fulfil their contract. But do the people and the Parliament of Canada desire to see a suspension of that work for six years? Do we desire to see a check to the progress of the country for so long a period as six years? There is no use in saying that if the Company had not done this, they might have done that. They have not proceeded slowly; they have proceeded rapidly and energetically, and they need assistance; and the question before the House is, shall we render them that assistance? The hon. gentleman also objects that they have been reaching out in different directions, obtaining connections east and west; and that if they had not done so, they would have had sufficient means in all probability to have completed the railway without coming to us for further assistance. I shall treat more fully that objection later on; but I must say here, that surely the people of Ontario ought not to object to a second trunk line through the peninsula of Ontario. The people of Ontario should not object to that which must furnish them with a relief from the monopoly, not in the North-West but in their own Province—a monopoly that has existed for the last thirty years. It seems strange to me that the hon. gentleman should so eloquently champion the cause of the people of the North-West, should so eloquently oppose a monopoly in the North-West, and yet so valiantly defend a monopoly in his own Province of Ontario. But should the House of Commons disapprove of an effort on the part of this Company to obtain additional business for the eastern division of their line? It is a well known fact that if the business of the eastern division of the line can be increased, even from Ottawa to Montreal by the Ontario business, lower rates of freight can be given by the Company to the Manitoba farmers than can be given if a small business is done on the eastern division of the line. It is also evident that, without feeders, reaching out into the older parts of the Dominion, the railway would have but a small chance of obtaining a fair share of the westward business; and therefore what the hon. gentleman blames the Company for, namely, the reaching out into the eastern part of the Dominion, for the purpose of obtaining business for their line both in the east and in the west, is something this House should not disapprove, but should certainly approve. I have now shown, or have tried to show, that the construction and completion of this road is a national necessity, and being a national necessity, the Resolutions before the Chair are to be considered in a very different light from that in which they ought to be considered if this railway were a mere ordinary enterprise. I have also shown, I trust, that the Company on their part have done their share thoroughly and well. They have built a better line than they agreed to build. They have

built it much more rapidly than they undertook to build it, and certainly, in that respect, commend themselves to the favourable consideration of the House. I now propose, with the permission of the House, to adduce an additional reason why we ought to come to their assistance. That additional reason is the character of the opposition from which they have suffered, and against which they have contended. That opposition has been of a variety of kinds. There has been the opposition of the Liberal party in this House, and that opposition—I do not say directly, but indirectly—has been directed to prevent capitalists from buying the stock. I maintain that the opposition which has been directed by hon. gentlemen opposite against this enterprise has directly tended to depreciate the securities of the Company and to prevent capitalists from investing in these securities. That opposition, also, has the tendency to prevent immigration to this country—not that hon. gentlemen opposite intended it should, for I do not believe that, wittingly, they could take so unpatriotic a course—but the course they have taken has had that direct result. How have the members of the Liberal party in this House prevented capitalists from buying stock? They have done so by exaggerating the cost of the construction of the railway; by under-estimating the area of the fertile portion of the country; by magnifying the extent of the mountain portion; by telling us, day after day, that British Columbia is a sea of mountains; by minimizing the volume of emigration; by magnifying the so-called exodus, and by under-estimating the probable receipts from the sale of lands in the North-West. How have they prevented immigration to this country? They have done so by preaching that such high rates are charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway, under the monopoly clause, and that such high rates will be charged by that Company, that it is a matter of indifference to any one going into that country whether he raises a good or a poor crop; they have done so by preaching that the Government land regulations in the North-West are so unjust that it is impossible for immigrants to prosper under them, and that those who go there invariably leave for Dakota and Minnesota; and they have done so by lauding the beauties of Dakota and the delights of Texas. Even the other evening, the hon. gentleman, no doubt unintentionally, used some arguments which must have the effect of bearing the stock of this Company, when he told us, for example, that the land through which the railway actually passes—the prairie—is much less valuable than that through which it would have passed if it had gone further north. Well, I am not going to take up the time of the House with arguing that the land is as good where the railway actually runs as it would have been had it gone further north. I merely mention this to show that the effect of such an assertion will naturally be to lead the capitalists of the world to believe that this railway Company have in their land grant, in the railway belt, an inferior character of land. But it does not seem to me at all probable that, with the whole country before them to choose from, a country not covered by timber, but perfectly open for observation, and which had been fully surveyed, this Company when it had perfect liberty to go anywhere, would have located their line so that their land grant would be useless. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his argument the other evening, said that the competition between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as the lessees of the Ontario and Quebec Railway, and the Credit Valley Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, would be so keen that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would find their rent charge to the Credit Valley Railway a very serious drain upon their net earnings. Without stopping for a moment either to attack or to condemn the statement which the hon. gentleman made, it is perfectly plain that that is no reason why the Resolutions before the Chair should or should not be adopted, but

Mr. Ives.

that the sole effect of a statement of that kind going abroad from such a source will be to lead the investing public to think that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are likely to be compelled to use the whole of their earnings in paying the rent upon their leased lines. The hon. gentleman also expressed his sorrow that he could not agree with the statement of the hon. the Minister of Railways that the earnings of the Company so far had been satisfactory. That is not a reason why these Resolutions should be adopted or rejected, and the effect of that must be, as I said before, to bear the stock of the Company. The hon. gentleman also referred to a supposed interview between the General Manager, Mr. Van Horne, and a reporter of the *Montreal Star*. I am informed no such interview ever took place. When the hon. gentleman read the statement I was unable to discover whether his object in so doing was to have an opportunity of creating a laugh in the House, or whether his idea was that this had some important bearing upon the Resolutions before the Chair. It is plain that what other effect it may have had, it must have had this effect, namely, that this road was being built in a haphazard manner through the country, without any reference as to whether it was going through good or bad land, and without any estimates whatever. If the General Manager said the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had not time to make estimates, what he meant was this: that the Company was proceeding so rapidly that, after they had ascertained the best location for the line, they went to work to build it without taking a great deal of time to estimate whether it would cost \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000. For my own part, I do not see what difference it makes. I do not see what advantage it would be for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to have estimated the cost of any particular mile of road they have constructed in the prairie section. The important thing for them to settle was the best location. Having settled that, and knowing that they must build the road, I do not know what particular advantage careful estimates would have been. Then, Sir, besides the opposition of hon. members in this House, there has been the opposition of the Liberal press, which has been iterating and reiterating the arguments of hon. members in this House, on the points I have mentioned, and, being under less restraint, have gone one better, and have given the world the earliest information of blizzards and droughts and frosts in the North-West; and, for fear that the world would not observe these reports, they have always given them a prominent place on the first page, and have drawn attention to them by heavy headlines. Besides, there has been the publication of bogus experiences of supposititious individuals in the North-West; and these have been cut out and sent to a foreign press, subsidized for the purpose of discrediting the country and discrediting the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why, Sir, articles have been written, I am sure, for the very purpose of being republished in foreign newspapers. Take the *Globe* of the 5th of the present month, and you will find in it a letter supposed to have been written by a workman in that city out of work. I am not going to read the letter, but the writer makes the statement that 40 per cent. of the workmen in the city of Toronto at present are unemployed, and he says the Government are only betraying workmen by bringing immigrants to the North-West when fully 40 per cent. of the workmen in Toronto are at present unemployed. The *Globe* of the 6th, the following day, as if to give time for this letter to have its full effect, has an editorial headed "betrayed workmen," in which it calls special attention to the letter of the day before, and gives the impression to the public that this particular workman was one of those who were induced to come to this country to settle here. That was not the intention of the writer of the letter, but the impression is conveyed that 40 per cent. of the workmen in this country are out of work, and that it

is the height of folly for any immigrant to come to Canada to-day. What could be more injurious or pernicious than this? If the Liberal papers of this country would only take a leaf out of the book of their neighbours to the south, they would never publish such articles. The political parties in the United States fight with all the rancour of the political parties in this country, but there is one thing they never do—they never foul their own nest, they never decry their own country. Why, Sir, if you will look at the *Globe* of the 5th, you will find the most astounding cablegram from England, headed "British opinion on the new bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway—Investors in railways alarmed:"

"The terms of the Canadian Government's proposed new arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been announced here. They are receiving much attention from the press. The opinion is expressed that the Canadian Government is taking a course likely to damage the country's credit by linking its fortunes so closely with the railway. It is also thought that the proposed arrangement is in effect a gross breach of faith towards British capitalists who have invested in other Canadian railways. The subsidizing of the road in respect of works east of the original main line is taken to be an act of hostility towards investors in railways in Eastern Canada. This feeling appears to be gaining ground, and already it is rumoured that steps will be taken to express formally opposition to the scheme."

What these people are going to do, it is difficult to say. Whether a portion of the British army is to be sent here to turn us out, as Cromwell did the British Parliament years ago, it is difficult to say; but this much is certain—that the Parliament of Canada will maintain their right to manage Canadian interests without the assistance of the *Globe* correspondent in London. What is the pretence here? The pretence is that it is a breach of faith to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the Government of Canada to assist in the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why, pray? For the simple reason that the Canadian Pacific Railway, by means of the Ontario and Quebec Railway and the Credit Valley Railway, are likely to be competitors with the Grand Trunk Railway. I presume that the men who are making this objection, the shareholders in the Grand Trunk Railway, if they were shareholders in any other railway—in the London and North-Western Railway, for instance—would consider it a great breach of good faith if the Parliament of Great Britain were to allow a competing line with the London and North-Western. I was under the impression that there was more than one line of railway from London to Liverpool, and more than one line from London to Glasgow; and what, pray, would an English shareholder in the Grand Trunk Railway say if it were contended in England that it was a breach of faith to permit more than one line of railway to connect the same places? Yet, because people in England are shareholders in the Grand Trunk Railway Company, we are never to be permitted to construct any railway which by any possible chance can compete with that line. And these are the views of hon. gentlemen in the Opposition. They are supporting this view, that, although a monopoly is wrong in Manitoba, a monopoly must be preserved to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the Province of Ontario. Sir, where are the reporters of the *Globe*, who used to go down regularly to the station, and observe the arrival of the train, and report in the *Globe* of next morning how many hours late the train was? Where are those reporters who used to give us such harrowing details of every accident that happened on the Grand Trunk Railway? Why, at the present day, you would not suppose such a thing as an accident ever happened on that railway line; and I cannot help asking where that sweet singer of Israel is who composed that ballad: "Ontario, Ontario?" It seems to me that, when an effort is made to rivet the bonds of the Grand Trunk Railway upon the Province of Ontario, when it is supported in this House by the whole force of the Liberal party, and is supported in the country by the whole force of their press, and after they have swallowed up the Great Western without dissent, and the Midland system, it is

time that singer should compose another ballad in which the refrain would be: "Ontario, Ontario." I undertake to say, and it is evident from the course the *Globe* is now pursuing, that it is as much a part of the equipment of the Grand Trunk Railway as the rolling stock of that railway. Then we have the opposition of individual Liberals. We have the opposition of the party in this House, we have the opposition of the party press, and we have the opposition of individual Liberals; and the effort of the latter seems to be to foment discontent in the North-West by getting up meetings and getting up agitation among the people, leading them to suppose that they are being abused by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and by the Government. And, besides all this opposition, which we should not have at all, opposition from within, opposition which has done more harm to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to the cause of immigration than all other opposition; besides all that, we have the opposition of every American line of railway to the construction of the eastern division of the Canadian Pacific. What do we see? We see Mr. Hill, one of the leading owners of the Minneapolis and St. Paul Railway, taking a prominent part in the formation of the Syndicate, taking stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and taking the most active part in the organization of the Company, and in furnishing the money to organize it—up to a certain moment. From that moment he leaves the Company, he takes his money out of it, and he commences to fight it. What is the cause? The moment he left was the moment when he discovered that it was the determination of the Company and of the people of Canada that we should have a Canadian Pacific Railway in fact as well as in name—a line completed from ocean to ocean upon Canadian territory. Then we have the opposition of all the cities in the United States to this enterprise, all the cities which are interested in foreign shipping or in railways, the opposition of every railway in the United States that has a land grant to sell or is interested in the carrying of immigrants, and, as I have said before, the special opposition of the Grand Trunk Railway and its shareholders. And we even hear the credit of the Dominion itself attacked. These gentlemen have got so ambitious that they are not satisfied with bearing the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but are commencing to attack the credit of Canada itself; and I noticed the other day that the Marquis of Lorne, at a meeting he was attending in the interests of Canada, was obliged, as an initial step, to contradict a message from the city of New York to the effect that the financial affairs of the Dominion of Canada were in a very critical position. These opposing influences have been favoured at the same time by an almost unprecedented condition of weakness in the stock markets of London and New York, and this rendered it impossible for the Company to dispose of their stock except at an enormous sacrifice. Here is an additional reason why this House should receive with favour the propositions of the Government. The road is a national necessity; its early completion is a national necessity; the Company have performed their part of the contract well and thoroughly, and the hon. gentleman does not find a word of fault with the rate of progress they have made; and they have been opposed by forces which renders it in our interest, and renders it our duty, to support them. In November last, this state of things being represented to the Government, the Government made an arrangement by which they received a certain deposit of money and undertook to guarantee a 3 per cent. dividend upon \$65,000,000 of the capital stock of the Company. Under any ordinary circumstances that should have sent the stock of the Company at least above 75 cents on the dollar; but under the circumstances actually existing, it not only did no service to the Company, but was actually injurious, inasmuch as it deprived them of the deposit of cash which they

had made with the Government. Sir, with the permission of the House at this point, I would like, for a moment, to diverge from the line of argument in order to consider the value of Canadian Pacific Railway stock as an investment. At its present price of fifty-six the interest paid on the stock at 5 per cent. per annum is equal to a dividend of about 9 per cent. on the money invested; and taking the guaranteed dividend alone it is equivalent to an interest of 5½ per cent. Now, Sir, I propose, for a moment, to examine the question of a probable dividend after construction has been completed. To do this we ought to consider, first, the volume of dividend bearing stock; secondly, the probable earnings; and, thirdly, the income likely to be derived from the sale of the land grant; and we should enter into this investigation by making comparison with other Pacific roads. The road, when completed, is expected to have out a capital stock of \$90,000,000, and it will owe as a funded debt about \$5,000,000, making a total of debt and dividend bearing stock, of \$95,000,000, for a total mileage of 3,304 miles. Now, Sir, compare this with the other Pacific railways. Take, for example, the Central Pacific Railway. Their main line, from Ogden to San Francisco, is 883 miles; the funded debt amounts to \$61,258,680; the capital stock amounts to \$59,275,500, and the total liability is \$120,534,180. The Union Pacific Railway, from Council Bluffs to Ogden, is 1,042 miles; the funded debt is \$75,132,512; the capital stock is \$36,762,300; making a total of \$111,894,812. The Union and Central Pacific combined have a funded debt and capital stock amounting to \$232,428,992. The Northern Pacific has a mileage of 1,954, a funded debt of \$68,850,000, a capital stock of \$100,000,000, making a total liability of \$168,850,000. Now, Sir, for a moment, compare the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway with these various other lines. The Canadian Pacific Railway, according to the figures I have given, would have to pay a dividend on about \$28,000 to the mile; while the Central Pacific is required to pay interest and dividend, on about \$136,000; the Union Pacific on \$107,000 to the mile; and the Northern Pacific on \$36,000 to the mile. Or, to make it more plain to the House, the Canadian Pacific Railway will pay dividends with one-fifth the earnings per mile that the Central Pacific would require, one-fourth the earnings that the Union Pacific would require, and one-third the earnings that the Northern Pacific would require to pay the same dividends. As to the past earnings, I claim that the result has been encouraging, if you consider the disconnected condition of the line and the extra expense entailed in its operation on that account. The gross earnings for the year 1883, were \$5,420,913, with a mileage of 1,100 miles at the beginning, and 1,900 at the end of the year, or an average of, say, 1,530 miles for the year. This is an average of \$3,536 per mile, notwithstanding, as I have said before, the incomplete and disconnected condition of the road, and the fact that it has been pushed somewhat in advance of settlement. On the eastern division the earnings for the year were at the rate of \$3,464 per mile, or, less construction material, at the rate of \$3,301 per mile. This has been secured entirely on the local traffic without any assistance from through traffic whatever, and it can easily be seen how largely the earnings will be increased when the whole of the line is connected. Now, as to probable earnings after the completion of the road. We have to take into consideration the Canadian business, in which I include the eastern movement of grain, and the western movement of manufactured goods, the movement of lumber from both west and east to the prairie section; and the distribution of fuel, together with the foreign business, such, for example, as the Chinese and Japanese trade with Europe and America. As to the latter business, there are three important advantages which the Canadian Pacific

Mr. Ives.

Railway will enjoy over any of the other Pacific lines—first, it will have a much shorter distance; secondly, it will have much easier grades; and, thirdly, it will have an independent position, the whole mileage being made upon one line of railway without change of cars. To illustrate the advantages that the Canadian Pacific Railway will enjoy, I will give you the following distances:—From Yokohama to Liverpool by the Central and Union Pacific Railways, the distance is 11,990 miles; by the Canadian Pacific Railway the distance is 10,977 miles, an advantage in favour of our line of 1,013 miles. Now, as to the matter of grades. The Northern Pacific has grades of from 118 to 130 feet per mile, frequently, over the mountain section, extending for 900 miles. On the Union and Central Pacific Railways you find grades of 116 feet to the mile, frequently, over mountain sections of 1,225 miles in extent. On the Canadian Pacific Railway there will be one maximum grade of 116 feet going west for a distance of twenty miles, and two of 116 feet coming east. From the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Lake Superior, coming eastward, the maximum grade will be 40 feet, and going westward 52½ feet to the mile. Between Montreal and the summit of the Rocky Mountains, either way, the maximum will not exceed 52½ feet to the mile; and the mountain section, instead of being 900 miles in length, as in the case of the Northern Pacific, and 1,225 miles, as in the case of the Union and Central Pacific, will be covered by a distance of 125 miles. In addition to this, and quite as important as either of these considerations, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be able to run its own line—to run its own cars from one ocean to the other; and I claim that these advantages are sufficient to draw to our line a very considerable part of the Chinese and Japanese trade. Now, coming back to the question of the movement of grain and cattle, I have no doubt that there will be a surplus for exportation. I have great faith in the possibilities of that country. I believe that it is now fully and clearly established beyond dispute that there is a very large area of country there, which is, at least, among the best wheat-producing countries in the world. Now, Sir, I have been curious to enquire what acreage of wheat and oats would be sufficient to furnish a paying business for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and what acreage the Canadian Pacific Railway will have to reach out for. Well, Sir, the railway belt alone contains 22,000,000 acres of good wheat land; and when you add to that the additional country which will be made tributary to the line by the branches of the railway Company itself, and the independent branches, you can form an idea of the immense area of country that will be served by this road. Now, Sir, supposing that three-fourths of the grain is exported, and one-fourth is retained in the country for consumption, at moderate rates for freight, how much grain would be required to be raised in Manitoba and the North-West to furnish a paying business for the Canadian Pacific Railway? Suppose, for example, that 20,000,000 bushels were raised—and that is a very much smaller amount than the hon. Minister of Railways mentioned the other night. Supposing that 20,000,000 bushels are raised, and that 15,000,000 bushels would be exported; that would furnish, at 400 bushels per car, 37,300 car-loads of grain to be moved eastward, this with the other business that would necessarily follow, such as the carriage into the country of manufactured goods, the distribution of lumber, and the distribution of fuel, would furnish, beyond all question, a dividend paying business for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, it does not require so large a country to produce 20,000,000 bushels of grain as some hon. gentlemen might suppose. Making a moderate estimate, supposing each farmer will have fifty acres in grain and that is not a large estimate for a western country, but a small estimate it will only require 20,000 people to be engaged in farming in the North-West

and Manitoba, to produce a paying business for the Canadian Pacific Railway. And, Sir, the acreage last year under crop is estimated by good authority to have been 500,000 acres, or one-half the quantity under cultivation that is required to furnish business for the road. I estimate the probable acreage under cultivation next year at 625,000 acres, and say, in 1885, 900,000, or within 100,000 of the acreage necessary to be under cultivation to furnish a business that will pay a dividend on the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is easy to see, if a population is settled in that country, that there must be a large business in the western movement of manufactured goods. There is an exceedingly large business already. It is easy to see that the distribution of coal and lumber will also make a large business, to say nothing about the mining boom in the mountains, of which we are beginning to hear, and the production of cattle and sheep on the North-West ranches. Not only will our line have the advantage over the other Pacific roads, as regards trade between Asia and Europe, but it will have the advantage in the transport of grain to Liverpool in point of distance. A comparison of distances to Liverpool, by the different Pacific railways, shows that our road has a very large advantage. For instance, by the Central and Union Pacific the distance is 6,762 miles; by the Northern Pacific, 6,841 miles; by the Canadian Pacific, 5,941 miles, or nearly 1,000 miles shorter than by any other Pacific road. What dividends do these other Pacific roads pay on their stock? The Central Pacific, with a debt amounting to \$136,000 per mile, with a debt which requires the Company to earn \$5 to pay a dividend where the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would be required to earn only \$1, actually pays a regular dividend of 6 per cent. and has paid as high as 10 per cent. in one year. The Union Pacific pays 7 per cent. on its capital stock regularly. Besides all this, an additional comparison might be made with other railways in the United States running through a prairie country. The bonded debt of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy amounts to \$51,000 per mile; of the Chicago and Alton to \$54,000 per mile; of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific to \$47,000 per mile. These roads are all paying roads, they are all competing lines running between the same points, and their bonded debts are two or three times as much as that of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and they all run through a prairie country and depend on the same class of business as the Canadian Pacific Railway will depend upon. Then the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have the sale of their land grant to steady the rate of dividend. An idea may be arrived at of the income that is likely to be derived from the sale of the lands by the following statement: The average of past sales has been \$2.36 per acre. At the same rate the balance of the land grant would yield \$50,000,000, against which there would be a charge of about \$16,000,000, land grant bonds, \$5,000,000 of which are deposited with the Government. This would leave say \$40,000,000 which would be available from time to time after the loan from the Government has been paid off in steadying the rate of dividend until such time as the earnings of the Company from other sources would be sufficient. Then I say that, considering the 3 per cent. dividend guaranteed by the Government for a period of ten years, considering the fact that this railway is the great artery through an agricultural country of unrivalled extent and fertility, considering that it will have little or no bonded debt when it is completed, considering its advantages in point of grades and distances, considering its independent position, considering the value of its land grant—I think in a fair market, and without the opposition that we all deplore, this stock should bear a high price in the market as an investment. But, Sir, the guarantee did not avail in strengthening the market. It is a fight between the enemies of Canada on

the one hand, aided by the enemies of the present Government, and Canadian interests; and the time has come when the Canadian Government and the Conservative party supporting that Government, have to take a hand in the struggle. And the question is, what course shall we adopt with respect to the Resolutions now submitted for our approval or rejection? There are three alternatives: we may suspend operations on this railway; we may oblige the Company, perhaps, to sell their stock at a sacrifice, or we may make the loan as proposed by the Government. There is one consideration which comes in right here, and that is, that we cannot under the contract, compel the Company to sell their stock or sacrifice their lands. We cannot compel them even to go on with the work. They have a perfect right, as I understand the contract, to suspend operations for five or six years, if they choose to do so, and then go on with the work, provided they complete it within the time mentioned in the contract. What would be the effect on the country if they suspended operations? It would be, in the first place, to discharge about 12,000 men, in mid-winter, and throw them upon the country for support. It would be to weaken the already somewhat weak nerves of bankers and capitalists, to put it mildly, and it would throw a blanket, and a wet one too, over every interest and industry in this country; and it would stop the wheels of progress as regards settlement, immigration and progress generally for an indefinite period. What would be the effect on the Conservative party, which is always an important consideration to the country? It would be this: The people would say, and would have the right to say, you approved of a contract, in 1881, for the construction of this railway; you came back to us for our approval or rejection; and we returned you by an overwhelming majority; then, you were not satisfied. In the Speech from the Throne, at the opening of the Session, it was plainly indicated that additional assistance must be given the railway Company; and at two bye-elections, taking place at points far remote from one another, which occurred after this declaration was made in the Speech from the Throne, we gave most unmistakeable approval of the proposition to further aid the Company; still, notwithstanding these unmistakeable declarations, you have come up to the hedge and refused to take the step which prudence and reason require you to take. The Liberals themselves could not have done worse or have acted less in the interests of the people. But what would be the result of selling stock at a sacrifice? It would be to add very largely to the proprietary interest, and it would make it impossible for the Company to give as fair and low rates of freight and passage as they would be able to give provided the stock is kept at a reasonable figure. What would be the result if this loan is made and is repaid, as we have every reason to say that it will be? The result will be that we borrow the money at 4 per cent. and lend it at 5, a transaction which would be a profitable one to the Dominion from that point of view. But supposing the loan should not be repaid, I desire to submit a statement to the House which I have prepared with some care, as to what the road would cost us in case it came into our hands under a foreclosure. I make the cost of the main line \$75,891,900, in this way: Expended by the Government, \$28,000,000; cash subsidy, \$25,000,000; loan, \$22,500,000; and 3,753,400 acres of land, actually sold, at \$1 per acre, \$3,753,400; land grant bonds sold and uncovered by sales of land, \$1,123,500; allowing twelve months' interest for the default, \$3,215,000, making a total of \$83,591,900. From this should be deducted the branch railways, say, \$4,500,000; for payments made in the purchase of the line from Callander to Montreal and Brockville, \$3,200,000; total, \$7,700,000, which deducted from the total, leaves as the

cost of the railway, \$75,891,900. But besides this there is another consideration which must not be forgotten. We have a line and an equipment at least \$10,000,000 more valuable than the line and equipment which were estimated by the hon. Minister of Railways in 1880. In addition to all that, there is a saving to the Government of six years' interest during construction upon their cash subsidy of \$25,000,000, and upon the money expended by the Government in railway construction, of \$28,000,000; that is to say, the saving of interest for six years upon \$53,000,000 amounts to \$12,720,000. I do not mean to propose the reduction of this \$10,000,000 and this \$12,000,000 from the figures I have given as the cost, but I do mean to say that it is a fair subject for consideration. The Government are supposed to have got value for what they gave their money for when the road is completed, and if the road is completed six years before 1891, we are entitled to mention the fact, and there is a saving of interest during construction of six years on this amount. I will only refer to the fact that the cost of this road is going to come far under any estimate which has hitherto been made either by hon. gentlemen to my right, or hon. gentlemen in front of me. The estimate of the hon. member who last addressed the House, of \$120,000,000, made in his speech of 1880, was not for a better road or a better equipment than that which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has built; and certainly the road and equipment, as I said before, is much better than were estimated for by the hon. Minister of Railways. Another important consideration is the value of the lands which Parliament in 1879 set apart and consecrated for the purpose of the construction of this road. We, by formal resolution in 1879, set apart, for the purpose of completing this road, no less than 100,000,000 acres of land; and whether you take the price at \$1 or at a higher figure, it is certain that the cost of this railway, if it falls into our hands under foreclosure, will be largely within the value of the subvention which the House made for the purpose of the construction of this railway. I now come to the consideration of some additional points in the speech of the hon. member who last addressed the House on this subject. I took pains in reading his speech, after getting possession of *Hansard*, to distribute it under different heads, and I found when I had got the points distributed, that they fell under the following heads: Criticisms of the Syndicate; criticisms of the Government, and reasons why the Resolutions should not be adopted; and I am bound to say that, by far the largest part of the speech will be found under the heads of criticisms of the Government and criticisms of the Company. The first ground of criticism of the Syndicate was that the hon. member had no means of knowing how much stock had been given to the members of the Syndicate for advancing the \$5,000,000 necessary to be paid in by the Company in organizing. Well, I have no means of knowing, but the hon. gentleman himself told us sufficient to lead us to know that there had not been a very large advantage given to the Syndicate in the sale or distribution of this stock. He told us that the net proceeds of this stock, after deducting all commissions, amounted to about 46 cents on the dollar; and we all know that the price at which it was emitted to the stockholders has been about, on an average, 50 cents on the dollar.

Mr. BLAKE. Sixty cents on the dollar.

Mr. IVES. Some at 60, but more of it at less than 50. Therefore it is perfectly evident, by the hon. gentleman's own showing, that there cannot have been any particular advantage given to the members of the Syndicate in distributing the stock allowed to them for the \$5,000,000 of capital which they furnished in the organization of the Company. I may say that in this matter Parliament has no interest except to know that an

Mr. IVES.

inordinate amount has not been given—an amount which would largely increase the proprietary interest of the road, and largely affect the question of dividends and rates. If the hon. gentleman is able to figure out that the stock, including all that was given to the Syndicate, has yielded an average of 46 cents on the dollar, instead of making out a case against the Syndicate, he has made out a case in their favour. I am aware that it has been usual with other great lines of railway, particularly lines constructed to the south of us in the United States, for the directors and promoters to make a large grab in the way of profits and stocks; and that having been the case with reference to almost all the American Pacific roads, it having been the case in respect to the Grand Trunk, I was not much surprised that the hon. gentleman directed attention to this subject. I am, however, exceedingly happy that he did not find the mare's nest that he was looking for. It is to be observed that the best evidence that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the original promoters of that Company, have not been after a grab of stock, or of profits, out of this undertaking, is the character of the road they have built, the way in which they have carried on their work, and the fact that the stock has realized, under all the circumstances, as much as 46 cents on the dollar. Then the hon. gentleman objects to the fact that a construction company was organized; and he points his objection with the remark that the construction company ceased operations as soon as the funds gave out, and argues from that that its object was to rob the railway Company. In this matter also, the Government has no interest, unless the construction company was used as a means of robbing the railway Company. Now, Sir, it has been found necessary to carry on all great enterprises of this kind by means of construction companies. I am quite prepared to admit that there have been cases of abuse—cases in which the directors of a company have had an interest in the construction company, and have made their steal by that means; but it is none the less true that a construction company is useful, and, under certain circumstances, necessary. For example, the promoters of a great work like this have not money in hand with which to pay for construction. They have a right to emit stock and bonds for that purpose; but it is almost always impossible to induce the general public to invest in their stock or their bonds until a certain amount of progress has been made in construction. It is, as a rule, necessary to organize construction companies, giving them certain advantages in order to induce them to construct railways, and to hold back the stock and bonds until there is a market for them. In this case it so happens, not as the hon. gentleman stated, that none of the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway were directors of the construction company, and it also happens that they had no more interest in the construction company than every other shareholder in the railway Company had. It is a fact, as I am informed, that a trustee for the railway Company represented it on the board of the construction company, and that that was the only interest anybody connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway had in this construction company. It is also true that only a small portion of the road has been constructed by a construction company—only one-third of the distance between Winnipeg and the summit of the Rocky Mountains. And I may here say that the object of organizing this construction company, was to induce certain capitalists, not members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to lend their strength and their financial credit to the enterprise, for the purpose of carrying on the work of construction; and it is an open secret that so careful were the railway Company of the interests of the railway—so impossible did those gentlemen who went into the construction company find it to make any money out of it, that they gave up their contract—not because the funds ran out, but because there

was no money in it—owing, when they ceased, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the sum mentioned by the hon. Minister of Railways. It is another reason why the Company should receive the favourable consideration of this House—that these gentlemen have not allowed any grab, or made any grab, at the expense of this Company, or at the expense of the country. The hon. gentleman next argues that the Syndicate increased their capital stock from \$25,000,000 to \$100,000,000, and that they got the Government to guarantee a 3 per cent. dividend, in order that they might get 11 per cent. interest on the money they put into the stock. One word, I think, is sufficient in answer to that. If these gentlemen did that, they must have entirely changed their minds, because, instead of using the time until 1891 to draw that interest, they have so hurried construction as to cut off six years of that high rate of interest. But the hon. gentleman himself, in another part of his speech, furnishes an answer to this same objection. He tells us that it is perfectly childish to suppose that the guarantee could have appreciated the stock, or could have been of any advantage to the stockholders. If so, it is perfectly evident that his objection, which I am now commenting upon, is unfounded. The hon. gentleman next objects to the acquisition of the Atlantic and North-Western charter, and to the purchase of a controlling interest in the South-Eastern Railway. Now, Sir, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have an interest that the freight which they bring from the west to the city of Montreal, particularly in the winter season, should be carried to the seaboard at a reasonable rate; besides, the Grand Trunk Railway controlled the only bridge that crossed the St. Lawrence, and, at the time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company invested in the South-Eastern, controlled every line of railway leading from Montreal, except the South-Eastern. It is an open secret that it was a race between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific to obtain a controlling interest in that road. Although I am prepared to admit that it is a question about which something can be said on both sides, yet I think the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have an interest that their freight, brought to Montreal and proceeding to the seaboard, should not be left entirely at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Railway. But the hon. Minister of Railways gave another reason, and an exceedingly good reason, why the Company invested in a controlling interest in the South-Eastern Railway. It was that they desired to attract to it and to their own line business coming from the seaboard and going westward. It is perfectly evident that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company confine their interests west of the river, or west of the city of Montreal, everything going from the east to the west will pass over the Grand Trunk; and therefore if the Canadian Pacific is to obtain any business south of Montreal, it is necessary that it should have feeders to bring that business to it. And for my part, I consider that, interested as the country is in assuring a large volume of business on this Canadian line, interested as the country is in low rates of freight on that line, we can at least pardon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for having had the fore-sight to prevent the Grand Trunk from controlling the last avenue from the east, and thereby securing all the freight going from the east to the west. But the hon. gentleman made merry over the idea that the Canadian Pacific Railway could not use the South-Eastern as a feeder without it becoming at the same time a sucker; or, in other words, that if the Canadian Pacific Railway took business coming westward, from the South-Eastern, they must necessarily give other business to the South-Eastern. I do not see anything particular to laugh at in the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways. Take, for instance, the case of the Central Vermont which runs alongside the South-Eastern. The Central Vermont is under the control and in the alliance of the Grand Trunk Railway. It is a feeder of the

Grand Trunk Railway. The business brought to Montreal from the west over the Central Vermont goes to the Grand Trunk Railway; but, because the business coming from the east goes to the Grand Trunk, it does not follow that the Central Vermont carries the freight of the Grand Trunk Railway to the seaboard. It is merely a branch of the Grand Trunk Railway, which carries its own traffic over the main line to Portland *via* Island Pond. So far as the Atlantic and North-Western was concerned, that charter contained the power of bridging the St. Lawrence, and it was a matter of importance to the Syndicate to obtain the right to bridge that river, and to obtain an interest in the South-Eastern. I now come to a question about which I hesitate saying anything, because it seems to me a matter entirely unworthy of mention in this House. I refer to the statement of the hon. gentleman that the gentlemen of the Syndicate had built lordly palaces and made magnificent benefactions, the insinuation being that they built these lordly palaces and made these magnificent benefactions out of their profits from the Canadian Pacific Railway. I claim that such a statement, unless founded on fact, is one which should not have been made here, and which should not attract attention here. It is a matter of fact well known to all that these gentlemen were wealthy before they ever had anything to do with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that they were in a position to build good houses and make large benefactions independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and it is also a matter of fact that the contract for this lordly palace, which the hon. gentleman thought worthy of mention here, had been let for some two years before its owner ever had or thought of having anything to do with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think it is to be regretted that gentlemen of wealth cannot make benefactions to a worthy object, such as McGill College or a hospital, without mention being made of it in this House in the manner in which this has been referred to. The hon. gentleman next objects that the prairie section has cost more than any recent estimate; and the inference which he draws is that an excessive expenditure was made in its construction. What did it cost? It cost only \$17,000,000 for the whole 958 miles, or an average of less than \$18,000 per mile. I do not know whether an estimate of 1880 would be considered a recent one; but in his speech of 1880 the hon. gentleman estimated that this section of the road would cost \$42,000,000, as against \$17,000,000. The hon. gentleman also noticed a discrepancy in the estimates of the cost of the railway. He referred to the official memorandum issued in December, 1882, by Mr. Stephen, the President of the Company, and to a letter from Mr. Stephen to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in 1883; and he commented at very great length upon the fact that the estimate of the cost made by Mr. Stephen in this official memorandum and open letter to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway was largely in excess of what is now estimated would be necessary to build this railway. Of course, that was a matter of considerable importance; but it so happens, on examination of this official memorandum and this letter to the shareholders, that there was no estimate of cost in it at all. It was not given as an estimate of cost. It was simply a statement by Mr. Stephen of the amount of proprietary interest in the shape of stock that would own the completed line and the unused land grant. It was simply a statement that \$90,000,000 stock would own the completed line, and would own the unused land grant. The hon. gentleman also called attention to the fact that there was a discrepancy in the statement made by Mr. Drinkwater some months ago, and that in January last, as to the bonded debt of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from Callander to Montreal. I am not in a position, at this moment, to answer the hon. gentleman on that point, but I have no doubt that some one else who will follow me will be able to do so. This much I have ascertained, that in the Railway Statistical

Returns of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, sworn to on the 11th January, 1884, by Mr. Drinkwater, the Secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the following is set down as the debt:—Canada Central bonds assumed by the Company, first mortgage bonds, \$850,000; second mortgage bonds, \$973,333; and the amount due the Province of Quebec on the purchase of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, \$3,500,000; making a total of \$5,323,333, as stated by the hon. Minister of Railways. A discrepancy was also noticed by the hon. gentleman in the return of lands sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the 30th June, 1883, and the present statement. The hon. gentleman himself explained the reason for that discrepancy. The reason was: that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company took back from the North-West Land Company 2,000,000 acres of land which had been previously sold. This was included in the return of June, 1883, but is not included in the statement now before the House. The hon. gentleman also commented on the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway had expended a sum of money to sustain the stock of the North-West Land Company, thus giving an impression which is not founded on fact. I do not suppose he intended to do so, but the impression he conveyed was that the Company had gone on the market and had purchased shares to prevent the stock from falling. That is not the case. The Company never purchased a share directly or indirectly of stock in the North-West Land Company on the market. The amount put down, and which was mentioned by the hon. Minister of Railways the other night, is the original subscription of the Company at the time the prospectus was first issued. They never owned an additional share of the stock, they never purchased or sold one. So much for the hon. gentleman's criticisms of the Company. We now come to his criticisms of the Government. He comments upon the change of policy in the manner of paying the subsidy. He says he is happy to see that the Government have come to his views with regard to the correct method of paying the subsidy to the Company. There was excellent reason why the subsidy during the first years of construction should be paid out by a mileage rate. That reason is this: that, in the first years of construction, it was necessary for the Company to purchase railway plant, railway material and rolling stock; it was necessary for them to make large expenditures which would apply to the whole work, and it was necessary, therefore, to pay them more than a *pro rata* amount of the cost. But that time has gone by; they now have the plant and the rolling stock; and the Government, when the proper time has come to make the change—for, when the reason for the former state of things has ceased, the effect also ceases—the Government now change the policy, and adopt a policy which shall secure the completion of the railway, for the loan which it is now proposed should be made. In fact, it is a question of a practical and common-sense policy, a practical and common-sense Government, as opposed to a theoretical opposition. The next objection of the hon. gentleman is that the progress of the North-West has been retarded by the so-called monopoly clause, and the disallowance of Manitoba railway charters. I shall not take up the time of the House on this point, but I wish to observe that the only thing in which the country is interested is that there should be reasonably low rates, that the business should be done by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that the business should be held for the benefit of Canada. A sound National Policy applies as much to railway construction in the North-West as it applies to trade matters here. It is as necessary to have a National Policy in the matter of railway construction in the North-West as it is to have a National Policy in force for the benefit of the manufacturers and people of the Dominion of Canada. Sir, the

Mr. Ives.

older Provinces of Canada have been called upon to pledge their credit in large sums for the benefit of the people of the North-West, for the benefit of the immigrants who are going in there, and it is not too much to ask that such a policy should be pursued as will preserve to the manufacturers of old Canada the advantages of the market of the North-West. The hon. gentleman made a distinction between the railway constructed and owned by the Government and the railway constructed and owned by a company. Sir, there is no distinction whatever. The same policy should be pursued as it would have been necessary to pursue if the Government had owned the road; and, the moment that the line is completed, the moment that we are put fairly in connection with the people of the North-West, the moment that our merchants and manufacturers are given a fair chance with the manufacturers and merchants of the United States, then the time will come when this monopoly clause may be done away with, when the country may be opened to free railway construction and free railway competition. The hon. gentlemen had a good deal of sport over the idea that anybody, much less a Government, could have supposed that the taking of a certain amount of money and placing it in the hands of the Government would be of any advantage to the stock of the Company. His idea was this: that the amount of money necessary to secure the Government would be the same amount, whether it was in the hands of the Government or in the hands of the Company. Well, Sir, I cannot dispute that proposition; but I undertake to say that that money, in the hands of the Company, might possibly be expended in paying their floating debt, or in railway construction, and it would not very likely be reserved for the payment of a dividend for ten years to come; whereas, if it is placed in the hands of the Government, a 3 per cent. dividend is assured. If the hon. gentleman made a wager with me of \$1,000, I should not be any better able to pay that wager if I put the money into the hands of a third party, than if I kept it in my pocket; but I do not hesitate to say that he would feel safer in regard to getting his bet if I placed it in the hands of another person than if I kept it in my own pocket. And the same principle applies to the setting aside of this money for the purpose of paying a dividend. The hon. gentleman also held that it was a mistake for the hon. Minister of Railways to reckon, among the moneys furnished by the Company, the amount of their floating liability. Well, where should he have placed it? Should he have placed it amongst the moneys furnished by the Government? The Minister of Railways was giving an account of the moneys furnished by the Government, on the one hand, and the moneys furnished by the railway Company on the other. He naturally did not put it down as having been furnished by the Government. Of course, the money has not been furnished in one sense, but it has been procured, it has been expended on the line, and, if the line fell into the hands of the Government, it would be as useful as any portion of the money that has been expended by the Company. What I mean to say, with respect to these floating liabilities and the right of the hon. Minister of Railways to reckon them as moneys furnished by the Company, is this: Suppose that liability existed to a man who had been constructing the railway in the North-West; the man continues to the last to be unpaid, but the railway falls into the hands of the Government; I ask if that is not as useful expenditure to the Government as any other expenditure that the Company could have made? So much for the hon. gentleman's criticisms of the Government. We now come to the reasons he urged why these Resolutions should not pass, for you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that the points which I have mentioned, which I have been trying to comment upon, are not reasons why these Resolutions should be rejected, or should be adopted. The hon. gentleman, however, said that he had his doubts whether

27,000,000 of money would be sufficient to complete the road. He says, however, that, if 27,000,000 of money would be sufficient to complete the road, we are asked to actually furnish all that would be necessary, because the balance of our cash subsidy and the loan will make up the amount. He also says that, if the amount is not sufficient, we shall see the Company back asking for more money. Now, if the \$27,000,000 is sufficient, it will complete the railway; and it is not a reason why we should not adopt the Resolutions, that it is not sufficient. It is a reason why we should increase it, or, if the amount is too great, it is a reason why we should diminish it; and the fact that we are furnishing nearly all the money that will be expended to complete the road, according to this estimate, is no reason why the Resolutions should not be adopted. What should we do? We are taking over into our hands the control of all the assets of the Company; we are depriving them almost entirely of the power of raising money, and surely, doing that, we are bound to make a loan adequate to the completion of the railway. The hon. gentleman told us a great deal, but there were two or three things he did not tell us, and which it was important he should tell us. He did not tell us he would like to see the work suspended upon this line, nor did he tell us of any other or better way of providing the money to continue the operations. If the hon. gentleman could satisfy us that it is better to suspend operations, or could show us some other or better way of providing the money, he would have adduced an argument which would have very great effect upon my mind, at any rate, and I believe on the minds of all the hon. members in this House. That is the important question. It is still time for some hon. member of the Opposition to show us a better way of providing the means of completing this railway. If they can do so, it will not be necessary to use the influences of the lobby, which the *Globe* referred to in its issue of yesterday, and it will not be necessary to take the measures that these Resolutions shall pass and not be lost that the hon. member for West Durham hinted the hon. Minister of Railways had taken. Sir, the hon. gentleman's criticism of the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways amounts to this: the hon. Minister of Railways asserts that the work upon this line should not be suspended, and that this is the only feasible means of procuring the money to go on with it. The hon. gentleman answers to that: the road has been built through poor land; it might have been built through better land. The hon. Minister of Railways repeats that this road must be built; that it will not do to suspend operations upon it; and that this is the only way of procuring the money. The hon. member answers that there has been too large an issue of capital stock. The hon. Minister of Railways repeats the same assertion over and over again; and the answer of the hon. member is: that the Company have been building lordly palaces and making princely benefactions. That is the style of the answer which the hon. member who last addressed the House made to the propositions of the hon. Minister of Railways which are submitted for our consideration. Sir, in conclusion, what is the duty of the House in respect to this important matter? We should bear in mind that we are laying the foundation of an empire. We should bear in mind that the one great object for which we are sitting here is to advance the interests of the country. We should bear in mind that the North-West is the portion of country which we are to look to for development and growth. We should bear in mind that it is essential, and a national necessity, that that road should be built, and that the country should be populated. And, Sir, we should ask ourselves this question: Do we desire to see a suspension for six years of the progress of that work and the progress of the country? If we do not, is there any other or better way of procuring the money than the way proposed by the hon. Minister of Railways? If there is not, if the credit

of Canada is sufficient to procure this money at a reasonable rate of interest, and if it is necessary to complete the road, then by all means let us complete it. Let us not put our hands to the plough and then turn back. Sir, in 1880, in addressing this House I ventured to express the hope that our great and respected chief would live to see the completion of that great enterprise. Since that day he has lived slower and the work has been progressing faster than I expected; and I think I may express the hope that he may not only live to see the railway built, but that when he leaves us, his deepest mourners will be a million of happy prosperous and grateful people settled in this North-West.

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

### After Recess.

### SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Halifax Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Canada Temperance and General Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Middlesex.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 30) to extend to the Dominion of Canada the powers of the corporation called De Nederlandsch-Americansche Land Maatschappij (The Netherlands' American Land Company).—(Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 32) to confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Pictou Mutual Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(Mr. McDougald.)

Bill (No. 40) to amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Saskatoon and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Commercial Bank of Manitoba.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Union Trust Corporation of Canada.—(Mr. Hesson.)

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Owen Sound Dry Dock Shipbuilding and Navigation Company, limited.—(Mr. Allen.)

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Wells.)

Bill (No. 47) respecting the winding-up of the Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Coal and Railway Company, and the sale of the property thereof to the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Atlantic Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Nova Scotia Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the International Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 51) to amend the Act incorporating the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with the hon. mover of these Resolutions, and also with the hon. gentleman who has last spoken, in thinking

that we have rarely, probably never, since Confederation, been called upon to deal with a subject involving more seriously the whole future destinies of this country than in the motion which is now before you. And, Sir, in the first instance, before I proceed to review the remarks of the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Ives), permit me to bring back the House to a consideration of the main questions which appear to me to be involved in these Resolutions. These, Sir, as I understand them, are two. First of all, are we really, fairly considering our position, looking at the demands upon us, looking at our true financial position, in a position to incur the risk of spending \$30,000,000 more in assisting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? And, in the next place, granting that we are in a position to spend this high sum, or to risk this high sum of money, has a sufficient case been made out by the mover of the Resolutions to warrant our assuming so grave a responsibility. To which may be added, perhaps, this third question: Have the extraordinary variations which have already been shown to have taken place in the calculations of the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, been so far explained as to warrant implicit confidence in the accuracy of those gentlemen's future calculations? Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways, when introducing these Resolutions, put his whole case, I may say, on this one plea: that the Company required no aid at our hands, they were quite able to fulfil their contract according to its terms; but for the sake of shortening the time for the construction of the railway, it would be, in his judgment, well worth our while to undertake this great liability. The hon. gentleman who succeeded and supplemented him took a somewhat different view, but still not differing so materially from the hon. mover as to make it apparent to us that there was any cause assigned for increasing this great liability, other than the expediency of constructing the road within a period of two years. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, on the other hand, asked, and he asked with very good reason, why the whole policy of the Government should be so suddenly inverted. He asked why, instead of, as we were informed some six months ago, being about to receive a very large sum of money from the Company, we are suddenly called upon to lend them an equally large sum. We asked why we are required to do this in such indecent haste; why we are denied necessary information on which we could base a judgment of the expediency of this proceeding. He pointed out that papers containing that information, moved for by himself a whole year ago, had not been laid on the Table of the House; that documents of the most important character had been placed in our hands within a few hours and not yet printed; he showed in every possible way that the House was not in the possession of information which the House itself, by ordering the information to be brought down, had shown that it believed to be necessary to the proper discussion of this question. The hon. Minister was good enough to tell us that what we were called upon to do was a mere formality. All we had to do, he said, was practically to endorse the Company. Well, Sir, most of us in our private transactions have heard that story before. Most of us know to our bitter cost that we had better than and there have made a present of the money than to have put our name on the back of our friend's bill; and I am much afraid that something like that—in spite of the hon. gentleman's assurance, in spite of all the pledges and precautions that can be taken—will be the result to the people of Canada if these Resolutions pass. The hon. gentleman behind me said, and said most truly, that the whole value of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the people of Canada lies in its being the means of the development of the North-West. I entirely concur with that hon. gentleman; and my charge, and our charge against the Government of Canada, is, that by their

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

misconduct in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, by their misconduct in regard to the land policy and divers other matters, they have contributed most seriously to impede the proper development of the North-West, and to prevent the people of Canada from reaping a title of the benefits which they ought to have reaped from the possession of that magnificent country. With all that the mover has said, with all that this hon. gentleman has said as to the resources of that country, as to the extent to which they might be developed, I fully and entirely concur; although, Sir, I think that the hon. gentleman, who I believe has been in the North-West himself, when he hinted that the members of the Opposition—and I think he alluded to my hon. friend here—were in the habit of alluding to Dakota and Texas at the expense of the North-West, might have recalled to his mind that it has been stated—rightly or wrongly, I do not know—that he, himself, after having examined the North-West, after having been so fully convinced of its magnificent resources, actually became a large proprietor in Texas. I do not blame my hon. friend.

Mr. IVES. I was probably convinced by the hon. gentleman and his friends.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I say, I do not blame my hon. friend; but in this case, as in many others, I think, perhaps, that practice is a little better than precept. No, Sir, I am more liberal to my hon. friend than some of his friends are to friends of mine. I do not think it is a high crime and misdemeanor on his part that he should have invested a little of his money in American property, or American securities, particularly when I say that the Americans are likely to make a good thing, as many of them have made already to my knowledge, out of this same Canadian Pacific Railway. Then, Sir, my hon. friend proceeded to what he would call an historical narrative of the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and listening to my hon. friend, I recalled a piece of advice once given to me many years ago by a very eminent practical politician. I was once called upon to draw up a statement of the affairs of an institution. This practical politician suggested to me that I had better do it by way of an historical narrative; and upon my asking him what an historical narrative really was, the practical politician remarked that an historical narrative was the best way to tell a story. Sir, it has dwelt in my mind ever since; and when I hear a gentleman refer to an historical narrative it always returns to my mind that an historical method is the best method to tell a story. Now, Sir, I do not want to complicate this discussion by a reference to the unhappy events of ten or eleven years ago, which we all deplore, and which ought to be deplored; but I think so good an advocate as my hon. friend would have done well to say nothing about Sir Hugh Allan and the causes of his failure. These causes were not creditable to Canada, but I will not dwell on them now—I do not want to dwell on them now. If, however, we find, Sir, that too much is said as to the causes why the Canadian Pacific Railway, instead of being an unmixed advantage, has been a source of danger and peril to the people of this country, we too, Sir, may have recourse to certain past events, and we may have occasion to remind gentlemen that there were causes why the original contract for the Canadian Pacific Railway did not prove a success, which are not attributable to any act of the gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman says that this road is a national necessity. Well, Sir, that is true; and no man ever recognized that fact more than my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie). But when my hon. friend was at great cost, and under circumstances of extraordinary difficulty, engaged in endeavouring to open up that country, in a way which everybody, as this hon. gentleman truly said, now sees was his plain and bounden duty, we, on this side, can recollect how he was denounced—not

to do him justice, by the hon. Minister of Railways, but by the very men who are now the colleagues of these hon. gentlemen—for his extravagance in going on with the road between Prince Arthur and Winnipeg.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, some of them did; and the press did pretty extensively. More than that, the Pembina Branch was denounced. It was said that he was going to make a connection with American railways; and I see before me some of the hon. gentlemen who specially denounced my hon. friend, because, Sir, he was going to create a monopoly by leasing the Pembina Branch for seven or eight years to certain gentlemen, who, if I remember aright, now have a monopoly for twenty years. It is true that this road is a national necessity; but it is a *non sequitur* that we are bound to construct this road at all hazards, within a time shorter than the contract calls for. But, Sir, if it be so all-important that this road is to be built in two years, how comes it that in the Resolutions before us, that in the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways, and in the speech of this hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives), we hear nothing about any obligation being imposed on the Company to build it in two years? I do not see the clause. Is it to be put in at a subsequent stage? We are told that the Company will build it when it suits the Company's convenience. I see plenty of obligations on our side, but none on the part of the Company; but if it is so important to build it in two years, why should not some obligation be imposed by these hon. gentlemen on the Company to do so? My hon. friend very properly pointed out that the grades of this road for some considerable distance west of Winnipeg were good grades, that they do not exceed 40 feet to the mile. But my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie), if I remember aright, had laid out a line on which the grade would hardly have run to 40 feet, at least for a long distance west of Winnipeg. The question is not what are the grades over the prairie section, or even close to the summit of the Rocky Mountains; but what I should like to know, and what the House and the country would like to know is, what are the grades you are going to get when crossing those difficult passes in the neighbourhood of the Kicking Horse Pass? We have been informed—I hope incorrectly—but we have been informed, and it has been publicly asserted over and over again, that the grades in that region range to something as high as 116 feet to the mile for several consecutive miles; and I am informed by my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) that the hon. Minister made that statement himself last year. That is a serious consideration. I should be glad if it should be found that this is a mistake, and I hope that better grades may be obtained; but if such grades are required it is a very serious argument against the propriety of the southern route, and against the propriety of having taken that particular Pass through the mountains. The hon. gentleman tells us that on the eastern section there was only a gap of 447 miles to be constructed. Well, Sir, only a gap of 447 miles may not alarm him; but it does seem to me—recollecting that that is about the length of the Intercolonial Railway as originally constructed by us—that a gap of 447 miles is a rather serious gap; and I may be pardoned in hinting that there is a possibility that that road will take a good deal more than two years more in construction. Now, Sir, I do not suppose that the hon. Minister or the engineers would deliberately deceive the House on this point. Every one of us, who has seen these great public works going on, knows that this question of time is a difficult question, unless, indeed, in the case of work done in an open country like a prairie country; and I submit that, even if we grant this large sum which is asked of us, there is little absolute certainty that the road will be finished in two, three, or even four years from this date. The hon. gentleman gave, as one reason for the increased

cost of constructing this road, that there was a great increase in the wages of labouring men. Sir, there ought to be a great increase in the wages of labouring men, seeing that everything these labouring men have to purchase is, by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, greatly increased in price; and I wish, with all my heart, Sir, that at this present moment it were true that the labouring men of Canada, from one end to the other, were in receipt of increased wages, instead of—as I fear too many of them are—without wages at all, or living on half wages.

An hon. MEMBER. They were in your time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, they were in my time. There is no doubt that at that time, when a great wave of commercial depression had spread over this continent, and when things were ten times worse in the United States than in Canada, we shared in that depression; and there is no doubt also, if the hon. gentleman wants to know it, that that depression was greatly aggravated by the misconduct of hon. gentlemen opposite, who piled up the expenditure of the country to many times more than was required, and left behind them many obligations to be carried out by my hon. friend beside me when he came into office.

Mr. RYKERT. What about the shield? Which side of the shield is that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sir, the hon. gentleman asks, do we desire to check the progress of Canada for six years? No, Sir, we do not desire to check it; and it is for that reason that we object to imposing these uncalled-for and monstrous burdens on the people. We can recollect what followed that insane line of policy in times gone by. We do not want to see it repeated now. Sir, the hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that there were grave reasons why this road should be in difficulties; and foremost among these was the opposition which the Liberal party have given to the Canadian Pacific road. The Liberal party, Sir, neither in office nor out of office, have ever given opposition to the construction of the Canadian Pacific road, to the development of the North-West, or to the acquisition of that territory; but they have opposed, and always will oppose, those measures which, under pretence of opening and developing that country, are calculated to strangle and retard it. That is the position of the Liberal party; and it does not lie in the mouths of those hon. gentlemen—who, as I recollect, were very slow, even in 1867, if the testimony of one of their own colleagues is to be believed, to take any steps to acquire the North-West Territory—I say it does not altogether lie in their mouths, or in those of their supporters, to say that the Liberal party were ever indifferent to the acquisition of that territory. He says the course of the Liberal party has aggravated the cost of the road. Sir, we will discuss that question by-and-bye. He says they found fault with the high rates charged all over the North-West. He says they found fault with the land policy and the Tariff policy of the Government. Sir, it is true that we said, and say, that the land policy, the Tariff policy, and the high rates combined, have done a great deal to check the development of the whole North-West. We say that we are prepared to maintain it, we believe it, and it is true; and there is no better proof of it to be found at this moment than that all over the North-West, thinly scattered as the people are, we have seen them during the past three months meeting together in every village and hamlet, to formulate their demands for just that policy which the Liberal party have advocated. The hon. gentleman cannot see that it at all impairs our security, or injures the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the Company should have undertaken great obligations with respect to other roads—obligations not properly coming within the limits of their contract. Now, Sir, that may have been a wise, or an unwise policy; but if these roads are not going to be

profitable, if large sums are going to be drawn year by year from the resources of the Company in order to pay obligations on that score, I would like to know from the hon. gentleman, as a man of business, how it is no concern of ours, or how it does not, *pro tanto*, more or less impair our security. Sir, the hon. gentleman said one thing that I thought might well have been spared, if my ears served me correctly. He spoke of my hon. friend here as a man who had the Grand Trunk road for a client. Does the hon. gentleman think that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have no paid advocates on the floor of this House—no gentlemen who are concerned to promote the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway—that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have no friends in court or in Cabinet? Does the hon. gentleman think that my hon. friend here is likely to be affected in the discharge of his public duty by what either one or other of the great railway corporations can say to him? If so, all I can say is that he might have learned better during all the years that they have sat together in this Parliament. But he admitted that although the attacks of the Liberal party were bad, they were not a circumstance to the attacks of the Liberal press. As to the Liberal press, he had hardly any words too strong to convey his disapprobation of their conduct towards the North-West and towards the railway. Now, Sir, I am not responsible, nor are my friends responsible, for all that the press of Canada choose to say. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite would like to be held responsible—at least, I hope they would not—for all that their press choose to say about the North-West, or about other public subjects. But let me point out this: that if the Liberal press have felt it their duty, in the interests of reform, to expose the defects in the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, all the reforms which have taken place in the North-West, and all the reverses in the policy of the Government—and they have been only too few and far between—have come because that same Reform press have exposed the misgovernment of the present Administration and called out for reform; and the people of the North-West are indebted, and know that they are indebted, to the action of that press for many of the benefits which they have thus far received. Sir, these hon. gentlemen have curious notions of public duty. To listen to them, one would suppose that, no matter what facts come to our knowledge, we are bound to remain silent, because, if we say anything it may not suit the pleasure or the plans of hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, we are bound, both in this House and in the press, not to say one word falsely against hon. gentlemen—not to say one word untruly in derogation of that country; and I do not believe the Liberal press, knowingly at any rate, have ever done so; but we are not to keep silent as to the misdeeds of the hon. gentlemen. On the contrary, we are sent here as members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, for the express purpose—and it is no sinecure—of exposing those hon. gentlemen's iniquities.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You had a hard race to get here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think so. Hon. gentlemen opposite are good enough to clear the way for us. They resign, we are told, after the same way that some public servants resign when they get a broad hint to quit. Now, my hon. friend was good enough to hold up the American press as an example to us. It is creditable to the American press that they always have a keen sense of the honour of America. I would, with all my heart, that the whole Canadian press had the same sense of what is due to the honour of Canada, for if they had we would never see the hon. gentlemen sitting where they now sit. My hon. friend gave us many valuable details which I propose to study at my leisure. I have not time—not because I think

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

them significant, but because of the somewhat elaborate character of those details—to go over them now. But he said one or two things which, I think, slipped out of my hon. friend's mouth in the hurry of argument. He hinted to us that there were other very important reasons why this measure should pass. Why, he told us you must pass this measure because, if you do not, look at the effect—not on the country—but the effect it will have on the Conservative party, so-called. There, I think, is the explanation, no doubt, of a good deal of the hurry and anxiety which has been displayed to saddle the country unnecessarily with an expenditure of \$30,000,000 of money. Then he went into a little calculation which, I confess, I was astonished the hon. Minister of Railways did not favour us with. Why, cannot any man see what a profitable transaction this is going to be? The hon. gentleman opposite showed, by a process of his own, that this railway, on which we are spending about \$103,000,000, as he said himself, is not going to cost us that after all, but is only going to cost us \$30,000,000. I am not going to analyze that statement, but I am going to point out this to the House. This is going to be, no doubt, a very practical transaction. We are borrowing at 4 per cent. and are going to lend out at 5, so that there will be \$300,000 a year on a capital of \$7,500,000 to the good. I am astonished the hon. Minister of Railways did not include this \$7,500,000 in the profits we are going to get out of the transaction, but no doubt he will do so afterwards. The hon. gentleman behind me tells us that, according to his calculation, the railway will cost \$75,000,000. Well, it may cost somebody \$75,000,000; but all I can say is that I can see no way by which, supposing we spend these \$30,000,000, and the road afterwards should fall into our hands, it will cost us less than \$98,000,000. It will cost us \$28,000,000 for the sections we shall construct, \$5,000,000 for the surveys and other incidental expenses, \$25,000,000 we are going to pay in cash subsidy, \$10,000,000 from our own lands—not the Company's lands—and add to these the \$30,000,000, and you will find that whoever will build the road for \$75,000,000—if it be built for \$75,000,000—the cost to the people of Canada will not be one penny less than \$98,000,000. If the hon. gentleman wants to know where I got the calculation of \$100,000,000, he will find that his own statements brings out the result almost exactly and identically with this sum which I named some ten or twelve years ago. The hon. gentleman tells us that the cost is going to be far below his calculation. Well, it may or it may not. In all these matters I would recommend the hon. gentleman to wait till the road is finished, and until the bill is paid. Then, and not until then, will we know what the Canadian Pacific Railway has cost the people of Canada. But the hon. gentleman advances one rather extraordinary proposition. He tells us that the country has no interest in knowing what the construction company may have received for this road. Well, I cannot agree with that. I think, on the other hand, that the country has the greatest interest in knowing what the construction company has received; and what the road was likely to cost had the terms made with the construction company been carried out. Now, I made the calculation which I now submit under correction. A very few hours ago, for the first time, I had placed in my hands those important documents which show the terms of the contract with the construction company. Well, if I have made a mistake, if I have erred in this important particular, I must say that it is scarcely fair, on the verge of a great debate, to call upon any of us to make somewhat intricate calculations in order to see what were really the terms which were accorded by the Canadian Pacific Railway to this construction company. But as far as I can see, that Company were to have received, according to the statement placed on the Table by the hon. Minister—although I am sorry to say not yet printed for the

use of hon. members—for what they call there the eastern section—which is not precisely the same as the eastern section mentioned in the contract—the \$14,000,000 in cash and \$20,000,000 in paid-up stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That distance I make 610 miles. There again I am open to correction, if wrong. Assuming the stock to be saleable at 60 cents on the dollar, that would equal \$26,100,000 to be paid the construction company for the construction of that part of the eastern section to which I have referred. I find that we shall have built the western section, which extends from a certain point near the Saskatchewan to the Kamloops. I find that for that, the construction company were to receive \$17,800,000 and \$25,000,000 of stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now that distance is 605 miles, as I make it, and the sum which, for the western section, the Company were to receive amounts, taking the stock as before at 60 cents, to \$32,880,000. We are, as I say, at a great disadvantage. These papers have been given to us only within a few hours. We are called on to analyze them, to compare them, and without the proper information, to enter on this debate. But it appears from the statement of the hon. Minister himself, that the construction company were paid, for the work they did on the eastern section, the sum of \$46,500,000, allowing the 40 miles west of Callander previously constructed, and allowing for that at the price of the Algoma Mills Branch, which was \$20,000 a mile. Therefore, this follows: that the cost of finishing this eastern section, as described in this contract, would amount, taking the stock, as I say, at 60 cents, to \$21,360,000, while in the same way we find that they appear to have received for the work they did on the western section, which again I observe is not the same as we would call the western section in the old contract, the sum of \$91,300,000, assuming that the prairie work for 615 miles from Winnipeg had cost about \$14,000 a mile. The result is this, and here I am going on the figures of the hon. Minister of Railways, that the total cost of the western section in money and stock, would have amounted to \$32,880,000; the balance to build it would have amounted to \$22,530,000; the balance to complete the eastern section would have amounted to \$21,360,000, or a total to complete the two sections, and finish the railway, of \$43,890,000, to which should be added for equipment, not included in the above, a sum of about \$2,700,000, so that it would appear that, to carry out the contract with the construction company they would have to have received, according to that very contract laid on the Table, \$46,590,000 more than they have received. Now, Sir, this follows: We are told that, including equipment, the present estimate is that the whole thing can be finished for \$27,000,000 and, including the real value of the materials, less fuel and general stores, which appears to amount to \$2,720,000, all the work could be done for \$29,720,000. Now, Sir, there is a difference there, between the sum the construction company were to have received and the sum which the present estimate shows is required to close the road, of just about \$17,000,000; and I have this question to put: If this contract with the construction company was a fair and reasonable contract, how are you going to finish this road for \$29,720,000? If this contract was not a fair and reasonable bargain, then the Company were going to get about \$17,000,000 too much, which would have remained practically a permanent first charge for ever, a source of high rates and a source of continually increasing difficulty in dealing with the road—a charge against, practically, the people of the North-West. Now, I do not say that that calculation is correct. I say that that is what appears to be the case on the face of the documents which have been laid on the Table to-day; and I say, if needed, there is a fresh verification of those discrepancies to which my hon. friend called attention between the statements of the Presi-

dent of the railway and the hon. the Minister of Railways and the estimates now submitted. Looking at the statements in that contract, I do not see, I confess, how this matter can be evaded. One of two things is clear. Either the cost was hugely under-estimated when the contract with this construction company was let, or else, if that statement be correct, the cost of this road will vastly exceed the \$27,000,000 which the Minister and the president now think is all that is likely to be called for from us. The hon. gentleman also raised a question, if I remember aright, as to what profit the original holders of the stock were going to get if the stock was given to them at 40 cents in the dollar. Well, Sir, I observe that the statement is that they issued thirty millions so as to net 52½ cents on the dollar. Now, if this thirty millions were sold at 52½ cents, and the Syndicate got their twenty-four millions for forty, it does appear to me that there was a reasonable profit on the transaction.

Mr. IVES. Forty-six.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; forty-six was the average on the whole fifty-five millions, and these papers, which I presume the hon. gentleman had as well as myself, admit that the twenty-four millions were issued at forty. As I said before, not having had the documents printed, and only having had a chance of looking at them two or three hours ago, I am open to correction if I make mistakes, but that is how I read them and that is how he will find it is written there. And, if this price, which is now fifty-six, is so disastrously low and ought to go up to sixty, let me remind him that there would be at sixty a moderate profit of about 50 per cent., if you make the purchase at forty. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that, unless that discrepancy in the accounts of the construction company is explained, we have made out an extremely strong case for investigation and enquiry into this matter. As I said before, I do not know whether those statements are absolutely correct or not, but I do say that, if it appears *prima facie*, on documents laid on the Table of this House, that, apparently at any rate, the construction company were going to receive about \$17,000,000 more than the road is now estimated to cost, we have great need to be careful and prudent in our dealings either with the Company that were going to put their affairs in the hands of this construction company, or of the Government which sanctioned that procedure and, until to-day, refused us all information as to what that company were doing or who that company were. And now, Sir, I come to what appears to me to be another and a more serious reason for pleading for delay. It is not merely the marvellous sumerset which the Government have contrived to make in this matter. Ten weeks ago, we were told that, among the other wonderful evidences of the financial genius of this Government, was the fact that they were going to extract \$24,500,000—I like to be particular—from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which would put them in the proud position of saying to English capitalists, when the Minister went there to refund the Canadian debt of 1885: We can do without you; we and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have provided \$24,500,000 with which to redeem all the debt that comes due in 1885. Now, a wonderful change has come over the spirit of the hon. gentleman's dream. Instead of borrowers of \$24,000,000, we are to be lenders of \$30,000,000, with results which, I fear, will not be altogether to his liking when he goes, as he shortly must, to visit the London market in the capacity of a borrower. I think it is quite right and quite proper that the hon. Minister of Railways should have, at an early day, laid these Resolutions before the House. I think we should have full discussion of them; but I think the Government owe it to the House, owe it to the country, and owe it to themselves

that, before they go further in this matter, they should also have the regular annual financial discussion and exposition of the real state and position of this country. All these gentlemen, through the press and in the House, have been dwelling long and loud on the magnificent surplus which the hon. gentlemen had piled up last year. Well, if that surplus was properly obtained, on which, later on, though not to-night, I shall have something to say, it would have been just cause for congratulation; but the House knows now, and the country knows, that the surplus is very fast vanishing from us. The returns which were laid on the Table of the House, scarcely two weeks ago, show that our revenue on the 20th January was \$2,000,000 less than our revenue of the corresponding period last year, and our expenditure \$1,000,000 more. If that process goes on for another six months, the hon. Minister will have no very great amount of surplus to dispose of. More, Sir; we are asked to incur a great liability, and we ought in all conscience to know where to stand. To many, if not to most people, the situation appears to have elements of serious risk. Sir, we have seen within the last few years the most extraordinary fluctuations in the trade and commerce of this country. We have seen—not once but twice over—fluctuations, within a couple of years, of the imports to the extent of \$34,000,000. We have seen the imports reduced from a sum even larger, I believe, than they now are likely to attain—we have seen them reduced by about \$6,000,000. And, Sir, the hon. Minister has over and over again declared that his policy is to reduce the imports. He has told us many times that the object of his policy is to make our exports exceed our imports. If he succeeds in that policy—if, during the next year or two, our exports do exceed our imports, then the hon. gentleman, though he may be proud of the success of his policy, will have to confess to a reduction of many millions of Customs receipts. To have large Customs receipts you must have large imports, and it is part of the hon. gentleman's policy that we should not have large imports. He has constantly told us that the imports are too great, and they must be reduced. He has pointed to it as a source of danger; he has pointed, I repeat, to a year in which the imports and exports balanced, as a period in which he takes the most pride, as proving the success of his policy. And, Sir, I say that if his policy does prove successful, if he does succeed in effecting the balance of trade, which he has spoken of so often and so long, then the hon. gentleman will find himself with a largely increased expenditure, and a vastly diminished revenue. Moreover, Sir, I say that this is a time specially inopportune for going on the English market with a very large loan. The House will remember that, on the first of January next, we have to provide for the redemption of nearly \$30,000,000 debt. That debt is at a high figure, and the hon. gentleman has publicly announced, and very properly, his intention of redeeming this debt. He went over to England last year to make arrangements for the redemption of this debt, and the issue of a Canadian loan on better terms. Now, I want to point out how dangerous a thing he is doing if he is going to assume all these liabilities within a period of two years. He has got, as it is, to pay \$30,000,000. He has got, as it is, to provide the sum of \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 additional subsidy; and he now proposes to add to that a further loan of \$22,500,000. Well, Sir, I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman cannot borrow this \$65,000,000 or thereabouts, within the space of two years; but I do mean to tell him that he will strain his credit somewhat in the operation, and that it is scarcely within the bounds of possibility that he will borrow these large sums of money within the time he requires on anything like as favourable terms as he could if he were to let this transaction alone, and borrow in the market as it stands, undisturbed by bringing in this further loan. Now, that is

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

a proposition so plain that I am quite sure no hon. gentleman opposite will be disposed to dispute it; and it shows that this advance of \$22,500,000 is, therefore, likely to cost us a considerable sum more than its nominal amount. He will fail considerably, I believe, of obtaining as good terms as we do obtain, and as we might obtain. I was in hopes the hon. gentleman might have been able to place our new loan on terms which would have involved a considerable reduction in the permanent charge to this country. He may, and I hope he will be able to do it still. But I point out to him, and I point out to the House, that his success in doing so will be greatly imperilled by assuming, first, the necessity of providing this additional \$13,000,000 within two years, and next, of the necessity of needlessly borrowing \$22,500,000 more. Sir, the House will recollect that for the last four or five years we have been piling up expenditure after expenditure at the rate, very nearly, of \$2,000,000 a year. Now, Sir, you cannot go on doing that for ever. You may, under certain favourable circumstances, succeed in doing it without injury for two or three years together, but the end of that thing comes very soon. We have also been piling up liabilities. We have had to meet all sorts of demands. An Act was passed last Session which, I will venture to say, unless it is taken off the Statute Book, will cause ultimately an addition of many other millions to the indebtedness of the country. Then, we see from declarations in this House—we see in the newspapers of a certain Province, we see in every direction, that one of the great Provinces of the Dominion is seriously dissatisfied with its financial position, and that it is not likely to consent to this \$30,000,000 being given unless other and greater concessions are made, unless other and still greater liabilities are incurred. If we give this \$30,000,000 we shall have to give many other millions to satisfy the demands—it is not my purpose to discuss them now—which are likely to be made upon us by the supporters of the Ministry coming from that Province. Now, what is the pretext for all this haste? Surely this road, as Lord Lorne truly said, was as richly dowered as ever railroad was on the earth. The late Governor General of Canada, speaking, no doubt, as he had been inspired by his Ministers—and, perhaps, with the High Commissioner at his elbow, or not far off it—that nobleman declared publicly that he had unbounded faith, I think he said, in the future of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he instanced, in proof of that, the extraordinary concessions—and he rightly called them extraordinary—the extraordinary donations that had been granted by the Government to that railway. Now, Sir, we have a right to ask, what has become of this \$10,000,000 for land sales, of this \$20,000,000 for stock sales? I have shown, with reference to the construction company, where some portion of that may have gone. Surely every supporter of the hon. gentleman opposite who chooses calmly to consider these matters, must see that we are needlessly imperilling what they say is a most excellent financial position, that we are needlessly taking very serious burdens upon ourselves, and I may recall to their minds, Sir, an offer from gentlemen who were quite as good as the gentlemen of the Canadian Pacific Railway—although I have a very high opinion of most of the gentlemen who form that Company—an opinion which is not always shared by hon. gentlemen opposite. I say, Sir, we can recollect when another company came down with an offer to build that road for many millions less money, and for many millions less land. They were refused, and the reason assigned was this: That the men with whom the Government were dealing were men of such unlimited and unbounded resources that it was wise to give them many millions more than the other company asked, and to give them most extraordinary concessions, and privileges, and monopolies, which have justly excited so much discontent, not merely

in the North-West, but through the whole of the old parts of Canada. Now, Sir, I am free to confess that the energy which has been displayed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been very great. I am free to confess, Sir, that those gentlemen have shown wonderful spirit in the prosecution of their enterprise. But I cannot go the length of saying, with hon. gentlemen opposite, that they have committed no error. I think, on the contrary, they have committed the very common error of grasping at rather too much and thereby imperilling the very excellent bargain which I still maintain they originally made with the Government. What is the practical result of all this? Suppose we granted those \$30,000,000, we know, everybody knows, that we bind up our credit to a great extent with that Company, and what is equally clear is this, that we encourage that Company to run all manner of unnecessary risk, to make a very unnecessary degree of haste, and in all probability to spend a great deal more money than it would otherwise really require to spend. I look upon this present demand, I say frankly, simply as an instalment—the first instalment; but I very much fear that there may be a second, a third and perhaps a fourth instalment that Canada may have to pay. Sir, I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite ever look at the Public Accounts, or do they put implicit faith in their leaders, because if they ever do condescend to look at this document which I hold in my hand, they will find among the assets of the people of Canada a sum of \$25,607,393.33, which, to my knowledge, has stood there for twenty years, and which represents a certain advance made to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. Sir, if this goes on, let a second line be put there with plenty of room below it, and begin with the advance of \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of Canada. Now, my friends from the Maritime Provinces may not be as well aware of the past history of old Canada as I am, and my friends around me; but there is a lesson there for us on which we will do well to ponder. It is just thirty years ago, as nearly as I recollect, since the Grand Trunk Railway Company was applying to the old Parliament of Canada for concessions, almost exactly identical, demanded for almost the same reasons, and in almost the same language, from gentlemen who then acted as the Government of Canada. Sir, I can recollect myself seeing in the public prints—I was not then a member of Parliament—how the men who advocated those claims pointed out the vast importance it was to Canada to have that road pushed through at railroad speed, the vast importance and immensely good results that would flow, and how safe the people of Canada were in going through the mere form of endorsing the Grand Trunk paper and of lending their credit to the Grand Trunk Company; and we can all recollect what the result of that liberality on the part of the people of Canada was. It is true that the Grand Trunk has, in the long run, been of very considerable benefit to the people of Canada. But the early years of the history of the Grand Trunk show that it was terribly disastrous, not merely to the shareholders, but to the people of Canada. And why? Because of the ruinous extravagance and because of divers political complications into which it had got, and it was only when the Grand Trunk ceased to be the milch cow of certain political adventurers that it had a chance of restoring itself.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the Grand Trunk is likely to be the milch cow of hon. gentlemen opposite, or of other gentlemen. As the hon. gentleman beside me remarked, they have other cattle on hand. The hon. Minister was good enough to quote my calculation as to the cost of the road to the country. Suppose the road is foreclosed; suppose that, after advancing

\$30,000,000, we have to take it, what is the result? It is this: Upon the hon. gentleman's own showing, that road will cost the country within a fraction of \$100,000,000, which I estimated would be the cost under very much more disadvantageous circumstances. And here let me say as to all those calculations, that it is utterly absurd to apply a calculation made ten, eight, or even five years ago to the cost of construction to-day. Everybody who knows anything about the progress of the North-West knows that a few years there will do more than three or four times that length of time in an ordinary forest country, and consequently even if the estimate were incorrect, it would be no reflection on my hon. friend here (Mr. Blake) or my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) that we overstated the cost under a contract which was to be completed several years ago. But there is another very serious consideration which I commend to the attention of hon. members, especially of the North-West representatives in this House. It appears to me it has been so far utterly overlooked by the hon. Minister. That hon. gentleman stated, and stated most truly, that the construction of branch lines in adequate quantity in the North-West, was a matter of first rate importance. He said, and he said truly, that branch lines were often of greater importance than many portions of the main line, and there again I entirely concur with him. This point, it seems to me, has been wholly overlooked. I do not believe if you insist on the Company rushing the road through within the next two or three years, the Company will be able to spare a thought or a dollar, except on compulsion, on the construction of any branch line. You have taken away most improperly, as I conceive, from the people of that country, the power of constructing the branch lines for themselves, and the advocates of the Canadian Pacific Railway say, and there is truth in that plea, that by what you are now doing you will deprive them of any power to do anything else than go on with the prosecution of the main line. Judging from what we hear and know, if these Resolution pass, and if the Company is to construct the line within two years, then there appears to be no reasonable prospect whatever of the North-West being supplied with those branch lines which they have a right to demand either from the Company or the Government, because the Company and the Government had absolutely prevented the construction of those lines, except by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves. Moreover, I say if you are going to do this, you should certainly readjust all the other terms of the contract. I cannot accept the concession indicated by the hon. Minister of Railways as a concession at all. As the hon. gentleman truly said, two or three years hence he proposes—he gave no pledge and put the Government under no binding obligation—to cease illegally and unconstitutionally exercising the veto power to the detriment of the Legislature of Manitoba. That is no concession at all. There is nothing in that which the people of Manitoba can accept as a boon or as something for which they should be called upon in any degree to be thankful; it is giving back what is justly theirs, and what should never have been taken away from them. Sir, probably the House will pardon me for going back on a subject on which I have recently been speaking. I feel very strongly the risks to which hon. gentlemen are committing this country. I have seen this country once or twice in a very good financial condition. I have seen that financial position utterly thrown away by reckless and insane expenditure, and by the reckless and insane incurring of liabilities.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say that hon. gentlemen who support a Finance Minister who, in six years, from 1867 to 1874, added \$10,000,000 a year to the annual expenditure, and left a further liability of \$60,000,000, and who has since added \$8,000,000 a year to the annual

expenditure, should know well what great risks the country runs from such insane expenditure. But, Sir, these gentlemen have a record, at least some of them have—which it is well for the House to remember. Canada in 1853-54-56 was in a good financial position. It was in as good a financial position relatively then, as the Dominion is to-day. Sir, as I say, we chose to incur, rashly and recklessly, claims and liabilities for the great railway enterprises of that day, and what was the result? The result was that in 1853 the receipts of old Canada were \$5,250,000, and the expenditure of old Canada \$8,600,000; that they had a large deficit of 60 per cent in proportion to their expenditure; that in 1859 they had a deficit of \$1,500,000. That condition of things went on through 1860-61-62, and only ceased when the present leader of the House was, for that and other offences, turned out of the Government of that day. There we all saw written, in pretty large characters in our history, what was the result, even in a very prosperous condition of things, of incurring those unparalleled expenditures. But hon. gentlemen can find out for themselves what would be the position of affairs if these same results are repeated to-day, as they are not unlikely to be repeated. It is our duty on this side of the House to warn them and the people of Canada, that although we do not undertake to make predictions either of seven years' prosperity or of seven years' depression; although we have not the spirit of prophecy descending upon us in that matter, still it is sometimes safe, as a warning, to point out what has actually occurred in the past, and that wise and prudent men would not altogether overlook those lessons, particularly at a time like this. Sir, I say that the whole business is a fitting climax to the antecedents of this railway. I have always held and I now repeat, although a great continental railway was a very desirable thing in itself, although I agree with the hon. Minister of Railways that we require a railway, that it is worth considerable sacrifices for, still I say that the terms of the original bargain with British Columbia, which was opposed by me, opposed by hon. gentlemen here present and others who are not now here, was an act of such indiscretion and folly that it has hung like a millstone ever since around the necks of the people; that it has led to national disgrace in one or two instances, and that at the present moment it is likely to entangle us in embarrassments of which no man can reasonably expect to see the end. I say, Sir, that there was never such a sacrifice of ends to means as was manifest in the policy of the present Government with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The object of that Railway was and is—the one thing for which it was worth a dollar to the people of Canada—to assist in the development of the North-West. The policy of the Government with respect to that railway has been, intentionally or not, such as to make that railway almost a greater source of injury to the North-West than of advantage. I say, Sir, that so far as the people of the North-West and Manitoba are concerned, with the exactions, the monopolies and the restrictions which have been imposed upon them, it would have been better for them if that railway had never advanced a foot beyond Winnipeg, and that they had been allowed, by the aid of their own land, to construct their own railway. This is my deliberate opinion as regards the people of Manitoba and the North-West. I do not ignore the fact that we were bound at a reasonable rate, and on reasonable terms, to go on with our obligation and build the road for the benefit of the people of British Columbia, and also to connect it with the older Provinces. I do not ignore that fact; I do not underrate its importance. But as regards the people of Manitoba and the North-West, the impolicy of the Government, not only in regard to the railway, but their general land policy and their tariff have been such that it is doubtful, to those who know the country best and prize it most, whether the people would not have been better off had that railway not gone a

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

foot beyond Winnipeg; if only they had been allowed any reasonable aid from their own lands to build their own railways thereof. Moreover, I say this: when you are asking to vote these \$30,000,000, that does not measure your liabilities. We will suppose that there are no more instalments to pay, that this is the only demand made upon us, although if it be, it will be the first instance in the history of Canada in which such a thing has happened; but I say—and every man knows that I say the truth—that the Government are not going to carry it through without making compensations in various shapes and forms to a great many other interests in this country; and I shall deem it myself a fortunate chance if the \$30,000,000 which we pay to the railway do not require before long to be supplemented by as much more in concessions to the other claimants on the public purse, who see the opportunity and are determined to use it, and who are now attempting, as we all know, to use it. I repeat again, that if ever there was a case for caution, for prudence, for hesitation; if ever men had reason for demanding delay, if ever we had the right to be fully informed as to the exact financial position of the country, as to the exact financial position of the institution which seeks our aid, it is now; and we shall be blind and deaf to the lessons of our past history and of our dearly bought experience in old Canada, if the House consents to pass this measure without fuller and more searching enquiry, and much greater information than it now possesses.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am quite sure those of us who have been in the habit of listening to the hon. gentleman when he was in Parliament before, and who have contrasted the speech he has delivered to-night with the speeches he delivered then, must have come to the conclusion that he was arguing against his own convictions, from the time he rose until the moment he sat down. We all expected—in fact it was announced to us by the leader of the Opposition in the closing sentences of his speech—that the financial aspects of this question were to be dealt with by some one; and as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has been brought into Parliament again, by the confession of the present leader and the ex-leader of the party, in order to deal with financial questions, we had right to assume that he was the person who would so deal with this particular subject. Sir, those who have listened to him to-night will agree with me, I think, in saying that he was certainly not doing himself justice in the manner in which he has treated this question. From the opening sentence to the close of his speech, we have had haphazard statements—statements which were evidently not the result of reflection; and, for one, I have come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman, against his own convictions, believing that the scheme which is now before Parliament is, in the position in which we stand, the best scheme that could be adopted for the completion of this railway and for the interest of this country, was forced to implement the promise made by his leader, and to deal without preparation with the subject to which he has just addressed himself. Sir, what have we heard from that hon. gentleman? With the single exception of his reference to the construction company and the great profits that company would have enjoyed, had they gone on with the work, which they did not do, we have had scarcely a reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway at all. We have had references to other subjects. We have had references to the conduct and character and career of the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman has gone back to the history of old Canada. For the benefit of the hon. members from the Maritime Provinces he has gone back to 1852, in order to establish that from that date downward the career of the Conservative party, its policy in the administration of the affairs of this country was a policy to the detriment of the country and tending

to extravagance in the expenditures of the country. And yet, Mr. Speaker, what will our friends from the Maritime Provinces say when I tell them that during the whole of those years that hon. gentleman was a humble follower of the Conservative party?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just say that it is not true.

Mr. WHITE. Not only a follower, but a traditional Tory in this country—one of those old blue-blood Tories—one of the men who had nothing but contempt for those common-place people who are commonly called Radicals—that this hon. gentleman from the day he entered Parliament, and for many days after—until the leader of the Government committed the heinous offence of believing that another hon. gentleman would make a better Finance Minister than himself—until that day that hon. gentleman supported the party whose policy, he says, from 1852 onwards, was a policy tending to the injury of this country, and to reckless and extravagant expenditure. Sir, we had also some reference to the Grand Trunk Railway. The hon. gentleman alluded to the early history of the Grand Trunk Railway, and he held up the fact that we have not yet got back the guarantee which was given to that Company, as a proof that it is utterly impossible that we can get back this guarantee. Does the hon. gentleman know anything of the history of the Grand Trunk Railway? Does he know anything of the circumstances under which that guarantee was given? Will he pretend to tell this hon. House that there is any similarity whatever between the guarantee given to the Grand Trunk Railway and the advance now proposed to be made to the Canadian Pacific Railway? Sir, in 1852, the Grand Trunk Railway Company got its charter. At that time, as everyone knows, we were in the midst of a fever for railway construction. The then leader of the Conservative party, the hon. gentleman's leader at that time, declared that his policy was railways, sitting, as he did at that time, as leader of the Opposition. The Government issued, through Lord Elgin—and I presume the Government were to some extent responsible for the utterances of Lord Elgin, even in the despatches he sent to the Home Government—issued a paper setting forth the great prospects of this country. A prospectus was issued bearing, if not the direct, certainly the indirect endorsement of the Government of this country, promising to those people in England who should put their money into the Grand Trunk Railway, a dividend of 11 per cent. at least. The Government guaranteed £3,000 a mile for the railway, and took a first lien upon it as security. But we all know that when the road came to be built, when the results came to be ascertained, it was found that instead of its paying the 11 per cent. then promised, there was no percentage at all for the people who had embarked their money in the enterprise; and when the question came before the people and the Government of Canada, as to what was to be done with regard to that guarantee, it presented itself in this form: Here were men in England who, on the strength of a prospectus practically issued by Canada—backed, as it was, by the Governor General, by Her Majesty's representative in this country—put their money into that work, without any hope of getting it back again, and without any interest whatever, except the interest which they expected to get in the form of a dividend from the working of the railway. There was Canada, with a railway built with English money, and benefited by the rapid development of every interest in the country which followed immediately after its construction; and the question which presented itself to us, as honest men, was this: ought we to exact the pound of flesh? Ought we, who have derived, and are deriving all the direct and indirect advantages resulting from the expenditure

of that money in our midst—from the expenditure of the money itself, and the development of the country through that expenditure—ought we to exact our interest before the people in England get a dollar? And the people of Canada did what I am satisfied, if the conditions existed, they would do again—what I believe, as honest men, it was their bounden duty to do—they took the ground that they would wait at any rate until the Company were able to pay dividends to their shareholders before they would exact their claim from the Company. It is true, that amount stands to-day among the public assets of this country; and I am not certain that, with the magnificent development of that railway—as a Canadian, I sincerely hope that that development will go on—the time may come when that Company will pay dividends to its shareholders, and when the claim of the people of Canada, under the circumstances, will revive. But what comparison is there between our position with reference to that matter and the relation in which we stand to this advance? Why, Sir, what is it which is proposed at this moment? It is this: We have a railway, a large proportion of which is built; its net earnings amount to nearly \$1,000,000 a year; we have already given large subscriptions to it; we are under no obligation to anybody connected with it, and either directly or indirectly, to treat that Company otherwise than the terms of their contract require; and when we place this money at their disposal, taking security for its return, I say we do it without laying ourselves open to the danger that the people of Canada will not be repaid. But we have given to other roads, as well as to the Grand Trunk. The hon. gentleman knows that the Great Western got an advance at the same time, and he knows that a great portion of that advance has been repaid.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That has all been repaid.

Mr. WHITE. I do not know whether it has all been repaid, but a great part of it has been. It was the subject of correspondence between Sir John Rose, when he was Finance Minister acting for the Government of Canada, and the Great Western Railway Company, and a large portion was certainly repaid. The Northern Railway Company also received an advance and we got back the money or a large part of it—why? Because both of these railways were paying interest—were successful railways—and we were therefore in a position to enforce our claim. But in this particular case we stand in a position of advancing money to an organized company with a large mileage of railway already completed, and the only question which arises is this,—is the security upon which we advance it sufficient to guard us against the possibility of loss in the future? That is the only question before us at this moment. I do not propose, Sir, to deal with the question whether it is or is not desirable that this road should be speedily constructed. We know that the people of Canada have committed themselves to the construction of this railway. We gave out this contract in 1851. We have had a general election since that time. I do not know how it was in other constituencies, but I know that in mine I had the pleasure and the honour—and I esteemed it an honour, and it certainly was a pleasure—of a visit from my hon. friend, the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), accompanied by the Premier of the Province of Ontario. We discussed for a whole afternoon the public affairs of this country; we had the Boundary Question, the Streams Bill, the Gerry-mandering Act; we had from the hon. member for East York some remarks with reference to the administration of railways by the hon. Minister of Railways, and with reference to some matters of detail connected with the public expenditure; but I think I am within his knowledge when I say that from the beginning to the close—I was not there at the opening, but a gentleman who was there told me what took

place—this question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was to have been the question that would hurl the Conservative party from power as soon as the people should have the opportunity of dealing with it, was not once referred to. I did not hear many opposition speeches, I admit, because, with the exception of that meeting, my political opponents for some reason happened not to be at the meetings I held in the constituency. But what I have to say is this, that, so far as I can know, that question had practically passed out of the arena of discussion altogether, and the people of Canada were thoroughly satisfied that the best thing had been done that could be done in the contract which had been let for the construction of the railway. Under these circumstances—the people of Canada having determined that the railway should be built—do hon. gentlemen opposite think that they are going to have the people with them in saying that it is a matter of indifference when it is built, and in saying that it is a matter of no consequence, now that a very large portion of the railway has been constructed, whether the links between them are left uncompleted or not. I venture to say that there is no man in Canada who looks fairly at the future interests of this country, who desires the development of every interest in this country, who will not say that it is a matter of the very greatest consequence, now that the railway has advanced to its present stage, that it shall be completed at the earliest possible moment. Remember that when this contract was made it was a ten years' contract. I am not going to say that if the Company had gone on—as possibly that second syndicate might have gone on, had they been awarded the contract—slowly, carefully, tentatively, just spending the dollars as they happened to get them, waiting for the whole ten years to build the road, everybody might not, to some extent, have been satisfied; because no one believed, before this time, that a railway of this kind could have been built in five years. But we have learnt differently during the last two years, and to stop the construction of the railway to-day, to even lessen the speed at which it is being constructed, would be an admission of failure, and failure to the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot take place without resulting in disaster to the people of Canada. I do not say that the Government or the people of Canada should feel themselves bound up in the interests of the gentlemen who compose the Company or the directorate of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but I do say that we are so situated in Canada, that the construction of this railway has been so identified in the public mind, not only here but in Europe, especially in Great Britain, with the prosperity and progress of the Dominion, that the stoppage of the line must mean disaster to the country itself. The hon. gentleman told us that we on this side of the House had complained of the conduct of the hon. member for East York, when he was head of the Government, in building the line from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. That was not the complaint. What we did complain of—what was complained of everywhere—was that the hon. gentleman built the two ends and left the centre section untouched—not that he built, but that he did not build a railway. That was the cause of our complaint; and what we complained of in him then we feel that the public would be entitled to complain of us now, if, after having gone so far with the construction of this railway, we were to stop the work or lessen its speed, or to refuse, with reasonable guarantee for its repayment, such an advance as might ensure the desired speedy construction. Then we are told by the hon. gentleman, contrary I think to what everybody has thought heretofore, that the railway is not such a railway as we ought fairly to expect, and we have a reference made to the gradients in the Rocky Mountains which, he says, are somewhere about 116 feet to the mile. That seems a very heavy gradient, I

Mr. WHITE.

admit. I believe it extends from the summit to the Columbia river, somewhere about 10 miles in length; but it is not as high a gradient as is to be found on the American Pacific Railways, nor as high as that which you will find on a railway which is to-day almost a controlling line in eastern and western transport—the Baltimore and Ohio road. On that railway there is a gradient much higher than this 116 feet. But I think that everyone will admit, who has been through this country—that is at least the testimony of everyone I have heard speak of it—that the railway has been substantially built, that the Company have built it in a manner indicating their intention to work it, and indicating their interest in its economical working after it is built. In that respect, at any rate, the people of this country have no reason whatever to complain. Then we are told by the hon. gentleman—and that, I admit, is a point upon which we require to have the most complete assurance and guarantee—of the difficulty of determining the time in which the railway may be completed through those difficult sections. He pointed out, very properly, that on the prairie section it is not difficult to determine how the railway might be built, and in what time it might be built, with the experience we have to-day; but that these sections which are now to be constructed are the difficult sections, and that therefore it required close calculation to determine whether we could build them within the time mentioned or not. I sincerely trust—I do not know what the intentions of the Government in the matter are—but I sincerely trust that when this bargain is implemented, that when this agreement is made, we will have in it some guarantee that the railway is to be completed in the shorter time proposed; and further, that provision will be made, by special supervision on the part of the officers of the Government itself, to see that the road is being constructed and the money being expended in such a way as will secure its construction within the stipulated time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I will say that it is never possible to embrace within Resolutions of this kind everything connected with them, but it is the intention of the Government, as is indicated therein, to provide by the Bill which will authorize the agreement for the most adequate security for the completion of the road within the time stated by me to the House, and also to provide that not a single dollar of the money advanced by the Government to the contractors for the work shall be advanced except upon the evidence that such money has gone into the road.

Mr. WHITE. I am quite sure that the assurance of the hon. Minister of Railways on these two points will be exceedingly satisfactory, not only to this House, but to the country, because the only reason, as I can understand it, for undertaking this new obligation—and obligation it undoubtedly is—is the importance of having the railway completed within the shorter time specified in the letter of the president of the railway Company, and affirmed in the statement of the hon. Minister. The hon. gentleman has referred to this construction company as affording positive proof either that the Company gave a great deal too much to the construction company, or that the amount now estimated for the completion of the railway is an amount altogether inadequate. We have not, at this moment, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, all the papers we would like to have for a discussion of a subject of this kind; but I do not regard that, as I shall show you presently, as a matter of so great consequence as the hon. gentleman does. But, Sir, I believe the fact to be that the contract with this construction company was entered into on the 12th December, 1882, that is, about fourteen months ago. Now, Sir, at that time it is well known that the Company were desirous of floating their capital, of floating their scheme;

that it was, therefore, a matter of consequence that they should have a contract made, so that the public who would invest their money in this enterprise would know reasonably what the enterprise was going to cost. There has been since that time nearly 600 miles of railway built. There have been very considerable surveys made; there have been remeasurements, and there is very much better evidence and information now than could possibly have existed at that time. We know that, so far as this construction company is concerned, they were to have taken a certain portion in cash and a certain portion in stock; but, as I believe to be the fact, so far as their work went, the expenditures which they made were simply made for them by the Company, and when they were unable to float the stock which it was their business to float, the contract was abrogated, I think in the month of October last, before there was any question whatever of applying to Parliament for an advance such as is applied for to-day.

Mr. BLAKE. About the end of November.

Mr. WHITE. I am told the deed was signed in November. But, whether it be the one month or the other, what I say to the hon. gentleman is this: that it was before any question of this kind could have arisen. It was just at the time that the Company expected that the arrangements which they had made with the Government for the guarantee of 3 per cent. for ten years, would have carried them through, and that they would have been able to complete the contract by the sale of the stock on the open market. That was the position at the time they abrogated the contract. Now that contract is abrogated. It is not a contract to-day, and under the circumstances, I do not think it is a matter of so great consequence that we should have all the details of a contract which existed for only a few months comparatively—for less than a year—under which, as I understand it, money was paid only for work actually done, which was abrogated on account of the failure of the contractors to implement their contract by selling the shares, and which is therefore a matter which, in so far as this particular arrangement is concerned, is of no value or effect whatever. What we know is this, that we have the statement of the Chief Engineer of the Department of Railways as to what the cost will be of the completion of this railway. What we know further is this, that the money which is to be paid for it, the money which we are voting, is to be paid *pro rata* as the work proceeds, having regard to the amount required for the absolute completion of the road; and that therefore, we have, in these arrangements—first, in the report of the Chief Engineer, which confirms the reports of the engineers of the Company itself, and next in the fact that the money is only to be paid out as the work proceeds—a sufficient guarantee that at any rate the money will complete the railway as is proposed. But we have further than that. I believe that the difficulties which the Company have had up to this time in selling their stock upon the open market have been due very largely to the determination on the part of rival companies to prevent the completion of this railway. The moment you prove to these rival companies, and to all interested in these rival companies, that this railway is going to be built, the moment you prove to them that the Company have been able to make arrangements by which they are practically independent of the stock market altogether in the completion of the railway, that motive at least is gone for the depreciation of the stock, and, that being the case, the investing public will have the opportunity, quietly, without influences of that kind surrounding them, of investigating the character of this enterprise, its commercial value, the probability of its paying dividends upon the stock it has issued, and how it stands

in relation to other trans-continental railways of this continent; and I believe that, before the two years are up within which this road is to be built, the stock will be at such a rate that it will be a question for the Government whether they will allow the \$35,000,000 to be sold on condition of the \$22,500,000 being repaid to the Government. But, independent of that, the assurance we have from the Chief Engineer of the Company, and the assurance we have had to-night from the hon. Minister, that there is to be proper supervision in the expenditure of this money, in such a way that it shall only be spent having regard to the completion of the railway within the amount voted, affords to us the most perfect guarantee that can be afforded in any business transactions, that the railway will be completed within that time, and for no further sum of money than is here proposed to be voted. Now, Sir, the question, and really the only important question is, what guarantee have we that this money will be repaid? Are we simply launching out \$22,500,000 or \$30,000,000—if the hon. gentlemen choose to assume that the second instalment of the purchase money of the annuities will not be paid—are we simply spending that \$30,000,000 without any prospect whatever of getting it back? Sir, we have, first, the lands of the Company. Now, I think, in view of what hon. gentlemen opposite have said as to the value of these lands, in view of the extravagant statements they have made as to the enormous subsidies which have been given to this Company, based upon an estimate all the way up to \$5 and \$7 an acre, we may fairly assume that the average price received up to this time will be realized in the future for these lands. We find that the Northern Pacific Railway, which runs through a territory very much like that of our own North-West, inferior to it as it seems to me—because they have to take the land irrespective of whether it is fit for settlement or otherwise—during the last year sold upwards of 750,000 acres of land at an average price of \$4 an acre, not counting in their town lots at all, for which they received something like \$332,000. We have the evidence of our own Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which has sold up to this time its land at \$2.36 an acre. They have sold up to this time land to the value of nearly \$9,000,000. If we receive but \$1,250,000 a year from the sale of lands—and remember that every dollar received from the sale of lands goes into the hands of trustees for the repayment of the interest and principal of the loan we are now advancing—we have the interest upon this \$22,500,000 paid to us, and the loan is not a charge upon the people of this country at all. We are practically buying back, if the worst came to the worst, about 21,000,000 of acres of the lands in the North-West, which hon. gentlemen, in estimating the subsidies given to the Company, have told us are worth \$5 an acre, and giving \$22,500,000 for them. That is practically the first security we have. You will remember, Sir, that, when this contract was let, one of the charges made against the Government, one of the complaints made with regard to the contract was this: When it was compared with the arrangements proposed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) while at the head of the Government, for the construction of this railway by a company, that gentleman's answer was: it is quite true we offered large subsidies, but we made a provision in the Act by which we could buy back the railway after it was built, at 10 per cent. over and above the cash that had been paid for it, less the subsidies in land or money which had been given to it by the Government. Now, Sir, suppose the worst came to the worst, what would be our position in this? We would practically be carrying out the very policy which hon. gentlemen opposite embodied in the Act of Parliament of 1874—we would be buying back the railway at very much less than the money put into it, deducting the subsidies received from the Government, whether in land or money.

Because, Mr. Speaker, until this money is paid back, until the country stands in the position in which it stands to-day, before we have voted this grant—until that is the case, not one single dollar can go from the sale of these lands into the pockets of the Company. It goes altogether into the Treasury of the Dominion. Under these circumstances, therefore, I think the land must be regarded as a valid security removing the arrangement altogether from the class of arrangements which we have made in the past. Then, Sir, we have, in addition to that, the \$35,000,000 of stock. When the hon. gentleman was dealing with the contracting company he chose to assume that stock at 60 cents on the dollar. If that is a fair estimate, we have in that stock enough to repay us for the advance of this \$22,500,000. And then, Sir, we have in addition to all that, a mortgage upon all the property of the Company, in addition to the property which we ourselves have contracted with them to build—because it should never be forgotten that the contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the people of Canada is for the construction of a railway west of Callander to the Pacific Ocean. Everything they do east of that is done simply as an ordinary business corporation, and Parliament has, in fact, little or nothing to do with it. We have contracted with them to build west of Callander, but we will have a mortgage, not only upon what we contracted with them to build west of Callander, but upon everything else which they have obtained, including their eastern extensions down to Montreal and Brockville, with their branches and everything connected with the railway. That I think would be looked upon by an ordinary loan company as a tolerably good security for \$22,500,000—anything better it would be difficult to imagine. We are, therefore, simply advancing that money, and holding in our hands the assets which, from year to year, as they are realized in the sales of land, must pay us interest upon them, and of which, ultimately, the securities that we take are certain to secure the absolute payment. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, are we in a position to enter into this bargain? The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House referred to the financial position of Canada. He referred to the difficulties, to the dangers, as he said, in which we stood of running too much into debt. He told us the old story of how rapidly the debt of Canada had increased from 1867 to 1873. He told us of the terrible extravagances which had characterized that increased expenditure. He did not, of course, quote to us the famous circular issued in England, in which he pointed out to investors in that country that all these expenditures inured to the advantage of the country, and were all practically money-producing investments, directly or indirectly. But, he told us of the position in which we stood, and he referred to the fact that the hon. the Finance Minister would be compelled, within the next year or two, to raise by loan something about \$50,000,000 in the English market. Well, Sir, what is that \$50,000,000 to be raised for? We know that this year, by the Estimates that have been laid on the Table, in spite of all the large expenditures which have been made, in spite of this enormous increase of the debt—which I find has even been telegraphed to England and published in the *Standard*, to warn people there from having anything to do with Canadian investments—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That was a false statement, too.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, there are no statements telegraphed to England but false statements through the American press just now, and through the ordinary channels of communication. As I was saying, we find that in spite of all this increase of expenditure from year to year, the estimates show a reduction in the charge for interest upon the people of Canada in connection with their debt, of nearly \$250,000. That is the position we will stand in next year

Mr. WHITE.

as compared with the current year. Then what are we to do? What is this money to be obtained for? It is true, the hon. the Finance Minister has to go to England, but he goes there to redeem \$33,500,000 of the debt of Canada which bears to day 5 per cent. He will be able to make an arrangement by which it will be no additional charge upon the country. It is simply an exchange of 4 per cents. for 5 per cents., and if he succeeds in doing it, he will further reduce the annual charge upon the people of this country by \$134,470 by that transaction. Is that the thing to be alarmed at? Is that an evidence that this country is over-burdening itself, is increasing its debt in such a way as seriously to imperil its future? On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, as regards \$33,000,000 of that \$50,000,000, to obtain which the hon. Finance Minister will have to go to England, it will not be an increase of our debt—measuring our debt by the annual charge upon the people, which is the true and proper way to measure it; it is actually a transaction by which we are to reduce, by over \$400,000, the charges of that debt upon the people of this country. And, as to this \$22,500,000—the balance of this money—that is a sum for which we are actually to receive five per cent. I attach no importance to the fact that we may be able to borrow money at 4 per cent. and loan it at 5 per cent. That may be an incident of this bargain. But what I do attach importance to is that this advance of \$22,500,000; that this \$33,000,000 which has to be borrowed on the English market; that this addition to our debt of \$50,000,000 which we are asked to contemplate with horror by hon. gentlemen opposite, is an addition to our public debt which, so far from increasing our annual burdens, will reduce them by about \$500,000. That is the position in which we stand financially, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to find a flaw in any single statement in connection with it. He may say: What evidence have you that you will get your 5 per cent. on the \$22,500,000? Sir, we have the evidence of 21,000,000 acres of land to be sold to settlers who may go into the country, the money coming into the Treasury of the Dominion, to be applied to the interest upon this money. So that, Sir, there is nothing, as it seems to me, in the financial position of the country to cause us any alarm; but, on the contrary, I think we may congratulate ourselves, and I think the hon. the Finance Minister may congratulate himself, upon the prospect that when he goes to the elections of 1887, with this railway completed, and running through the Dominion to the Pacific, so that people who take the train at Halifax may go to Port Moody over Canadian territory without changing cars—when he will be able to show that accomplished, while the annual charge for interest upon the public debt is less than it was in the elections of 1882—I say I think he may fairly look forward to a position stronger than that which any public man has ever occupied before the people of this country. Sir, that will form a striking contrast to the position which the hon. gentleman occupied when he left office in 1878. He talks of increasing the public debt. Does he remember that during the five years he controlled the finances of this country the public debt increased about \$40,000,000? Does he remember that every charge connected with the public debt increased enormously while he was Finance Minister? Does he remember that the people of this country were compelled to do without expenditures for those useful objects which a new and growing country like this always requires, because of the manner in which the finances were administered, and in which a policy was carried out of annual deficits instead of annual surpluses, as we have had since that time? The hon. gentleman tells us that in this country sometimes we have a great revenue and sometimes a small revenue. That is true. I think we had, for a while, a too great revenue. I do not hesitate for a

moment to say so, and I have not hesitated to make that assertion. I was among the first to warn the merchants of Canada, as a journalist, against the danger of over-importing, and the possibility of that great boom in the North-West collapsing, as unfortunately it did collapse—but, I hope, only for a short time. But I think we may fairly say, with the prospect which the completion of this railway holds out to us—with the prospect of the settlement which is certain to take place in the North-West—we may fairly look forward, under our present Tariff, with a continuance of those reductions which the hon. Finance Minister has been able to make almost ever since the Tariff was introduced in 1879, to having such resources as will enable us to carry on those reasonable works of public improvements in every part of the country, which it must be the interest of the people of Canada at large to have. One of the objections, and it seems to me the objection of which I have heard most, to this arrangement, has been that this Company has busied itself with other enterprises; that it has overburdened itself by undertaking a number of other enterprises I have no hesitation in saying that, as regards the Ontario and Quebec Railway and the Credit Valley Railway, I think it would have been better off if it had not touched them; but I am not responsible for its having touched them, for, as an independent member of Parliament, I did what I could last year to prevent the arrangement under which those lines were taken over. I cannot, however, overlook the argument of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr Ives), which is not an unreasonable one. Of those railways, the Credit Valley was already built, and the Ontario and Quebec was advancing towards completion. It was really not a question as to whether there should be opposition to the Grand Trunk or not. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as I understand their arrangement, have not put one single dollar of capital into either of those enterprises. The only enterprises into which they have put capital are those which properly belong to their great enterprise—that is, the enterprises which bring the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the seaboard at Montreal and Quebec. They have leased the other railways mentioned. They think they are advantageous to them. They believe this year they will be able, by the Ontario and Quebec, and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, which they have also leased, to carry the traffic and the immigrants to the port of Owen Sound, and make of that port, what it has never been to the same extent, a great port for the transshipping of immigrants and freight between the great West and the eastern Provinces. The Company think that is advantageous, and they have gone into it. To my mind, having regard to this particular scheme, it is a matter of no consequence whether they acted wisely or unwisely in doing it. They have done it. The Parliament of Canada has sanctioned it. The people of Canada will get the advantage of competition through a great corporation, not through a miserable, small, struggling corporation, whose owning of a railway is, perhaps, one of the greatest curses which can befall the country through which it passes, but by this great corporation they will be saved from the monopoly which hon. gentlemen opposite fear so much in the North-West; and so far as we are concerned, in connection with this particular enterprise it is a matter which does not affect it in the slightest degree. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), tells us that the construction of this railway has done more harm than good to the North-West; that the farmers of the North-West would have been better off if the Company had simply built the railway to Winnipeg and there stopped, and we had allowed them, with their own lands, to go on with the work and build the railway beyond that point. Why, we have been giving lands to private companies to build railways through that country; we have been

affording opportunities to railway companies by granting subsidies of a valuable character to build railways there, and I am not incorrect when I say that the experience, so far as the rapid construction of the railways is concerned, and as regards affording railway facilities to settlers, has not been a very assuring one. It surely is little less than an insult to the House and to this country that any hon. gentleman should rise and say he believes that the farmers in that North-West country, with whatever grievances they may have to complain of, would be better off if they had not had a railway running from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains, as they have today. It has been a matter to them of the greatest possible consequence. It is quite true they complain of their grievances, and doubtless they suffer the incidents of settlement in a new country. But it seems to me, when I look back at the early history of this country, when I remember, as I have had recounted to me personally, the records of the fathers of some of the men who have gone into the North-West and are now meeting in convention for the purpose of declaring their grievances; when I remember how those sturdy pioneers went into the backwoods of old Canada with an axe over their shoulders and hewed out for themselves a home; how these men had to carry on their own backs their bags of grain to the mill, eight or ten miles distant, in order to have it ground and take back the flour with which to feed their families; when they had to go miles and miles and leave their wives and children in the forest clearing to get the nearest doctor in order that they might have the advantage of his attention when sickness occurred; when they were removed from all the advantages and associations of civilized life, and yet when you go to Ontario today and find those old men with their families round about them, and hear them tell the story of their settlement, one cannot but feel almost indignant that their sons should be grumbling because they have not a railway to their own doors. The grievances in the North-West, what are they? Hon. gentlemen opposite have manufactured the most of them; hon. gentlemen talk about the land policy and the evils connected with it and about people leaving the North-West to go to Dakota, saying, they might there find better land regulations than in their own country—those hon. gentlemen have done more to stir up a sense of grievance among the people of the North-West than any others. One would imagine, hearing them speak, even during this debate, that the land regulations of the North-West contrast most unfavourably with the regulations in the United States. Do they so contrast? What is the fact? Here is a comparison between the Homestead Policy of Canada and that of the United States, which will show which is more favourable to settlers. In Canada, the head of a family or any male person not less than eighteen years of age is entitled to a homestead himself. In the United States he must be twenty-one years of age before he is entitled to a homestead entry. In Canada, such entry may be for any quantity not exceeding 160 acres in any land open therefor; the even-numbered sections on about 80,000,000 of the most fertile lands being free for selection. In the United States, within the railway belts, a man is only entitled to a homestead of 80 acres. In Canada a man is entitled to a pre-emption of 160 acres. In the United States pre-emptions have been abolished. In Canada he obtains his patent at the end of three years residence. In the United States not until the end of five years. In Canada he may have a second homestead entry. In the United States he cannot have a second homestead entry. In Canada he may commute, by purchase, after a year's residence. In the United States he may commute by purchase, but it is recommended at this moment that that privilege should be restricted. Now that is a contrast between the land regulations of the two countries. We hear hon. gen-

tllemen telling us, and in such a way as to induce settlers to believe it, that the people are leaving the North-West because of the land regulations, and are going into Dakota, where, presumably, they will enjoy better regulations. Let these hon. gentlemen say that something might be improved, that the Government might do differently from what they are doing; but in the name of all that is patriotic, in the name of all that is true, in the name of all that is decent, let them not say—or make their statements in regard to our country in such a way as to imply, when they say that people are going into a foreign country to escape the conditions here—let them not make them in such a way as to leave the impression that the conditions there are better than in our own country. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to say that the American press always had a keen sense of the honour of their own country, and I believe the public men of the United States always have a keen sense of the honour and prosperity of their own country. You do not find them complaining to the world of the character of the land laws of their own country; you do not find them giving to their enemies opportunities of quoting from their journals paragraphs which tend to prevent people from coming to that country. I heard of an editor at Fargo, in the northern part of Dakota, who, when driven from the lower flat of his office by the floods, went up to the upper flat and sitting on a high stool, and putting his feet on a chair, in order to keep them dry, proceeded to write. And how did he write: "Magnificent overflow of the Red River! Splendid prospect of the crops for the coming season!" That is the kind of spirit which makes the American North-West, and the opposite of it is the kind of spirit which is doing so much harm to our country. We have much more to fear to-day from the feeling which seems to prevail with hon. gentlemen opposite, that their only chance for success as politicians in this country depends on the ruin of the country. We have much more to fear in regard to this country from their doing everything they can do to depreciate the country and alarm the people who may be proposing to come here and share our lot—I say we have much more to fear from that than from the financial position of the country, or from our loaning on good security to the Canadian Pacific Railway \$22,500,000, which we are certain, by the conditions of the bargain, to get back; and for one, Sir, I have no hesitation in saying—and I have no doubt whatever what the result will be when the matter comes to be discussed by the people of this country in future—that the Government would have been recreant to their trust if, having so favourable an opportunity to secure the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they had, from timidity, from fear, from the danger of meeting with opposition to their scheme, failed to put forward their hand and secure for the people of Canada the early construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was not my intention to take part in this debate this evening, but I made certain calculations upon the figures which have been laid before this House by the hon. Minister of Railways, and I have found some discrepancies which I shall submit to the consideration of hon. members. I believe I shall be able to show that the figures which he has laid before us and which he has challenged us to examine contain grave errors. I find, in the first place, that there is a discrepancy between the figures of Mr. Schreiber and the hon. Minister of Railways as to the total receipts. The total receipts admitted by the hon. Minister of Railways are \$52,994,702, while those admitted by Mr. Schreiber are only \$21,318,222, making a difference of \$32,676,480. It may be said that this discrepancy arises from the fact that he only gives the assets had from the Government. I take the whole assets and I take them and put them at \$53,000,000, as they sum up in round numbers.

Mr. WHITE.

From the figures which I have, and which I believe to be correct, I intend to demonstrate that this Company are going to build the railway without expending one dollar out of their own pockets. If we deduct, out of the total amount of the \$54,728,500, which is the amount given by the hon. Minister of Railways as the total expenditure from Montreal to Kamloops, we find that out of these sums must be taken a number of others for different purposes, among them being the extension from Callander to Brockville, \$3,270,351; the sum of \$900,000 for rolling stock for that extension, for shops and machinery, \$516,032; for tools and machinery for the same, \$352,230. Then there is real estate for termini, \$390,790, as mentioned by the hon. Minister, and forming together the sum of \$5,428,403. Now, Sir, there is another item for extensions and acquisitions east of Callander—that is to say the Atlantic and North Western, the Canada North Western Land Company, advances for construction and sundry advances in respect to securities deposited by the Government, making another sum of \$3,966,865 to be added to that, making in round numbers the sum of \$9,395,268 of moneys expended east of Callander. Another sum of money which has not gone into the construction of the railway is the amount deposited with the Government on account of the guarantee, \$8,710,240, and another sum of \$2,128,000, retained for a 5 per cent. dividend on the stock. These divers sums amount altogether to \$20,213,508, which are to be deducted from the total amount of the expenditure, that is to say, \$58,695,365. Well what is the balance that now remains in the hands of the Company? It shows a surplus of \$14,532,834, which the Company would have had if they had not made any acquisitions east of Callander. I maintain that with this amount—and their investments east of Callander which must be profitable, and must yield them a certain amount of dividend—and with the other amounts that they will receive, over and above their total receipts of \$52,994,702, they have sufficient, apart from the loan, to build the railway within two years. But why do they come here? They come because they have sufficient influence to get what they want. They come because they want to save the interest on their money—because they want to build the road as fast as they can, and have the revenue of the road for themselves. These gentlemen want to build the road without spending one dollar out of their own pockets, and I am going to demonstrate that they are going to do so. Now, Sir, we have already given them, in round numbers, \$53,000,000. What are they going to get in the next two years, either in value or in cash? Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be astounded at the difference between his figures and mine, but I contend that investigation will lead the public to accept mine as true. In the first place, they will have the balance of the subsidy, \$12,210,789. They will have the Government works now being carried on, which the hon. Minister of Railways places at \$28,000,000, supposing that no extras will be added to the amount. They will have the proportion of \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 expended for surveys, of which I apportion to that part of the railway given to them, \$2,500,000. They will have the net revenue of the road for two years, which I place at the same figure as my hon. friend who has just sat down—\$1,250,000 a year, or \$2,500,000 for the two years. Assuming that they will only get 5 per cent. dividend from their investments east of Callander—which in reality amount to \$14,000,000, but which I place only at \$10,000,000—they will get from that source \$1,000,000. From postal subsidies, taking the amount given by the hon. Minister of Railways himself, they will get \$3,000,000, as the value set thereon by himself. There is a small bonus of \$200,000, an advance of \$339,235 for rails not credited, and a further sum of \$286,000, which has been paid on one of the contracts which the Government has turned over to them. These different sums, added together,

make, in round numbers, \$51,000,000, which, with the \$53,000,000 already mentioned, make the total sum of \$104,000,000, which the Company are going to have within two years; and yet they come before this House and say that they want money. No, they do not say that they want money, but they say they can get it. They say, we can build the railway, but we want to build it at once, and will build it in two years, provided you give us \$30,000,000. I do not know whether they will build it or not if we give them the \$30,000,000. Most likely, as it is their interest, and as the Company are powerful enough to do so, they will build it in that time. But there is more than that. They get their \$104,000,000 at the end of these two years, and they want more. They want to build the railway without spending any of their own money. That is what they want. Now let us see what additional guarantee the Government is going to give them, or the guarantee they ask for, and which the Government is willing to give them. The Government is to give them 3 per cent. on \$65,000,000 of their stock for ten years. Rightly calculated, this interest will be, for the ten years, \$19,500,000. But now I would not place that full figure against them, because they place in the hands of the Government a certain sum in order to guarantee the payment of this interest. I put this amount at the sum of only \$7,300,000. I put against them also the present loan which they ask, \$22,500,000, and the sum released to pay their floating debt, which will amount to \$7,500,000. All these sums together make up the small amount of \$141,000,000 besides the \$1,000,000 of guarantee returned to them. The hon. the Minister of Finance is accustomed to make calculations; but I think that my calculations, in this respect, are quite as correct as any that are made in his office. They are going to get \$141,000,000, and they may be called upon to return hereafter—what? To return perhaps \$30,000,000. Therefore, they will be, in cash, all round, in the receipt of \$111,000,000 for the cost of the road. After having the road paid for by the Government, what more remains in their hands? There remains in their hands a quantity of land which they value at \$2.36 an acre, and which, according to their own assumption, will give an aggregate value of \$50,142,920. That is not all. They leave in the hands of the Government a further amount of \$35,000,000 of stock. Well, that stock must be worth something. Take it, say at 50 cts., that will be what will remain in their hands—\$17,500,000 when sold. The consequence will be that they will have, all around in cash, land and stock, the sum of \$188,747,920, out of which they must repay \$30,000,000. Now, that is a very large sum of money for the building of this road. They have expended, they say, so far, in its construction, \$58,695,365, and they say to build it they have only to add \$27,000,000, making in all \$85,685,365, to complete the road. It is very singular that this estimation was the first that was made, even four years ago, by the hon. Minister of Railways, when he said in the *Hansard*, page 59, vol. I, of 1880, that the cost of the road would amount to \$84,000,000. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe has said that the railway will cost about that sum. But if it will cost \$85,000,000 in round numbers, these gentlemen of the Canadian Pacific Railway will have, over and above the road itself, which will remain in their hands, a sum more than equal to its cost. This is the deduction that I make from the figures given by the hon. Minister of Railways. It is true that he has a peculiar mode of showing that this railway will not be paid these large amounts. But I maintain that each and every item that I have prepared in that statement can bear the same challenge that the hon. gentleman has asked for his own statements. The hon. gentleman pretends, with regard to the quantity of wheat that may be raised in the North-West, that were we to give him an army of 100,000

men he would repeat the miracle of the loaves and fishes, he would feed both continents for one year with 100,000 farmers cultivating 320 acres each. There are probably 10,000,000 farmers in the United States, and they do not raise half that amount.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman probably found that in my speech. That is exactly what I said. I said that amount was 50 per. cent more than the entire yield in the United States.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does the hon. gentleman believe what he says? I do not intend any offence at all, but the thing seems to me so preposterous that I may express my opinion that the hon. gentleman does not believe it. The hon. gentleman may be able to perform miracles, but we only read of the miracle of the loaves and fishes once in the Bible, and it has never been repeated since. The hon. Minister's calculations are made for school boys, not for reasonable men; and on the same principle as the advice given to children to make their figures on the black-board a little larger, I would tell him also to do so that his amount may look bigger. I may say also that the little letter of instructions to Messrs. Miall and Schreiber to scrutinize the books, might as well have been dispensed with. That little ceremony need not have been gone through at all. The hon. Minister might as well have accepted the books and returns sent by the Canadian Pacific Railway without sending these two officials to go over them and report that they were all right. They may be very expert book-keepers, but I must say that if they pretended, in two or three days, to make a full and satisfactory report of the whole transactions of this company, they must believe us to be green horns. Now, Sir, there is another thing which strikes me also in the manner of introducing this measure. It reminds me of the Pacific contract when it was first introduced some three years ago. It was made first, as we then said, in the dark. It was put on the Table of the House at a particular period of the year, at a special time at which we were assembled here on purpose, and it was intended to pass it through in a hurry. Well, I see that the same dodge is resorted to on the present occasion. This good Government has been kind enough, during the recess, to enter into this bargain with the Syndicate, and now they come before the House and say to their friends and to the members of this House: We have passed this little bargain; you have got to take it as it is; in fact, you have got to swallow it. *Grip* gives a very good description of it. Shut your eyes and open your mouth, and swallow it. That is what gentlemen on the other side have got to do, and they cannot do otherwise. It is true that some of the Canadian members do not like the pill at all. If I may believe the rumors we hear in the lobbies, some of them are *cabrés*; they are baulky on the subject; some of them are kicking in the traces; but they will soon cool down. I never knew these Conservatives giving a bad vote to their party. They will swallow it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says some hon. members are kicking in the traces, but are going to swallow it. What are they going to swallow? are they going to swallow the traces?

Mr. CASGRAIN. They will swallow everything, like the motion of yesterday. They say the motion is lost and the money too. That is what their friends say. Well, I admire the hon. gentleman; I admire his magnetic talent, of course I do. He has got a great deal of magnetism in him. Now, Sir, there is another characteristic in this loan which appears to me to be very singular: I always understood that, when a party wanted to borrow money, he would take the sum he wanted to borrow and not give an equivalent sum. He

would not return at once the amount borrowed. But the Syndicate want to borrow a sum of money, and they say, out of that sum we will give you at once \$8,000,000; we will leave it in your hands. Why do they not borrow at once the difference? It would simplify the matter very much in my opinion. But this would be rather unimportant compared with the fact that, in spite of this fine bargain made by the Syndicate with this good Government, the value of their own stock, and the credit of their own Company has not been enhanced one farthing; on the contrary, it has been depressed. I think the Government must have had a very baneful influence upon the stock. The mere idea that the Government was going to help them, or going to be partner with them in some way, had the effect of depreciating the stock at once. It is no credit to the Government that, in spite of promising something like 11 per cent. upon stock, it would not realize anything at all. There is another point that struck me in the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. gentlemen told us that the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was to have a terminus on the Atlantic, and a terminus on the shores of the Dominion, and he went as far as Louisburg: in fact, I suppose he will find another way of crossing the Gut of Canso easily—it will be the same way, I suppose, as the production of wheat; it will be done by a miracle. Well, we are not going so far as Louisburg. We will remain on the main shore. We will go only as far as Halifax or as far as Quebec. It was hinted, and, I think, it may be received as a very broad hint of the future demands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that, as I inferred from the speech of the hon. Minister, it is the intention, and not only the intention, but a matured project, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to extend their line as far as the Atlantic; and by what route? Will it be by the International Railway, which is owned in part by the Minister of Agriculture, or will it be by the Intercolonial Railway, that they will reach the Atlantic? If they reach the Atlantic by the Intercolonial Railway, it must be with the connivance, or rather with the agreement, of the Government. Well, there are two ways of making this agreement. They may either lease the road or buy the road. As far as I can see, the intent of the Pacific Railway Syndicate or Company would be to buy the railway, or perhaps, as they have had already many presents from the Government, to ask the Government to cede them that railway. Perhaps they may be powerful enough to exact something of the kind from the Government or get it for a nominal sum. It does not, at the present moment, give a great revenue to the Dominion, and perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways would find it advantageous to the country and very advantageous to the Pacific Railway Company to sell them the Intercolonial Railway; and perhaps also they might induce the Syndicate to buy the North Shore Railway from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Perhaps we might have the help, in that respect, of the present Secretary of State, who understands how to make a good bargain in respect of railways. Having that aid, I do not doubt the Canadian Pacific Railway could make a first rate bargain. It is all well enough to speak of patriotism, and all that. We may say this in this House to ourselves, but in regard to the Syndicate, which is composed of acute Americans, steady English capitalists, very close French capitalists also, a few German also, I would be at a loss to find any patriotic sentiment in any of them towards Canada. I do not believe one of them cares a rap for Canada, except about the money they are going to make in this country—not one of them. I do not suppose that Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Hill cares at all whether this Dominion increases or not, provided their railway progresses, and provided their railway pays. They will exact from us all they can, and, moreover, they will not be at all thankful. They have shown, up to the present moment, what the power of money can do—that to

Mr. CASGRAIN.

receive they have only to ask; and they will get this, and more too. I have read, for the first time this afternoon, from the papers laid on the Table of the House, about this construction company, which appears to be also a part of the Syndicate, or composed partially of the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I observe a statement made by Mr. Schreiber to the hon. the Minister of Railways, recapitulating the expenditure of \$58,000,000 and the receipts of \$52,000,000. There appears to be an excess of expenditure of \$5,790,000. Although this expenditure may appear in the books of the Company, I would like Mr. Schreiber or Mr. Miall, who are such good auditors, to tell me whether this amount has not been made up already by the profits which the construction company has made by the Canadian Pacific Railway. If we were to look closely into the account, we would probably find that this \$5,000,000, which appears as an expenditure, would be covered by the operations which some of the companies have made by the contract. Now, Sir, there is an old proverb which has been often quoted—*festina lente*—make haste slowly. This proverb has not been followed by the Company, and their course has proved, not exactly disastrous to the country, but certainly not favourable. As I said before, it is not because they want money at present, but because they say they cannot now command the money for future use. Suppose they did not get the money at all that they are asking of us, I have not the least doubt that those great capitalists would soon find elsewhere the \$27,000,000 which they want. They could sell their stock, or they could wait a little while until they found the paltry sum of \$27,000,000. But they command the situation, and they say: We want money, and we are going to have it; we will get our \$30,000,000; we will build the railway, and when it is built we shall not have disbursed one cent of our own money. That is the long and the short of it, and it shows that they are more acute speculators than we suspected at first. I would also like to know in what position the second syndicate would have been, had they obtained the contract, if they had come before this Government and asked the same favour. Would the hon. Minister of Railways even have listened to them? Would he not say to them: You have made a contract and you must abide by it? But, Sir, we are told that if this railway is not built within two years, disastrous consequences will result. Well, I cannot see it, but perhaps I cannot see so well through my spectacles as others can. I cannot see how, by enhancing the privileges of this Company—which may be said to rule one-half of this Dominion—how, by increasing its privileges, we are going to benefit the Dominion. I think I see in this proposition, rather, an arrangement by which the Government hope to sustain themselves in power and to bolster up their National Policy. That is the view I entertain of the project of the Government in helping this Company to such a large extent. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I had had more opportunity to examine these papers, I might have made a stronger case. This is a very grave matter, indeed. The hon. Premier, I fear, has not realized its gravity. He has been leader of the Government for a long time, and he might have profited by this occasion to retrieve his many sins of omission and commission, which he has already confessed before this House. I will not say that he is at the end of his political career—and certainly I do not wish, personally, to see him out of public life—but if he had taken a statesmanlike view of this great matter, he would not have treated it as a mere party politician. He ought to treat this Company as he would treat any other company coming before this House, and then he would not have succumbed to the influence of this great Syndicate. On the contrary, he would have improved the occasion to retrieve his past errors, to render to the country its due, and to exact from this Company the odious monopoly, the vexatious privileges, that they are now to enjoy for twenty years to come. With

these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I leave the matter before the House.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I do not intend to address the House at very great length, but I think it my duty, as representing one of the counties of this Dominion, as a member of this House, and as a Canadian, to give my opinions upon this question to the House and to the country. I am not sure that they will throw much additional light on this question, and I do not expect to make the case any more plain than it has been made; but I wish to place on record the reasons why I am about to give a vote, the most important I will likely be called upon to give during the term of the present Parliament. The Railway question is one that is not new to this House or the country. This is in regard to assisting a Company which has undertaken the stupendous work of building a railway across the Canadian half of the continent of America. This question has occupied the attention of the best minds in Canada for many years. It has occupied the attention, not only of the present Government and their supporters, but of members of the House generally; and very particularly the members of the late Government, who are now sitting on the Opposition benches and are leading the Opposition. In 1873, it is well known that the Allan contract, so-called, was made. That contract gave 54,000,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000 to a company to build a railway from Lake Nipissing to Burrard Inlet. Everybody knows the fate of that contract. Everybody knows how it collapsed. Everybody knows the reasons why it collapsed, and that we were unable to gain what all parties in the State declared was a very great object to gain, namely, a railroad to the Pacific Ocean on Canadian soil. I need not dilate any further on that matter, but I wish to state as succinctly as I can, the history of this question as it is in my mind. In 1873 the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald was hurled from power and the Reform party, with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) as leaders, took their places in this House. They placed upon the Statute Book without the slightest delay, in the Session of 1874, an Act whereby they were to give to any company to build this great road that the previous Government had been unable to build, \$10,000 per mile and 20,000 acres per mile, for 2,797 miles, and they were also to give 4 per cent. for twenty-five years on such balance as was necessary to complete the road. Everybody knows, who has looked at the question at all, that that represents the following amounts: \$10,000 per mile for 2,797 miles would amount to \$27,970,000; the land at \$1 per acre, to \$55,940,000, and 4 per cent. upon such necessary balance, taking the Foster contract as the test—and I have the authority of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), in the Session of 1881 (see page 362 *Hansard*, 1881, vol. 1), for doing so—would amount to \$20,997,500. I have here his statement that the hon. Minister of Railways had not taken an unfair test when he took the Foster contract, and it was well known that Mr. Foster was not able to make anything out of his contract and had to abandon it at \$7,500 per mile with a guarantee of 4 per cent. for twenty-five years. Adding those amounts together, they make the sum of \$104,887,500. This was the amount which hon. gentlemen now in opposition, and who were leading the Reform party, placed upon the Statute Book as that which they would give to any company which would build a railway to the Pacific, a distance of 2,797 miles. That is a clear statement and it is a true one. Those gentlemen advertised in the public press of the day. In 1877, they advertised all over Europe. They tried their best to get a company to build the road, and I will give the hon. member for East York, then the Leader of the Government, the fullest credit for having endeavoured to get a

company that would construct the road on those terms. But he failed, and he came to this House in 1879, and stated frankly that he had failed, that he could not get a single *bonâ fide* offer. Here are his words:

"The hon. gentlemen opposite, and the whole country, are aware that we solicited tenders in England for some months upon this ground, before hon. gentlemen opposite came into office; also that Mr. Sandord Fleming, the Chief Engineer, was instructed, while in London, to place himself in communication with contractors and financial men, and also to obtain the assistance of Sir John Rose, who, in many things, had been the active, energetic and patriotic agent of the Dominion, with a view to the carrying out of this scheme. But I am informed that, notwithstanding all our efforts, we signally failed in obtaining one single offer (there was one imperfect offer made) for the construction of the railroad on these terms, which were, the grant of 20,000 acres and \$10,000 cash, per mile, with a guarantee of 4 per cent. upon such balance as might be represented as necessary."

These words are very emphatic and very specific, because they are not confined to the Foster contract at \$7,500 per mile. Any sum which a company tendering with sufficient bonds would accept to build the road, they were prepared to give, whether it was \$7,500 per mile, or \$15,000 per mile. The then Premier then said: "No terms could be more explicit; it would be difficult to mention terms more favourable." I think the House will agree with me that it would be difficult to mention terms more favourable than 4 per cent. for twenty-five years, when the amount might be \$10,000 or \$20,000 per mile. That speech was delivered on the occasion when the present hon. Minister of Railways asked the House to pass resolutions in which the Government of the day were asked to hand over to trustees 100,000,000 acres of land to sell, at not less than \$2 per acre, the proceeds to constitute a fund for the purpose of building the Pacific Railway. Time passed on. The Government were utterly unable to get a single offer to build the road on these terms. They passed out of power; they were scattered to the four winds of heaven, when they went to the elections of 1878. They came back with their shattered forces, and the "sulky leaders of the chase," to use an expression borrowed from Sir Walter Scott, came to the House to face their former opponents, who took their places on this side of the House. Again, the Government which I have the honour and pleasure to support, grappled with this question, and in 1879 they asked the House to pass certain resolutions setting aside 100,000,000 acres of land to build this road. Then, Sir, the hand of the Opposition was seen. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) in 1879 complimented the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, whom he mentioned by their names, as having supported him in his arduous duties and in the efforts he had made in regard to that road. I believe that these words were honest and sincere, and I believe that the hon. gentleman did make energetic efforts to build the road. These words are on record in the *Hansard* of to-day. But, what was the course of these hon. gentlemen? We would have thought that they would have endeavoured, as patriotic Canadians, to strengthen the hands of the Government in endeavouring to build this road which had challenged their greatest energies. They were appealed to and asked to lift this question above the mire of party; they were asked if there were not enough subjects for fighting in the National Policy; if there were not other chances which the Reform party might take without dragging this great question which affected every man, woman and child in the Dominion, and had baffled the energies of two strong Governments into the mire of politics—the bitter party rivalry which prevails in this country. They were asked, in language which I shall quote, and which, to cite another author, "should be written on the door-posts of every deliberative assembly," not to make this question one of narrow, party bigotry. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, speaking in 1880, said:

"We have such a question in the National Policy without a dragging Pacific Railway. If we are defeated on that issue, hon. gentlemen opposite will take our places, irrespective of the policy of the Pacific Railway. Having that line of demarcation between us, let us, on the great national question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, unite as a band of brothers, irrespective of old parties, showing not that we are Liberals or Conservatives, but that we are Canadians, and that in every word that is uttered, whether we sit on the Treasury benches or on the Opposition side of the House, we feel we owe it to Canada, to ourselves, and to our children, to do all that men can do to strengthen the hands of those who are engaged in a great national enterprise, upon the success of which the rapid progress and prosperity of our common country depend."

Never did more patriotic words issue from the lips of a public man, and they came from the lips of the man who was complimented by the ex-Premier as having given him every aid and assistance when he occupied his place on this side of the House. Look at the difference to day between the Reform party and the Liberal Conservative party on this great question. Has the Government received on any single occasion, aid or comfort from hon. gentlemen opposite in dealing with this question? No, Sir, the moment they came back from the country, unexpectedly to themselves, but not to us, for the by-elections had given forth the *fiat* that their days were numbered, they came back disgusted, dispirited, savage, not with themselves, so much as with the people. They were angry and they did not allow their better judgment and reason to prevail, but they allowed themselves to be swayed by the narrow prejudices and bigotry of party and of disappointed ambition, even in the presence of this great question. Accustomed as they were to public warfare, they not only refused to strengthen the hands of the Government on this question, but they employed scribes all over this country to oery the credit of the country, so as to render it impossible, if they could do so, for the Government to build the road. These resolutions of 1879 proving abortive, the Government again came down to the House, in 1880, and asked for leave to build the 125 miles from Yale to Kamloops. The Opposition said, no, you shall not build a mile of road. The leader of the Opposition, who said he had been resurrected, that he was a political ghost, with his great power of debate, with his practice at the bar, with all the powers of his mind, went to work in a six hours' speech, to show that it was impossible to build the road, and that after it was built, it would not be worth anything. It is the most melancholy sight that you can possibly see to witness the powers of a great mind prostituted to the task of sinking, if possible, a great public work and endeavouring to destroy the prospect of ever building this railway. I have taken the pains to look over the *Hansard* to see what these gentlemen said, my pen refused to go further in extracts. The effect is something like the man with the load of apples. He was asked why he was not profane, and he replied, that he could not do the thing justice. I do not believe there is a pen or a voice in this country that can do it justice. I have waded through the *Hansard* to find if there was, from these hon. gentlemen, one word of comfort, of patriotism, of assistance to the Government in the undertaking, but I failed to find it. I did, however, cull a few expressions which they made use of, and I might have culled enough to occupy the time of this House for a week, but I shall only ask for a few moments to read them. I want it done for all time. I wish to have them placed together, in order that when we come to the next elections they may answer, like a lawyer's brief when he lays it away for other cases of a similar character. When I am at a public meeting I will not have to cull them again, but I will be able to read them at once, or some one else can do it for me. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) stated, in 1879 (you will find this in the *Hansard* of 1879, vol. 2, page 1969):

"I believe that, if the country is to be settled, if a certain breadth, say twenty miles on each side, is to be made available, other lands must be given cheap, or for nothing, to attract people into the country. Because, after all, the money obtained for the land is not equivalent for

Mr. WOODWORTH.

the labour and prosperity produced by a large influx of immigrants. Those people will do far more to enrich the country than will the holding of the entire land for land settlement, at a high price."

Again, he said, on page 1905, vol. 2, of *Hansard*, 1879:

"We must, therefore, make up our minds if we are to settle that country that it will be done only at the expenditure of a large amount of money to aid settlers in going in and giving them land free after they get in. That is my conviction."

Again, in the same volume, on page 1970, he says:

"I am, therefore, very much surprised that the hon. the Premier should have declared that the late Government had lost five years. We shall see what the next five years will bring forth, and the result of the right hon. gentleman's engineering and planning."

Why, Sir, his words were hardly read by the people before there was a contract laid on the Table, declaring that there was a company ready to build this road for a certain sum of money. The hon. gentleman also said, on page 1901 of the same volume:

"He (Sir Charles Tupper) has not hesitated a moment to say, in the face of all this, that he expects to go to England and get the active sympathy of the British Government. As a Canadian, I fervently trust that the British Government, notwithstanding the ill-behaviour of Canada to Britain, will show us that consideration which they have always hitherto been disposed to show; but, at the same time, I must say that if I were a British statesman, and were to act in the interest of British commerce and British workmen, it would be impossible for me to extend a particle of consideration to the hon. gentleman's proposal."

That was sent to England. I need not stop to say how it was met. I need not stop to show that, side by side, almost, with his utterances, went over that famous despatch of the then Governor-General, or to show how the leader of the Government suddenly cut the debate short by saying to the then leader of the Opposition: Why, the Governor General is the agent of Her Majesty here; he is an Imperial officer, and has a right to send what despatches he pleases to his Royal mistress, and this House has nothing to do with them; and the hon. member for East York sat down and said nothing more, because he knew that it was true constitutional doctrine. What was that despatch? It was that owing to the fact that fifty-two millions of people in the country lying contiguous to our south had a protective, almost a prohibitive policy, he, as a free trader of the Cobden school, believed that it was necessary in the interest of the Canadian people, that we should possess a different Tariff from what we had prior to 1879. That despatch was sent home, and hon. gentlemen were very curious to know what it was, but were not so anxious to see it when it was published in all the newspapers. On page 1899, vol. 2, of the *Hansard* of 1879, the hon. gentleman says:

"I was glad to hear the Minister of Public Works declare that those initial contracts which we gave out to secure a railroad from Lake Superior to Red River were as much in the interest of British Columbia as if the expenditure had been incurred in that Province itself. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is correct in that statement. It must now be quite evident to every person that the railroad must be a lamentable failure, unless means be adopted, in the first place, to throw a very large population into that country, in the centre of the continent; and, without means of access to those western prairies, equivalent to that of the United States to theirs, we never could hope to get a large population into that country."

Mr. Mackenzie, on the railway, page 1967, vol. 2 of the *Hansard*, says:

"The fact is I have been personally and politically a devotee to the settlement of that country and the promotion of the interests of Canada there. I have looked upon the North-West as the place that was to give solidity and power to us."

I will just refer again to the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways in 1879, when, in the glow of enthusiasm which has always characterized him, he spoke on this question—and I believe there is not a political opponent of his in Canada or elsewhere who will not say that on this great public question he has never swerved one single iota from

the principles he enunciated when he first entered Parliament, and that he has been, in season and out of season, the patriotic advocate of this road and of his country; and although, Sir, it may be said that he has used extravagant language in regard to Canada, her capabilities and her immense resources—although that may be said by persons not acquainted with the country—I, for one, do not believe that it is in the power of any hon. gentleman here to use language which is too extravagant in regard to the future of this great country. But, Sir, even if he had used language which was extravagant, would he not be pardoned? Is not the Scotchman pardoned when he declares that the thistle is softer than satin? Is not the Irishman pardoned when he declares that the shamrock is the most beautiful emblem in the world? Is not the Frenchman pardoned when he takes pride in his *fleur-de-lis*? Sir, the extravagance of any man, on an occasion when he speaks of his country, would be pardoned as readily as when he speaks of his mother; and there is no man who has the sympathy of his race, and the love of his country, and who thinks for a single moment, who would not almost let a tear fall when he hears one speak of his love for his country and his love for his mother. The hon. Minister of Railways, speaking in 1879, on page 466, of the *Hansard*, referring to the hon. gentleman—the hon. Mr. Cartwright—he will pardon me for mentioning his name—I forget what constituency he was from at that time, he is from so many; they all want him—the hon. Minister of Railways said:

“I say the language the hon. gentleman used—the language that he unfairly, unpatriotically, and dishonestly used, because, Sir, it is not true—I say that language was unworthy the mouth of any Canadian statesman. I say that declarations on the floor of the Parliament of Canada, going to-morrow morning down to New York and Washington, that we are at the feet of the Americans—the declarations that we are as clay in the hands of the potter, that we live by their favour, that they have it in their power to adopt a policy that will crush us—I say that that was an unpatriotic statement, and I repeat that it is not true.”

One would have thought that the party of which the hon. member for East York was the leader, astray though they were, would have had patriotism enough to lift him far above the imputations of the hon. Minister of Railways. One would have thought that the leader of the Reform party would have got up and said: No; I mean no reflection on the credit of Canada, or on its capabilities as a home for immigrants. He did not say that he professed that he wanted to see this road built, and to see this country peopled. Now, what he said was this, as reported in *Hansard*, page 467, of the same volume from which I have already quoted:

“But the hon. gentleman says that the true policy is propounded for the promoting the prosperity of the country; he says that a Protective Policy is the one thing needful in order to make the nation great and glorious, and he has pictured to himself and to the House a great and magnificent country, flourishing and prosperous with protection. He says we have the best half of the continent; I only wish it were true, but the statement is rather an extensive one for the hon. gentleman to make. Every one knows, at least I supposed every one knew, that we have the worst half of the continent. We have a very good country, which we can make something of; but not by such exaggerated statements which only make us the laughing stock of other people.”

This is what the hon. member for East York said in answer to the Minister of Railways, a gentleman who had only just left—who had quitted, as it were, only a few hours before, his position as Leader of the Government, with eighty-five of a majority in this House—who had been entrusted by the people of this country with the wielding of its destinies, the shaping of its public opinion, and its advancement in influence and material prosperity—an hon. gentleman who, in 1874, had entered office amidst the plaudits of the people and who, down to 1878, led a large majority in this House. I was not then a member of this House, but I desired to understand this great question, to see exactly what position it occupied in the public mind, to ascertain what has been done and said on both sides, and I read carefully the speeches of the leading men on both

sides. I say honestly now, in my place in Parliament, that were the people to take the time to read this record of the speeches in Parliament they would, I am confident, whether Grit or Tory, provided they had the love of their country in their hearts and sound intelligence in their heads, come to but one conclusion and that is, that the Reform party have not dealt with this question in a manner creditable to them as Canadians. Had they done so, they would to-day hold a position far higher in the estimation of the people of this country than the one they now occupy. Side by side with this declaration, I wish to read, in order that it may go down in *Hansard*, a statement quite as authoritative made by the distinguished nobleman who is now in the Mother Country doing his very utmost to make Canada better known abroad and to direct the stream of immigration to our shores. For five years he occupied the most exalted position that a man can occupy in this country. During this time he mixed freely with our people, he loved our winter sports, our northern clime, he enjoyed our glorious summers, and on his return to England gave the great weight of his social position, of his Parliamentary authority, his prestige as the eldest son of the House of Argyle, his great experience of our country, to the advancement of Canadian interests. I want to place this language alongside that of the ex-Premier, who, I am sure, would now like to see what he said then expunged from the *Hansard*, although the statement he made, he made as a public man, as the leader of a great party on the floor of this House, and however he may dislike the comparison, he cannot now object to having his words contrasted with those of this distinguished nobleman who lately governed our country. Here is what the Marquis of Lorne said in his speech at Birmingham:

“The great bugbear—for it is nothing more—present to the minds of many in contemplating a move to Canada is the alleged great and trying cold of that country. This is a fear which is not justified by the character of the climate. The climate is exceedingly healthy. Fevers, which are only too common in parts of the United States, are unknown. Men attain to great ages; and where, as is the case of some English and many of the French, many generations have lived on Canadian soil, we see the race more vigorous, if possible, than in the days of the first settlers. Cold it certainly is during five or six months of the year, but the cold is dry, and, except upon the sea coasts, is less felt than is cold here. The saying of the old Scotch woman is literally true. She wrote home to her people to say, ‘it was fine to see the bairns play in the snow without getting their feet wet.’ Throughout the winter the snow is dry and powdery. The Canadian seasons are very certain. It is sure to be steadily cold in winter and steadily warm in summer, and throughout the twelve months a light sun gives cheerfulness to the scene. In any case, what we desire is that the advantages of Canada should be known, so as to induce men to weigh them as compared with the United States. I, from personal knowledge, believe that Canada can hold her own in the comparison. In climate she has in her various Provinces vast areas as agreeable to men of our northern races as any America can offer. Her soils are as rich, her Government is more free, and the opportunities presented, not only for making a comfortable living, but for the attainment of comparative wealth, are as good. Sudden fortunes are, it is true, not so often made; but, on the other hand, there is far less poverty. There is an equality of fortune, taking the people as a whole, which can hardly be matched elsewhere.”

I ask if any Canadian can cite that before any assembly of his brother Canadians and not be cheered to the echo. For it is true every word of it, and yet the hon. the ex-Premier, the leader of his party, had the hardihood to state that the hon. Minister of Railways, in declaring that this Dominion was a fine country to live in, that it had great advantages and great prospects, and was destined to be the home of a great and prosperous people, was making his country the laughing stock of the world. In 1880, the hon. member for East York, as quoted in *Hansard*, vol. 2, page 1530, said:

“When the operations of 1877 were completed, and the profile of Burard Inlet Route was obtained, the completed profile was transmitted to England. . . . In the meantime we compiled in one volume, a mass of information about the country, its *flora*, *fauna*, soil, climate, geology, minerals, &c., and sent copies to all parties who might enquire

concerning the work. We also had the Act of 1874 reprinted, and sent a sufficient number of copies to London, and distributed others here. We, in short, did everything in our power to make the country known."

That was very patriotic, but that was when the hon gentleman was Minister. Why did he, in such a short time afterwards, make the statement I have shown he did make? But in 1877 he had a powerful coadjutor when he was sending that work abroad, employing geologists, having the *flora, fauna* and soil of the country examined and spending tens of thousands of dollars in advertisements under his Act of 1874 to build the road. His Finance Minister then was the hon. gentleman who delighted the House to-night, the hon. member for South Huron. I shall show you how he assisted him. He assisted him to the utmost of his power, in the same patriotic strain that the hon. member for East York and the hon. member for West Durham assisted in 1880. The hon. the Minister of Railways, was speaking again, and on the question nearest his heart, and that is the development of this country by an iron road on our own soil. I read from page 149 of the Debates of 1877:

"The hon. gentleman opposite, in his statement to-night—and I was sorry to hear him do so—"

That was the hon. Finance Minister of 1877, the hon. member for South Huron I think he is now—

"has spoken in terms of disparagement of the railway undertakings of this country."

This was the very year the leader of the Government, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), was spending \$10,000 in advertisements to get somebody to build this road for nearly \$105,000,000, taking the Foster contract as a criterion:

"The hon. gentleman intimated that the people who invested their money in promoting the railway enterprises of Canada would lose it. I say it was an unpatriotic statement for the hon. gentleman to make."

Would you not have thought that the then hon. the Finance Minister, occupying the exalted position he did—the custodian of the finances of this country, the man who was, above all others, to shape its fiscal policy, who was directly responsible for it, and who was sitting side by side with his leader, with an Act upon the Statute Book to build this road under the extraordinary rates they then estimated, though they tell a different story now—would you not have thought that he would have jumped to his feet and said: "I did not make any such unpatriotic statement; if I said so, I will withdraw it; I never thought so. We are advertising in England, we are advertising all over Europe and in America for people to build this road; we are spending \$10,000 in advertisements, and I would never have said anything unpatriotic. I would never have said that men who invested their money in railways in this country would lose it because it is not true." He did not do it. He jumped to his feet—but it would hardly be believed, it would not be believed by the hon. gentleman's own constituents that he said it, unless the book were here to prove it; they would not believe it if they heard his speech to-night—he jumped to his feet and said: "They have lost it." That ended that affair. That went over to England, and it was no wonder that, in the bitterness of his heart, the Premier, in 1879, said that, although no terms could be more explicit or more advantageous, they failed to get one single offer, though they employed Mr. Sandford Fleming and Sir John Rose as their agents. The hon. the Finance Minister was saying at that very time that any one who invested a dollar in railways in this country had lost it. Nice men to build a road. While all these statements were being made, while Canada was being decieved as a country not to live in, while they were working might and main as party men to obtain a party advantage, not, seemingly, caring what became of Canada during the time, only to obstruct the Government in

Mr. WOODWORTH.

building the road, the very leaders of the Government who, they said, had helped them when they were a Government and wanted to build it—I say that, before the people were done reading the *Hansard*, if they had it, or reading the newspapers with these statements in them, the statement of the hon. member for East York as, pointing his finger to the hon. leader of the Government, the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, he says: "You say we have lost five years; we will watch you for the next five years and see what your engineering and planning will do; I tell you you cannot build the road; \$120,000,000 will only build a colonization road; \$121,000,000 he said—he went one million better;

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. WOODWORTH. *Vice versa*. I will prove it.

Mr. BLAKE. You will prove it *vice versa*.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for the interruption, for now I will prove it though it will take some little time.

Mr. BLAKE. You had better ask the hon. Minister of Railways whether you are right or not.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I will not ask him. I will stand on my own feet and make my own speech, and, while I honor the hon. Minister of Railways, and am proud of him as a Canadian, I do not think he would be proud of me if he thought I came before Parliament without being prepared for an interruption from the hon. Member for West Durham. I have got it here, Sir. I said he either made it \$121,000,000 or the hon. member for East York made it \$120,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. For a colonization road.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. You did.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I beg pardon. I am aware that the hon. gentleman said that \$31,000,000 would only build a colonization road, but he did not say that \$120,000,000 would build a good road. Mr. Mackenzie stated as follows:—

"I am sure I am within the line in stating that these figures (\$121,000,000), and that it will be impossible to construct anything that can be called a railroad, nothing else than a mere tramway, for the amount now given (\$34,869,618), as the hon. gentleman says by the chief engineer."—(Page 1532, *Han.*, vol. 2, 1880, McKenzie.)

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. This is not the first time the hon. member for West Durham has interrupted me. He had the distinguished pleasure, and I do not doubt it was a pleasure to him, when I first spoke in this House, when I was on my feet in this House for the first time, to show that he understood men and understood their feelings; that he had fine feelings himself, that he was an excellent leader, a great man, and to show that he could successfully lead, looking at an hon. member, very much his inferior in debating talent, he, the old parliamentarian in the House, the trusted leader of his party, when I, the member for King's, Nova Scotia, was making a statement which was perfectly true—and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., got up just after and said it was true, and look at the *Hansard*—he, the leader of the Opposition, said "order." The hon. member for King's sat down, as it was his duty to do, and the member for West Durham said:

"I do not rise to a question of order because the hon. gentleman has used any unparliamentary language, but because he is making a statement which is not true. If it were true the member for Queen's, P.E.I., could not be in this House; he could not be the retained counsel of Mr. Robertson, and have his seat in this House."

And Mr. Davies got up and said: "Yes, I was Mr. Robertson's counsel until I came into the House"—of course he was not in the House, acting as counsel—the very thing I had said. I did not get up and get into a rage with him, and say, I was a young mem-

ber. I did not care about saying that. If I stay here long enough I will be an old member, probably. I hope always to see the hon. gentleman before me. We cannot lose him in our debates. He is too able a man to lose. I say that the hon. member admits that the sum of \$120,000,000 would suffice to build the road, and the hon. member for East York mentioned \$121,000,000. Then they spoke of another calculation entirely, which was \$84,000,000. odd. But, after speaking of these other large sums, they did not discriminate and say that the \$120,000,000 would build a first-class road, but they said: "You can only make a colonization road with this money." If the hon. member from West Durham had discriminated, if he had wished to be as fair as he was finical and emphatic, he would have distinguished between them and said that \$84,000,000 would only build a colonization road, but that \$120,000,000 would build a first-class road. But he failed to do it, and he, as a chancery lawyer, with reference to a *suppressio veri* of that kind, knows what he would say to a witness who was guilty of it, and to the court he was practicing before regarding such a witness. I say that before their words were scarcely read by the people of this country, when they promised to watch and see what five years would do, the House was suddenly called together in the fall of 1880. The contract was laid on the Table of the House, and the Government said: "You said that \$7,500 per mile for the whole length of the road, viz.: 2,797 miles, and 20,000 acres of land per mile, and \$10,000 per mile, would build this road but you could not get a man to invest a dollar in such a contract. Here is a contract that provides that for 25,000,000 acres of land and for \$25,000,000 more money, and \$28,000,000 worth of roads constructed, including the Pembina Branch, all making \$78,000,000, a first-class road in every particular can be constructed." Did the hon. gentleman say then: "I have watched your engineering plans for five years to see what you would do and you have certainly astonished me. You are going at last to build this road that we could not get a man to tender for, although we offered nearly \$105,000,000." No, he did not say that. Why, Sir, they made speeches by the hour, by the day, by the week—I was going to say, by the month. They declared this country was in a state of rebellion. They sent their missionaries—and very able men they were—to Halifax, St. John, Montreal, Toronto. Everywhere they took the stump. Did they get anybody to respond? No, Sir; and the hon. member for West Durham will tell us why? In a long speech, and an able speech, which I read with the greatest care, he told the reason why; and, Sir, let me say, as a Canadian, I feel proud of his abilities as a debater, and would be sorry to lose him from this House, or from public life. We are all proud of his abilities; but at the same time, he might learn some lessons in patriotism and statesmanship, and some lessons in conducting the affairs of this country, from his great opponents opposite. I find on page 99 of the *Hansard*, for 1880, that he uttered the following words:—

"I shall be very much pleased if the hon. gentleman is able to obtain a declaration from the members of the Syndicate that what is intended is that they are to get not less than 10 per cent. of the money they themselves put into the railway. That nothing that comes from the country—that the Thunder Bay Branch" for instance, is not included—that the railway in British Columbia or the Pembina Branch is not included—that the proceeds from the sale of lands is not included, that only that which, after the public resources are exhausted, they take out of their own pockets, is to bear this 10 per cent. If the hon. gentleman will say so, he will remove a large part of my objections to his contract. But he cannot say so; it is not in the agreement; it is not the contract; it is not the law."

The hon. William Macdougall, when a member of this House, also made a very able speech. This struck him in the contract as a very objectional feature. He was interrupted by the right hon. Premier, who told him that there would be an amendment to the Railway Act of 1879, pro-

viding for that very thing, and meeting the whole of this great objection. True to their promise, the Government amended the Act, and here is how it reads:

"The said word 'Capital' as used in the said sub-section (sub-section 2 of section 17 of the Railway Act of 1879) meant and means the paid up stock and share capital of the Company, with interest added for periods during which no dividend is paid, to the exclusion of all subsidies and bonuses, and as regards the Canadian Pacific Railway, of any debt of the Company contracted on the pledge thereof, or of any part thereof."

One would have thought that the member for West Durham would have said: "My objections have vanished; I will never say another word against the contract. I have already stated on my honour as a member, that if you would amend the contract in that way my objections would be removed." Well, after the Act had been amended according to promise why did he not say: My objections have vanished. He promised that a large part of his objections would be taken away. I do not know what the other part was; but this was the big part, and it was taken away from him by this Act. It is amusing to hear that hon. gentleman to-day coming to the House and saying that this country is going to be in a blaze on this very contract. Why, Sir, he and his friends said so before. They said so before, and in the most beautiful language that can be used. The hon. leader of the Opposition spoke of what the people were going to do with the Government the moment they could get hold of them—they were going to show them that they could not make a contract like this and be returned by the people. This is what the hon. member for West Durham said, on page 106 of the *Debates* of 1882:

"This contract is worthy, in my opinion, only our rejection. I shall not venture to hope that this House will reject it, but I do think that an indignant country, although you will not give it time now to raise its voice, will take the earliest opportunity to inflict a summary penalty upon those persons, offenders for the second time, who have once betrayed, when entrusted with power, their country's honour, and having been forgiven, have now taken advantage of the opportunity which a too confiding people conferred upon them, to betray, in the same transaction, her most vital and material interests."

And he sat down. He did not fall into the arms of any beloved friend, as Sheridan did in the Begum charge. He did not throw any dagger on the floor, as Burke did in the debate on the French Revolution. He did not get down on his bended knees, as Lord Brougham did in the House of Lords in the debate on the Reform Bill. He did not make any such theatrical exhibition at all. He made a most pleasant and dignified address, and he sat down and looked around him, prophetic like, after he had uttered those oracular sentences. He did go to the country, and he came back again—"but not the six hundred." Well, the hon. member for Cardwell wondered to-night why they had not said something about it. Why, how could they? They can say a great many things and say them well, but in the light of these facts it was a little too much. They could not say anything after the experience of 1882. I was sitting in the gallery, listening, and I could not help smiling, remembering the result of the elections of 1882, to hear the then hon. member for Bothwell declare, standing beside the hon. member for West Durham who had sat down: "Why," said he—and his words are there in the *Hansard*, page 1002 of the Session of 1882—"as true as the sun rises and sets, when the election comes we, on this side of the House, will be sitting on that side," and he has not sat on either side since. And the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance, now the hon. member for South Huron, followed his leader, the hon. member for West Durham, and with the splendid rhetoric he has ever at his command; with those flowing and rounded periods, he declared that the hon. the Finance Minister would never come back to this House again, and he was supported by the lamented Sir Albert Smith, whose demise we all regret. The *Arabian Nights* entertainment is not half so entertaining as this. Look back a little.

They declared that the hon. member for St. John would be buried politically ; but he has come back with an increased majority, and his majority is constantly increasing—more power to his elbow. Some of the occupants of the Opposition benches have not returned. Some are, however, here, thanks to the hon. leader of the Government, who looked after their comfort, and gave them constituencies which could not help returning them. And I would say just here that he is badgered and abused by gentlemen opposite more about the so-called infamous Gerrymandering Bill than anything else he ever did, and yet he was the warmest but secret friend of some of those hon. members who never otherwise would have returned to this House. It is the lot of good and great men that their deeds live after them, and that history and posterity will do them justice. I now come to speak of the \$22,500,000 proposed to be advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite are more pleased than even I am, that I am able to do so. There are, however, a good many members from certain constituencies, who know very little about the history of this matter. But it is very necessary that those hon. members who have been anxious to hear their political leaders make speeches, and those who cheered to the echo anything said against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the credit of the country, should recollect the history of their party on this question and be thankful for the partial and imperfect glance I have given it. The contract of 1880, after receiving the assent of this House, as it has since received the verdict of the people of the country, was carried into effect by the Railway Company. They proceeded with the most marvellous rapidity known to build the rail way. They were engaged, as has been well said, in the greatest enterprise on the continent of America. There is no other trans-continental railway in America. After having proceeded with such vigour and built with such marvellous rapidity so many miles of road and expended such large sums of money, they come to this House and solicit a loan of \$22,500,000. I must confess that when it was first announced I was apprehensive that the Company had failed, and the Government was about to give them \$22,500,000. I confess that I felt we had not succeeded in getting a Company that could finish the road with the means at their command, and that the Company had utterly collapsed and failed. I had occasion to say not long ago, that if they had failed or should fail, there was neither tongue or pen that could paint the desolation and despair over Canada. It is said here, in the able speech of the hon. member for West Durham, and it was cheered to the echo by his followers, that the Government were silent partners, or sleeping partners, which, I think, was the expression used. I do not think the Government are sleeping partners, for they seem to be pretty well alive to the interests of the country. They have had a watchful eye on the Company, and it behooves them as partners, so far as the national welfare of Canada is concerned in this great work, which is to build up the Dominion, that they must be, from their position, not sleeping partners, but very active and energetic partners. As a strong party man, and as a Canadian in sentiment and act, as I have always been, and hope to die, I was afraid that the Government, of which I was a supporter, had made a mistake, and we would be called upon to give to the Company \$22,500,000, and trust our luck as to whether we should ever get it back again. I expressed myself thus to several of my friends. I thought the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was perfectly justified and right when he stated in his speech : "How do we know that the Company is going to build the road with that money; or that the hon. Minister of Railways is correct when he says the road will be finished by the end of 1886 ;

Mr. WOODWORTH.

or that the Company will not be back again with another application to Parliament, or that they will expend the money on the road ?" I think every member of the House, and every man in the whole Dominion will feel relieved when they read and hear that the hon. Minister of Railways to-night, in the course of the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said that the Company would not obtain a dollar until they could show that the money would be spent on the work ; that ample security would be given in the agreement that they would build the road in the time he stated they would build it in his speech in this House. I think that should have been an answer, and was an answer to the spirited speech of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think that was as effectual an answer to everybody as the Premier gave to the objections of Mr. Macdougall the then member for Halton, when he stated that 10 per cent. was only on their own capital. It was a complete answer and should be as satisfactory as it was to Mr. Macdougall ; and now I expect to hear the hon. member for West Durham and his party say that, as the Minister of Railways has made this authoritative statement, since the Government has given this pledge, they will not debate this matter further, as it is quite as satisfactory as their explanation in 1881 was, in regard to their amendment of the Railway Act. We are asked to lend the Company \$22,500,000. The member for South Huron says we know what endorsing paper is. He says that we know that to put our names on commercial paper means that we generally have to pay it. I do not think that everybody will endorse that statement ; I do not think the commerce of the country is carried on in that way, and I do not think a friend would be a real friend who would refuse to endorse from any such cause. Besides the cases are not parallel. We are not endorsing their paper in the sense of their having nothing to pay. I will read the words of the hon. Minister of Railways as to what security we have :

"That embraces the entire property, from the ocean terminus at Montreal to Port Moody on the Pacific ; it embraces the line on which they have paid over \$3,000,000, between Montreal and Callander ; it embraces the line on which they have expended nearly \$2,000,000, the branch to Algoma Mills ; it covers the 269 miles of branches in the North-West ; it covers the three magnificent steamers that they are placing upon the route between Algoma Mills and Port Arthur, and it covers the entire 21,000,000 of acres of land that remain at the disposal of the Government."

I think that is pretty good security ; and if they make one year's default in the payment of interest, the Government, without notice, can take possession of the whole vast property. Is there a member of this Parliament who dare in his place, if he knew that his speech would have the effect of stopping this work, make such a speech ? Why, Sir, the credit of Canada would be gone, and we would be in a most humiliating position in the eyes of the world. A vast number of men would be thrown out of employment on the road which the hon. member for South Huron described as a disgrace and a disaster to the North-West, and the desolation over this country, which would ensue, if that road should cease running, no tongue could tell. Why, Sir, it stopped for ten days on account of a strike out in the far west, and everybody knows that in those ten days the greatest consternation prevailed. I could not help remarking when I read the newspapers in the North-West, both Grit and Tory, and when I heard what was said by the people of that country, that they no longer spoke about monopoly or about the fearful exactions of the railway. On the contrary, their whole attention was centered on the question : When will the road resume running ? There was a body of engineers on this road who belonged to a certain secret combination, and who were like the old Highlanders when they heard the cry of the slogan or saw the cross of fire calling a gathering at Lanrick-Mead. The

plough stopped in the furrow, the bridegroom left his bride at the door of the church; for these men left their engines without going to the stations for which they were destined; they left their engines on the open prairie, and did not care what became of the passengers. Sir, we did not hear anything then about monopolies, about the tariff of rates, or the cruelties of the Government. I think that if the hon. member for South Huron, with the interests he has in the North-West, who has given such fearful accounts against the Government against these monopolies, had been in the country at the time and had been told that the road would be stopped for three months, he would have been ready to give his solemn promise that he would not make another speech against the Government if the road would only go on. While I admit that there are grievances—as there will be in all newly organized countries, grievances which will be remedied—we must not forget that there are also benefactions. The people must not forget what has been done for them, or the energy which is being displayed to satisfy their wants, and to make for them comfortable and happy homes in that country. I was rather amused to hear the speech of the ex-Finance Minister. I like his dash and his fire. There is fight about him. There is a wild rush but not a great amount of judgment, from our point of view—from our national, Canadian, standpoint. But still he fights his battles like a fighter. He does not care very much whom he hits or where he hits. His mind and heart are in the work, and it is natural that they should be. I never knew a man who had cut the ties that bound him to his former friends who did not feel that he would like to give them a Roland for an Oliver at every opportunity. This is history repeating itself, and undoubtedly he has a marvellously forcible and clever way of hitting, and I listened to him with great satisfaction. But he made a very injudicious speech to-night, and he certainly got a very powerful and eloquent answer from the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), to which he could not make a rejoinder. He even attacked the friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway in this House; he said they, the Railway Company, had paid counsel sitting in this House. Well, I was called to order by the hon. member for West Durham last Session when I suggested such a thing as that an hon. member in this House was counsel for a suppliant for a seat in this House; but I did not hear any one call the hon. member for South Huron to order when he said there were men who were the paid counsel for the Company in this House. For my part, I do not believe that a man, because he enters Parliament, can throw off or is required to throw off, his professional obligations to his clients. Did he not know—I think he did, for he reads the papers very carefully—that there was an hon. gentleman sitting very near him who occupied the position of the paid counsel in this House of another corporation—of a rival corporation—of a corporation against which I do not intend—because I do not wish, and I would not if I could—to say one single word, for it is doing good work in this country. I believe the Grand Trunk Railway should be protected in its legitimate rights. I believe that everything that can reasonably be done for that Company should be done; but it is a rival of this national road—naturally so, commercially so—and I believe it was very largely, if not entirely, instrumental in preventing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from getting a quotation on the London stock market until last summer. Well, I was wondering, with the *Globe* newspaper filled, as a party organ, with this great outrage on the people, of lending this money to this soulless, bowless, heartless corporation, that the hon. member for West Durham, being inspired with information from that source, did not make a more spirited speech than he did. He made an able speech, but there was

not in it the fire of even the hon. member for South Huron. But I wish to read something to show why it was injudicious in him to speak of the Canadian Pacific Railway having paid friends in this House. The shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company have half-yearly meetings in London, and the President is called upon to make a statement of the affairs of the railway. His name is Sir H. W. Tyler, M.P., and he made a speech there on the 25th of October last, in which, after speaking of the prospects of the road and of a good many other things, he refers to certain arrangements made for the use of the international bridge, and of a dispute which the Grand Trunk Railway Company had with the Canada Southern Railway Company with reference to tolls. He goes on to say:

“As you know, that question has been in litigation in all the courts. It was decided against them in the first court. They went to the second court, and it was again decided against them; and they then went right up to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Mr. Blake, our counsel in Canada, came over, having prepared a suitable speech to deliver before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.”

This is not the authority of a reporter of a newspaper, who goes up to the manager of a railway, perhaps when he is a little busy and a little irritable, and gets a story all wrong, and sticks it into a newspaper, from which the leader of the Opposition afterwards reads it on the floor of Parliament as Gospel truth. It is not that case. It is the case of a member of the British Parliament and the President of the Grand Trunk Company saying, that they, the Company, have a distinguished counsel, a standing counsel, in Canada—

Mr. BLAKE. It is not true that I am a standing counsel of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. WOODWORTH. You are standing now. Well, suppose he is not a standing counsel. The President of the Grand Trunk Railway calls him “our counsel in Canada.” I do not think he should get annoyed at me—

Mr. BLAKE. I am not annoyed. Nothing the hon. gentleman can say can annoy me.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman smiles. I like to see him smile, he has such an innocent, pleasant and assuring smile. I am not saying a word against this; but I say that the hon. member for South Huron, with his wild dash and rush, does not see where he is firing. Looking over the *Debates* of 1880, I found on one page where the hon. member for West Durham, with all the ability of an English chancery lawyer, that this Government had given the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a fearfully advantageous bargain. He showed in two pages after that that this Company were impecunious, and that they had got everything from the Government to build the railway. It reminded me of the old woman's answer about the tub. In the first place, she said, she had not a tub; secondly, the hoops were off, it was full of suds; and thirdly, she lent it to a neighbour who had not returned it. The hon. gentleman takes care to leave nothing out. He reminds me of what a friend of mine said of a sportsman, who was so ardent that he did not see a feather without shooting at it. It is a wonderful speech, as the speech of a lawyer, but is it the speech of a statesman? Is it a speech upon which he would like his fame to rest as a statesman who took hold of a question and wanted, like a strong man, to carry it to the end. While it is an able piece of reasoning, it begins nowhere and ends nowhere, but remains as a splendid exhibition of what a man can do with his powers of reasoning on any given question, no matter how he mixes them up or how inconsistent with himself—that is all. I am sorry I had to read this extract from Sir Henry Tyler's speech, but I was forced to do it. I beg pardon for saying standing counsel; I will say “our counsel in Canada.” I do not wonder that the Grand Trunk Railway Company succeeded so well against the Canadian Pacific

Railway when they had such a man for their counsel. They have a right to do it, and I do not think the hon. member for West Durham should have called me to order last Session, when he knew that he himself was a standing counsel. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House to any very great extent, further than merely to recapitulate what I have said; for I have made these extracts within the last three or four days, and I had not looked at them until a few minutes before I rose, when I was asked to speak. My remarks are imperfect, but they have the element which I would like the speeches I have heard on the other side to-night to have—the element of truth. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to point to one statement I have made that is not true, for the simple reason that I have not travelled into deep water, but have confined myself to their utterances, as recorded in *Hansard*:

“Little barks must keep the shore,  
Larger ships can venture more.”

I have kept very near the shore on this occasion. I wish to recapitulate what I have tried imperfectly to evolve out of the multitude of speeches and political utterances, viz.: that the great Canadian people have declared that this road must be built from Lake Nipissing to the Pacific Ocean; that the Liberal Conservative party failed on that question in 1873; that the Reform party assumed office in 1874, with a large majority; that they passed an Act, and advertised for tenders under that Act, offering nearly \$105,000,000 to any company to build the road, but without success; that in 1878 they went out of power and their opponents came in; that the moment this Government came in, at their very first Session, they put on record a Resolution placing 100,000,000 acres of land in the hands of trustees to build this road; that in the fall of 1880, they called Parliament together and submitted for its approval, a contract giving altogether in money and lands \$78,000,000 to this Company to build this road, as against the \$105,000,000 which the Reform party were prepared to give, but under which they could not get a tenderer; that this Company, under this contract, and notwithstanding the hostility it met, and all the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite, and other people not responsible to this House, in the public press and on the public platform to decry Canada, they have been able to place upon record an advancement in railroad building unequalled in any other part of the world; that this Company were obliged finally, owing to the difficulty of obtaining funds on account of the depression of railway stocks all over the world, to ask Parliament to lend them \$22,500,000 on a security no man can impugn; and finally that at the end of two years we will have a road from one end of Canada to the other. This is, briefly and tersely, a recapitulation of what I have so imperfectly said. At every turn this Company have been met by the hostile criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite. Had they confined themselves to statements and charges in this House, where they could be met by the Government and their friends, nothing very dangerous or evil could result; but they resorted to insidious means. Scribes, with facile pens, but little patriotism, sent broadcast through the world, wherever the financial pulse beat, statements against Canada, its clime, its soil, and its laws—in every corner of the civilized world, wherever a telegram or paper could reach, such unpatriotic and injurious statements were sent; yet, notwithstanding all this, the Company have been in a great measure successful. I believe in my heart that had the same patriotic consideration been extended to this enterprise that the hon. the Minister of Railways displayed in a speech which will do him honour and his children after him, as long as Canada has a history—if they had shown that patriotic consideration, or a particle of it, which the hon. Minister called for and which they were bound to give,

Mr. WOODWORTH:

by their own record, in common gratitude to the men who helped them in many trying situations in the past, when they were professing their solicitude to build this road—this Company would never have been obliged to ask for this advance of \$22,500,000. They would have been able to build this road without any assistance from this Parliament. The walls of Jerusalem were built by the Jews with one hand on the sword and the other on the trowel, but the enemies they had to deal with were enemies from the outside. In building the walls of our Jerusalem, our enemies are not outside. Our Amorites, Hittites and Amalekites, and all the other ites, are in Canada. It is they we have to dread more than any enemies of the outside, more than the people of the United States, though they are naturally our opponents, and naturally try to keep the tide of immigration from our shores. We have within our borders gentlemen who seize on every failure, who note every person who falls from affluence to absolute penury—in most cases by their own speculations and want of prudence and foresight—who gloat over every disaster, who would hail the darkness and blackness of poverty with the greatest satisfaction, rather than prosperity and happiness under the men who now administer our affairs. This was unmistakably evident in the speech of the hon. member for West Durham at the opening of the Session. It showed itself in the glow that lit up his face every time he spoke of depression, every time he referred to a fall in bank stocks, or to the closing of a factory. On those occasions the faces of himself and his followers beamed with delight, but the moment he had to acknowledge there was some cause for congratulation, they looked as if they had suddenly lost their best friends. Party politics have driven us to this pitch in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. It drove you to that five years ago.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes, it drove us to the polls, and if the people had not spoken out against them they would have driven the country into the jaws of the American Republic before they stopped. It has come to this: that with four or five millions of people occupying half a continent; with the resources depicted by the distinguished nobleman, whose speech I have read, with a soil and climate unsurpassed, with a population of sturdy men and women, for it is well known that the men and women of northern latitudes have more courage, persistence, and energy, than those of southern, tropical climes. We have in our midst men who refused to see those advantages, and who, instead of aiding our country, decry its resources. You will look, Sir, in vain in *Hansard* to find a single statement from any hon. gentleman on this side of the House made during the five years of depression, when we were in opposition, in depreciation of our own country. You will look in vain, Sir, to find one single sentence or one single word, and, though they say: “When you were in power, you took advantage of us”—it is not true. When the hon. Finance Minister has to stand up in the House, and, in answer to a question of taking the duty off tobacco amounting to half a million: I have nothing to replace it but direct taxation; if I knew of a law to tax these people directly I would do so—

Mr. RYKERT. The income tax.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes, the income tax—who was it decrying Canada then? Was it the Opposition—now the Government? No; it was the men entrusted with power, who were appealed to again and again from the benches where they sit now to alter their Tariff, to cease supinely lying on their backs, or sitting in their seats, and saying we are flies on the wheel, only to try to do something. Whoever heard of them going to a factory? Whoever heard of one of them leaving his comfortable room in Ottawa and going to a factory and shaking a workman by the hand and asking him how he was getting on, and shaking

the master by the hand and asking how he was getting on, and how he could assist him? If they had shown some sympathy, if they had done something they would have earned the gratitude of the Canadian people and their opponents. If the National Policy had done no good to the country, which could be shown by facts and figures, which the advocates of it can show that it has, I say that if this Government had done no more than for the hon. Finance Minister, and the hon. Premier, and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and the efficient and able Minister of Public Works, and the Postmaster General, and the hon. Minister of Customs, and the whole Government to visit the different factories and industries of Canada—yes, all of them have sometime or other, not just before an election, Mr. Speaker, to catch the people's votes; but after they had been entrusted with power, they immediately showed the faith that was in them and went to the factories and saw these people and did their best to help them—I say the hope they inspired in the breasts of those managers of the different factories who were hardly and sorely pressed, the hope they inspired in the breasts of the workmen that their wages would not be discontinued and they would not be out of employment; if they had done no more than make the enquiries they made and show the sympathy unto our struggling industries that they showed, they would receive and deserve the gratitude of the people of Canada. I say that these men, having attempted to repair the walls—and I will use the walls again for a simile, and for fearsome of my hon. friends opposite may think this is in Shakespeare, I tell them it is not in Shakespeare; and while they are building and repairing the walls of this great British Confederation they are opposed by the men within who should help them. Our foes indeed are those of our own household. Has it come to this, that, with a sparse population comparatively to the great area that is ours, ours by heritage—is it come to this: that we are driven by party politics to enter Parliament, and, from the moment that the Speaker takes his Chair down to the moment of Prorogation in the spring, it is one continual bitter party strife, decrying the interest of the country, because somebody else happens to be sitting on the Treasury benches? While I believe that the system of party is the best that can be devised, with all its imperfections, yet I say that we cannot afford, in the infant history of our country, to have as much politics as we have got, and to have men, merely for office—for it can be in no other interest, merely for the purpose of turning the ins out, to have them on a great national question like this sinking their patriotism, doing discredit to themselves, and injuring the country as they must and are doing. Suppose the hon. members opposite—the hon. member for West Durham, and the hon. member for East York—had risen in their places in 1880, when the contract was placed upon the Table of the House, and, in answer to the eloquent, fervent and heart-burning appeal of the hon. the Minister of Railways, had sunk all party politics in the presence of this great question, as he had done in Opposition, and had said: "We will help you, we will watch the Company, and we will help to build the road as best we can, and fight out, on party lines, the rest of the question belonging to the region of politics," these men would have risen and would have stood 100 per cent. better in the estimation of their own friends and the people of the country. Their supporters are not so much to blame. Party politics have whipped them into line, but they should not forget that we are Canadians first and politicians after that. You find in the House of Commons in England, when a great question is brought before that House, you often find the Conservatives and the Liberals—not the Radicals, but the true Liberals—working hand in hand. They do not take a party advantage when they can, because it might be disadvantageous to England and to the Empire, and the statesman there who

forgets the voice of patriotism and seeks only a party advantage sinks into insignificance, whoever he may be, in the estimation of the people. But I repeat this again, that during this Session I am afraid you will find the same tactics revived; I fear, they have commenced now. I will close by saying the lines—I will not go to the reading room and copy them—they are not Mr. Smith's—but lines which I know my hon. friends, or some of them, have read when they were but schoolboys, and learned, and that are applicable to the state of things I would wish, and that we all would wish, to see. I will quote the lines of the old dead poet, Longfellow, on the building of the Ship of State, as it occurs to me at the moment, and in the line of thought that I have followed for the last few moments. The building of this great ship, this great Confederation, was the work not of party, but of patriotic Canadians of both sides of politics; but, having had it built, as I have said before, they should seek to be Canadians first and politicians afterwards. Without any more preface I will here recite those lines—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

"Thou, too, sail on, O, ship of state!  
Sail on! O union strong and great!  
Humanity with all its fears—"

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. WOODWORTH. What does the hon. gentleman say?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That reminds me of a short story. It is said that John Randolph, of Roanoke, who was a very witty man, and a very plain, blunt man, was interrupted, as I have been interrupted, while he was speaking as loudly as it was necessary to speak, and he stopped in his speech, and looked at the man in the crowd who had done it purposely for interruption, as of course I have not had it done to me, and he said: "When the archangel Gabriel shall place one foot on the sea and one on the land, and, with his silver trumpet, shall proclaim to the living and the resurrected dead, that time shall be no longer, there will be some long eared, long-nosed, wizen-faced, saffron-hued, sallow, lanky-shaped, knock-kneed, contemptible, suuken-eyed, son of a nobody, singing out 'louder.'" This is all in a parliamentary sense—and in a very parliamentary way I hope:

"Thou, too, sail on, O, ship of state!  
Sail on! O union, strong and great!  
Humanity, with all its fears,  
With all its hopes of future years,  
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!  
We know what Master laid thy keel;  
What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel;  
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,  
In what a forge and what a heat,  
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!  
Fear not each sudden sound and shock!  
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;  
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,  
And not a rent made by the gale.  
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,  
In spite of false lights on the shore,  
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea,  
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee.  
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,  
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,  
Are all with thee! Are all with thee!

I believe, Sir, that these lines are applicable now, and if we would fain hush our party strife but for a moment, and let the strong tide of Canadian patriotism call out the best feelings of our political hearts, we would respond in the words of the dead, great American poet, that—

"Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,  
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,"

are all with this great Ship of State, no matter who is at the helm of it. I thank you, Mr. Speaker,

and I thank the House, and I thank my hon. friends opposite for listening so patiently and attentively to these somewhat crude remarks, for which I must apologize, because, as I said, fifteen minutes before I spoke, I had not time to look at my voluminous extracts from the speeches and remarks of my hon. friends. I have not quoted one-half of them now, and no doubt the House will pardon me for not referring to the rest of them. But I could not give a silent vote on this question, and I felt constrained to give to the House, crude and imperfect though they were, some of the reasons why I meant to vote in favour of the Resolutions, why I believe the great party with which I am allied has the good of this country at heart, and have shown it by their measures that they have inaugurated and by the executive action they have taken.

Mr. DAVIES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

### RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to what I have already spoken to him about privately, namely, that the return brought down the other day does not contain the enclosure that he professed to have brought down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, with reference to that, that the Secretary of the Department informs me that the application of the hon. gentleman was communicated to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Secretary of the Company has written to say that they had not the Act of Incorporation which, I think, has the names and addresses of the corporators. But they have communicated with the members of the Company in the United States, and as soon as the information is received it will be laid upon the Table.

Mr. BLAKE. The statement contained in the record is an extraordinary one, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to cause his officers to reconcile the statement they have now made with that statement on the papers of the House, which is, that the papers are closed. The hon. gentleman will see that in the margin.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman did call my attention to that. I have a note from the Department stating that the return contains all that was furnished by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in answer to our request.

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the consent of the hon. gentleman opposite, I beg leave to move:

That from and after this day, the Order of the Day for the consideration of the Resolutions moved by Sir Charles Tupper, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, shall have precedence next after Routine Proceedings, and the disposal of Questions put by Members.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, no. The hon. gentleman knows that he cannot move that now, after the Order was called this afternoon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like very much to do so with the consent of the hon. gentleman. I intended to do so before the House adjourned.

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman did not intend to move it, or he would have done so at the opening of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must say that it is for the best interests of the country that a decision should be come to as speedily as possible upon this question. To a great degree, delay paralyzes the action of the Company; it introduces an element of uncertainty as to the future action

Mr. WOODWORTH.

of the Company, and affects every person concerned on the road, including the employees. Therefore, whatever may be the fate of these resolutions, it occurs to me that if the hon. gentleman would think for a moment of the interests that are at stake, he would allow this motion to pass.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say it is for the best interests of the country that a decision should be arrived at promptly. I think it is clearly and more obviously for the best interests of the country that that decision should be wise and sound—be based upon full information, full consideration, and with full time for discussion. We have not full information, we have not had opportunity for full consideration upon that information, and we have not had time to discuss it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well then, of course, if the hon. gentleman objects, I cannot go on with it, but I throw the responsibility upon him and the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. No; the hon. gentleman cannot throw the responsibility upon me. If the hon. gentleman, having an opportunity, according to the Rules of this House, to move his motion, has not done so, he is himself responsible. He has let it stand instead of moving it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I want the hon. gentleman to move now and he says—stand.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman would not move when he could, and now he cannot move when he would.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:10 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 11th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Henry Smyth, Esq., as a member to represent the Electoral District of Kent, in the Province of Ontario.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Innes.)

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Platt.)

Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the Ranchers' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Alberta Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Calgary Waterworks Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Calgary Omnibus, Tramway, and Transfer Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 79) for the equitable distribution of Insolvent Estates.—(Mr. Beatty.)

## SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 53) to authorize the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce the number of their Directors.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Live Stock Insurance Company.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 59) respecting the Northern and North-Western Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 60) to increase the Harbour Accommodation of the city of Toronto, to extend the Esplanade, and to provide for the control of the use thereof by Railway Companies.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 61) to amend the Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the River St. Clair Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Macmaster.)

Bill (No. 66) to reduce the capital stock of the Maritime Bank of the Dominion of Canada, and to make other provisions respecting the said Bank.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Gunn.)

## AMOUNTS OWING BY QUEBEC AND ONTARIO.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, What is the precise amount owing by the Province of Quebec to the Government of Canada? What is the nature of the Dominion claim, and for what objects was that debt of the Province of Quebec contracted? How long has the said debt existed, and what has been the annual increase thereof? Has the Dominion claim been contested? If so, what is the nature of the contestation?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In reply to the hon. member, I may say that the most complete answer that can be given is furnished by the papers just laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, What is the exact amount owing by the Province of Ontario to the Government of Canada? Has this Federal claim been contested, and for what reasons?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have to give the hon. member the same answer—the papers furnish the best answer to his question.

## SALE OF LIFE ANNUITIES.

Mr. HALL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in addition to the Savings Branch of the Postal Service, to introduce any system of receiving deposits in connection with the sale of life annuities?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In reply to the hon. member, I may say that the Government are considering the subject; and I will be happy to have communication with the hon. member in regard to it, if he will afford me the opportunity.

## JOHN CORBETT.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Is John Corbett an employé of the Government; if so, in which Department employed, and nature of employment or service, date of appointment and salary? If not so employed, when and why his connection with the Government ceased?

Mr. McLELAN. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that John Corbett is in the employment of the Department of Marine and Fisheries; that he attends to the repairing of lighthouses and inspects new lighthouses; that he has been so employed since June 18th, 1880, at a salary of \$100 per month.

## ELGIN ROAD, COUNTY OF L'ISLET.

Mr. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to erect a station-house at the Elgin Road Station, county of L'Islet, on the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in answer to the hon. member, that I have received a number of petitions and communications from various members of Parliament on this matter, and it is now under the consideration of the Department.

## COLCHESTER REEF LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Has the contract for the Colchester Reef Lighthouse been taken off the hands of the contractor? What amounts have been paid to the contractor on account of the work? When were the payments made?

Mr. McLELAN. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the contract for the Colchester Reef Lighthouse has not been taken out of the hands of the contractor. \$5,000 have been paid to the contractor on account of the work: \$3,000 in October, and \$2,000 in August, 1883.

## SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

Mr. KAULBACH enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to amend 45 Victoria, Chapter 19 of the Acts of 1882, intitled: "An Act to exempt vessels employed in fishing from the payment of duties for the relief of Sick and Distressed Mariners," so as to enable the fishermen of the Dominion to participate in the benefits of the fund, and the advantages of the Marine Hospital?

Mr. McLELAN. I have been collecting information from the representatives of fishing counties in Nova Scotia, and have obtained such information as I think will enable us to remedy the evil. I have a Bill in course of preparation, which I intend to submit, and which, I think, will meet the requirements of the case.

## SECURITY FOR ADVANCE TO THE EXCHANGE BANK.

Mr. HOLTON enquired, Why did the Finance Minister not accept the personal security of Mr. Alexander Buntin for the last advance of \$100,000 to the Exchange Bank of Canada when offered, as well as that of the Hon. A. W. Ogilvie?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government decided to accept security from either of these gentlemen. Mr. Ogilvie came and tendered his security, and it was accepted.

## LEASE OF GOVERNMENT MILLS IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) enquired, Have any of the saw and grist mills, erected by the Dominion of Canada, in the North-West Territories, been sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of? If so, how disposed of, when, to whom, at what price, how paid or payable? Was the disposal by public auction, or private sale?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The saw and grist mills at Old Man's River was sold by the Indian Department to Mr. Peter McLaren, for \$10,000, on October 22nd, 1881. The

sum of \$5,000 was paid down; the balance is to be paid by annual instalments of one-fifth, with interest at 6 per cent. The disposal was effected by private sale. Besides the pecuniary price the sale has been made subject to the following conditions: That the purchaser is to keep both mills in perfect running order; that he will grind Indian and Government farm produce at one-half the rate charged to other parties; that he will make the lumber required for Government and Indian purposes at \$20 per 1,000 feet for five years; that the grinding of the grain and the making of the lumber for the Government and Indians shall have preference over any other work done at the mill; besides which, he was to take over the servants of the mill from the time of the contract.

#### SUPPLY FARM ON PINCHER CREEK.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) enquired: Has the Home or Supply Farm on Pincher Creek, North-West Territory, been sold, leased or otherwise disposed of? If so, when, and to whom, and at what price? Have the stock, plant, and farming implements on said farm been sold or otherwise disposed of? If so, to whom, when, and at what price? Were such sales or other disposals by public competition, or private sale?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Pincher Creek Indian Farm was leased on shares on the 8th of March, 1883, to Jas. L. Chipman, for one year from the 1st of April, 1884. The lessee is to have three-fourths and the Department one-fourth for that year. The stock, plant and farming implements were transported to the Indian Reserve in the McLeod District. The lease was a private transaction, and was not made by auction.

#### IMPROVEMENT FUNDS DUE THE TOWNSHIP OF WALLACE.

Mr. McMULLEN enquired, Whether any sum of money accruing to the Township of Wallace, county of Perth, as Improvement Fund money was, on the arbitration between the Provinces, paid over to the Province of Ontario; if so, how much? if not, is there any sum or sums of money due the said township on account of said fund?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. An answer to the question of the hon. gentleman will be found in the papers which have been laid on the Table of the House.

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

HENRY SMYTH, Esq., Member to represent the Electoral District of the County of Kent (Ontario), having previously taken the oath, according to Law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, was introduced by Mr. Patterson (Essex), and Mr. Wigle, and took his seat in the House.

#### QUEBEC SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION.

Mr. AMYOT (Translation), in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Government of the Province of Quebec, and of all other correspondence, in relation to the School of Navigation at Quebec, and asking for a subsidy from the Dominion Government for the said school, said: Mr. Speaker, some twelve years ago, thanks to the intelligent efforts of the gentleman who now represents the county of Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) a School of Navigation was established at Quebec. This school was subsidized during a couple of years by the Dominion Government. Later on, for one reason or another, this same Government decided not to continue this allocation. There was, and with good reason, quite an agitation among the trade and shipping interest of the country, and earnest entreaties were made praying the Local Government to continue to subsidize the school. This

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Government, true to the devotedness which they are known to have always shown towards all that can aid the advancement and progress of science and arts, extended a helping hand to this institution. They gave it the rooms, furniture, maps, stationery, and all that was required to keep such a school. They also granted to the institution, during a certain time, a yearly subsidy of \$1,000. For the reasons we have explained the other evening, the Government of the Province of Quebec is not willing to continue to subsidize this school. However, we have the proof that the school has given excellent results. Thus, in April last, seven candidates attended the examination; three received certificates as masters, and four received certificates as mates, and since the establishment of the school at Quebec, eighty-two candidates have attended the course of study with the following result: twenty-nine applicants received master's certificates, thirty-four received mate's certificates and three received pilot's certificates; the other cadets are continuing their nautical studies and making the voyages required to obtain their certificates. Since the Local Government has ceased to subsidize this school, it has become necessary to close that institution, but we have deemed it our duty, in the interest of trade and navigation, to approach the Federal Government and to ask them to subsidize this school, whose existence is indispensable to our marine. We must bear in mind that it is the Ottawa Government who, during last Session, passed a law requiring, under a penalty of \$100, that every ship of a certain tonnage should have on board a master and a mate having certificates. The Act 46 Vic., chap. 28, sec. 7, says, among other things:

"After the first day of January, which will be in the year of Our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-four, no sailing ship registered in Canada over one hundred tons register tonnage, nor any steam ship so registered, shall go from any port or place in Canada on a voyage to any other port or place in Canada, or in Newfoundland, or in the United States of America, or on a fishing voyage, or be licensed or allowed to ply on any Canadian water, unless the master thereof has obtained and possesses a valid certificate of competency or service as master for inland, or (as the case may be) coasting ships of the class and description to which such ship belongs, from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or a valid certificate of competency or service as master for sea-going ships, from the said Minister, or a valid certificate of competency as master, for foreign-going ships, from the Board of Trade in the United Kingdom, or a valid certificate of competency as master, granted in any British possession and declared by order of Her Majesty in Council, published in the "London Gazette," under the provisions of the Merchant Shipping (Colonial) Act, 1863, or of any Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, containing such provisions, to be of the same force as a certificate of competency, as master for foreign-going ships granted under the Acts of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, relating to merchant shipping; nor shall any ship registered in Canada and over two hundred tons register tonnage, nor any steamship so registered and allowed by law to carry more than forty passengers, go from any port or place in Canada, on a voyage to any other port or place in Canada, or in Newfoundland, or in the United States of America, unless such ship carries also a mate who has obtained a valid certificate of competency or service as such mate, granted by some such authority as aforesaid."

The same section also requires a certificate for mates, and provides that any person violating this law will be liable to a penalty of \$100. I do not pretend that this law is unwise. I know that the legislation of a country cannot be too anxious to ensure the safety of navigation, both as regards passengers and as regards the freight carried on shipboard; but on the other hand, if this Parliament has deemed it their duty to impose on the owners of ships having a register tonnage of over 100 tons, the obligation to have on board masters and mates having obtained certificates of competency, it also becomes their duty to put the sailors in such a position as to enable them to follow the course required to pass that examination. This law was useful; it was even necessary and its necessity was shown by the somewhat numerous disasters which took place in our Canadian waters, involving the loss of several ships. I am also glad that this law has been passed because it compels our sailors to acquire sufficient training to obtain certificates of competency. It is a guarantee for the

public, an advantage to the sailors and a legitimate cause of national pride for our Canadian navy. This school will open out a new career to our young men, and will make them competent to be good sailors in the waters of any country in the world. At a given moment, our navy may acquire a great importance in a military point of view, and it is well known that in case of war, England recruits a great number of her best naval officers and men among the sailors of the merchant navy. The same thing will take place here, and even from this point of view only, we could not do too much towards favouring the development of the nautical science. But it may be said that this is within the province of the Local Governments. This objection is somewhat serious, and I comprehend all its gravity; but if the hon. Ministers and the hon. members of this House will only lend me their attention for a spell, they will understand that it is unfounded in fact. We have the land militia, which is wholly dependent on the Federal Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, has that Government ever entertained the idea that it was the duty of the Local Governments to establish military schools or to maintain them for the defence of the Dominion of Canada. I think this rule applies, and with much more reason, to the navy. If the instruction of the land militia is entrusted to the Federal Government, it follows that the instruction of the navy must also be entrusted to them. The sailors trained in the schools devote the remainder of their life to sea service. Could a similar statement be made respecting the services of the cadets of our military schools? Perhaps I may be told that the schools of navigation in various parts of the country are self-supporting. I know that such a thing may exist in certain Provinces, where the navigating season is a great deal longer and where the number of sailors is far greater; but it is not so with the school of navigation at Quebec, where the navigating season is shorter, and where for the time being, the number of sailors is too small to make it possible for a school to support itself with its own revenues. This may be realized when our navy shall have become more extensive, when our international trade shall have increased and shall have become fully developed under the influence of our National Policy; but, for the present, we have to create this kind of calling for our young Canadians in opening out to them this important and lucrative career. It may also be said: if the Government grants this subsidy to the Province of Quebec, they will be obliged to grant it to the other Provinces also. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the other Provinces need a subsidy, and if they ask it, I do not see why they should not get it. We have, in the Province of Quebec, only one school situated in the principal seaport. We have sustained it by dint of the greatest sacrifices on the part of the Province. Quebec, although it was not obliged to do it, has paid the expenses of the institution. As this expenditure ought naturally to be borne by the Dominion, Quebec ceases to make those sacrifices. But we ask Ottawa to continue the necessary work and to subsidize this school. The importance of this question, for the present, as for the future, is such that the Government ought to undergo this, to them, very trifling expense. It must be borne in mind that all we ask is the sum of \$1,000, to pay the salary of a professor, chosen by one of the most competent men, the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin), who has always taken such a deep interest in maritime questions. Therefore, let the Government place us in such a position that we may carry out the law passed by them, the law whose existence only began last year, and which has, already, been the source of great difficulties to the navigation between Quebec and Montreal. Even now, the owners of schooners are at a loss to know where to find masters and mates holding certificates, and it is probable that many of their schooners will be retained in the ports of Quebec and Montreal, for want of the certified sailors, which, by law, they are obliged

to employ. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we should facilitate the opening of this new career to second the efforts of the Local Government of the Province of Quebec, and to enable our young sailors to receive what training is necessary to put them in a position, not only to fulfil their duty in the merchant navy, but also, at a given time, to aid the forces of the country by furnishing the officers and crews needed by our war ships. The sum we are asking is not large and the Local Government, if I am rightly informed, is ready to give the rooms, maps and everything necessary for the school, except the salary of the professor which salary they are not now able to furnish. Being already aware of the good will of the Government of the Dominion towards all that concerns the training of our Canadians, both from a naval and from a military point of view, I have no doubt that our request will be well received and that we shall obtain for this school the subsidy to which, it seems to me, we have an undoubted right.

Mr. RIOPEL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, after the remarks so ably made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (M. Amyot), there is hardly anything left for me to say, except that I fully concur with what he has just said respecting the motion which I now second. I shall, however, take the liberty of stating that if a School of Navigation is destined to produce a desirable improvement in one of the main branches of our national industry, it behooves the present Administration to see that such a school is established. It must be admitted, notwithstanding the high position held by our navy from an international point of view, that there is still room for improvement in the practical training of our Canadian sailors. There exists in this respect a want which, in my opinion, should be filled as soon as possible. The Government has already done much towards protecting and developing our shipping trade. Each year large sums are expended for the improvement of our harbours and rivers. We have one of the most complete semaphore systems known; our telegraph lines, established on the remotest coast, all render important services to navigation. And still what is the position of the Canadian sailor? He is left to his own resources to acquire the knowledge necessary for his calling. Is it not evident that he is often in an inferior position, and that he has great difficulties to attain the rank which a better nautical training would give him? Therefore, it is very desirable that the Government should come to his relief and afford him an opportunity to become initiated with the secrets of the hard work he is called upon to perform. Besides, the Parliament has already recognized the necessity of elevating the position of our sailors, and by virtue of an Act passed in 1870, and of another passed in 1883, all masters and mates serving on board Canadian vessels must be holders of certificates of competency. Now, whoever wishes to attain a certain end must be willing to take the necessary means, and the only way to have first-class sailors is to give them the advantage of acquiring that special knowledge which they require to succeed in their profession. We have heard with great satisfaction the statement of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when he said the other day that the Government had under consideration the question of establishing a school of navigation at Quebec. We hope and trust that the Government will not stop there, and that the estimates for the next fiscal year will contain an appropriation with a view to the improvement of the condition of a class so useful to our fellow citizens—the hardy toilers of the sea.

Mr. VALIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I fully endorse all that has just been said by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) and the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel). However, I must add a few words. It often happens that for want of a school of navigation at Quebec we are unable to find mates and masters, and very

frequently ships are delayed in Quebec harbour, as it is impossible for them to pass the Custom House for want of mates and sometimes for want of masters. The Federal Government has already taken a step in favour of this school by appointing, last year, a good Canadian captain of the merchant navy to examine the candidates. As to the school itself, I do not know whether the Government has helped it or not, but I join my colleagues to ask the Government to put their shoulder to the wheel, because the French Canadians are in need of such a school, and because the want of it is deeply felt by the shipping interest of the country. This want is felt not only at Quebec, but also at the port of St. John; if we had this school we could furnish to the navy a greater number of persons whose services are indispensable, and we would probably also have a greater number of vessels, because the fear of not being able to find captains, stops the building of ships.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the merits of this question; I simply wish to join my voice to that of the hon. members who have just spoken. As I represent a county the population of which is partly composed of sailors, I have at heart the interest of that class, and I think it my duty to ask the Government to favourably receive the just demands made to-day by the Province of Quebec. Not very long ago, I was glancing over the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I found, if I mistake not, that we were the fourth or fifth maritime power in the world; but if this powerful navy of ours has not even a school supported by the central Government, I do not see how we can boast of it to our neighbours. If we wish to have a real navy worthy to be set up as a model for other nations, we must at least be able to educate sailors who will also be models among their kind, and from this point of view I think that the Dominion of Canada ought to have for the navy what already exists for the land force, that is to say, schools where the young men who intend to devote their life to sea service may acquire the necessary knowledge to attain this end. I am satisfied that schools of that kind would have a direct influence on the general welfare of Canada, by giving us men able to take the lead in our merchant navy and, at a given moment, to take a place in our military naval force.

Mr. McLELAN. A few years ago, I think in 1870, a grant of \$1,000 each was made by the Dominion Government for the purposes of these schools, which was subsequently supplemented by the Local Government; but owing to the decrease of foreign shipping at Quebec, the number in training for masters and mates became gradually so reduced that the grant was discontinued by the Dominion Government, and by the Local Government, last year. The effect of the Act passed last year will no doubt be to bring in a large number of applicants. I may say that I have been gathering information bearing on this question for some time, and as soon as that information is obtained I will be able to decide whether or not I can recommend a grant from the Dominion Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I might mention that I have just learned that there is a fine vessel of the Imperial Government to be had very cheap. She is at Halifax, and I believe she will soon be broken up unless we decide to take her back again. I mean the *Charybdis*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be silly.

Mr. FORTIN. As I had something to do with the establishment of the first schools of navigation by the Federal Government, I wish to make a few remarks to the House. When the Federal Government, I believe in 1870, brought in a measure which England permitted us to pass here providing for the examination in Canada of masters and mates, and

Mr. VALIN.

thereby enabling them to take command—not only of Canadian but of British vessels, I told the then Minister of Marine, (Mr. Mitchell) that if they did not establish schools of navigation, such as they have in every civilized country—those boards of examiners would be, if not useless, without the influence that they would have if it were known all over the world that our mariners had not only passed a successful examination, but were trained in a good school of navigation. Well, the schools were established, notwithstanding some difficulty from the other side of the House; and I remember the leader of the Opposition opposing the passage of a vote of money for the schools because things were not in proper order. But afterwards we triumphed, and I was proud of our triumph, because we established good schools of navigation in the principal ports of the Dominion; we had good professors, and mariners were enabled to have every facility for study, and to pass excellent examinations. The result was that they were able to go into every port of the world, hold up their heads, and feel that they were as good masters or mates as those in any other part of the world. But it appears there were private schools in some of the ports which were jealous of the public schools; and, at all events, by some means or other, a kind of opposition sprang up against the Government schools in the Lower Provinces, and the Federal Government determined, in 1872, to abolish them. Hearing that that was the intention, I went at once to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), and complained very strongly against the action of the Government. The hon. gentleman was pleased to promise me that he would communicate with the hon. Minister of Marine, and I am glad to be able to say that our efforts were successful in getting him to keep the schools open, until hon. gentlemen opposite came in power, when they were abolished. I was not in the House at the time; I was in the Local House. What did I do? I went to the hon. Mr. DeBoucherville, who was then the Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec, and he was not long in learning that it was necessary for the Province of Quebec to have a school of navigation. He, therefore, re-established the school as a provincial school under Professor Seaton, one of the most suitable men in the world for his position. And sailors who had served their time could come to the school to be educated as first mates, as second mates, or as masters, and they found Mr. Seaton to be a good friend and a good professor. Now, I am sorry to see—I am much grieved when I see—the poor Province of Quebec unable to support a school, and obliged to come here and beg for \$1,000 for the purpose. I am ashamed of it, but it is so. Now I have given these explanations, and the Government, and the House, and the country, will judge what ought to be done. My opinion always has been that the Province of Quebec should be able to give \$1,000 for the education of a class of men who labour so hard, and whose lives are exposed to so many dangers. But still I would urge upon the Federal Government, as I have done before, to reestablish schools of navigation as they were in 1873—one at Quebec, one at Halifax, one at St. John, and one at Yarmouth. No \$4,000 could be better employed, and I would tell the Government that they could do it if they had the will.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has answered the hon. members who have moved and supported this motion, perhaps I may be allowed to add a word or two. I regret that my hon. friend the member for Gaspé should have used the expression which he used just now about the Province of Quebec. The Province of Quebec has not come to the Parliament of Canada as a beggar. We are not begging here; the representatives from that Province have asked for this school as a right; and my Province is not here begging. The representatives of Quebec come here because they think they have a right to lay their grievances before the Govern-

ment of Canada and the representatives of the people. That is the position which I understand has been taken by my hon. friends who have spoken on this subject, and I have no doubt that will be the spirit in which this Government will receive their representations. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from Gaspé used this expression unwittingly; but as this is the first time it has been used in this House, though it has appeared in a certain section of the press, I felt that I should protest against it, because the Province of Quebec is large enough, and proud enough, and strong enough, not to come here as a beggar, but to come as Ontario, the richest Province of the Dominion comes, to lay its grievances before this Parliament, and to receive that attention which it considers itself entitled to.

Mr. FORTIN. Allow me to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman is very hard on me; but I will not withdraw my expression, because it is the truth. I do not say that the Province of Quebec is a beggar, or that the people of the Province of Quebec are accustomed to beg; but I say that the people of Quebec are obliged to come here and ask for \$1,000 to keep up this school because they say the Government is so embarrassed that they are not able to do so. Under Mr. Chapleau's Government the school was abolished, and when I learned it, I wrote a very strong letter to Mr. Chapleau to induce him to keep up the school, and he did so; and I am pretty sure that if Mr. Mousseau had remained, he would have kept it up too. But now it appears they will not keep it up, and they come here to ask for \$1,000.

Mr. AMYOT. No, they do not come here.

Mr. FORTIN. Well, Sir, I always call things by their right names; I tell the truth, and I close these remarks by telling the Federal Government, what I told them in 1873, and many other times, that their duty is to keep up schools of navigation in all the chief ports of the Dominion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very sorry the hon. member for Gaspé has brought in my name, saying that during my administration as Premier of Quebec I had abolished that school. My hon. friend's memory is failing a little, I am afraid—because I am sure he tells the truth, he says it himself, and we all believe him—when he says there never was objection in the Province of Quebec to keep up the school of navigation. The hon. gentleman should remember that the first time that he mooted the idea, as a good patriot, as we know him to be, I said that it was no more the duty of the Province of Quebec to keep up a school of navigation than it was for that Province to keep up a school of gunnery or a school of artillery. We held that since navigation was a matter within the jurisdiction of the Government in Ottawa it should be taken care of by that Government. Had the Quebec Government asked the Dominion to keep up a normal school in Quebec, the latter would have replied that education was under the protection of the Provincial Governments, whose duty it was to keep such schools open. The great anxiety my hon. friend displayed induced the Government for a while to keep that school open, meanwhile asking the Ottawa Government to take charge of it. My colleague the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries made a slight mistake in saying that the subsidy was dropped by the Federal Government when the school was kept by the Provincial Government. No; it was because the subsidy had been dropped by the Federal Government that the demand of the hon. member for Gaspé had been made. I was then Provincial Secretary in Quebec, and, strange to say, the school of navigation was under my Department. There were many students attending that school in Quebec, and my hon. friend knows that when he wrote me to prevent the school being abolished I told him that the Quebec Government could not in justice keep up that school, because it was not our duty to do so. When my hon. friend saw that I was threatening to tell the Federal Government we would no longer maintain the school, he

insisted again very strongly on our continuing it, and, good naturedly, I yielded. The Province of Quebec did not ask, nor had it any right to ask, anything in that matter, except that the Federal Government should take care of an institution which properly came under its protection. I am sure my hon. friend will coincide with me in saying that I have stated the facts as they are.

Motion agreed to.

#### HUDSON BAY NAVIGATION.

Mr. ROYAL, in moving that a Select Committee be appointed to consist of Messrs. Scott, Ross, Watson, Dawson, Abbott, White (Cardwell), Baker (Victoria), Woodworth, Foster, Paint, Brecken, and the mover, to take into consideration the question of the navigation of Hudson Bay; with power to send for persons, papers and records, said: Every hon. member of this House is aware of the agitation that has been going on for some time in the Province of Manitoba with respect to the navigation of the Hudson Bay. This agitation arose in October last, when the farmers of Manitoba, after the frost of September, saw their grain run down in price by a combination of millers. After discussing many questions in connection with their grievances, or so-called grievances, it seemed to be the general opinion that the best way to escape what was called the monopoly of freights of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be to build a railway from Winnipeg to the Hudson Bay. This agitation led to a large meeting called lately in Winnipeg, at which speeches were made and resolutions carried, embodying the strong opinion of all present in favour of the construction of this road. The agitation also extended south of our own borders. The farmers of Dakota and Minnesota, as well as the farmers west of those States, had stronger grievances than ours, and at the Farmers' Convention held at Grand Fort a few weeks ago, which was attended by delegates from Manitoba, the project of constructing the Hudson Bay Railway was discussed. There was but one feeling on the subject, and that was a feeling of enthusiasm in favour of the project. I believe it was there said that if its feasibility was established not only would the Manitoba and South-Western draw every bushel of wheat grown as far as three hundred miles south of Winnipeg, but would also bring into our border the wheat grown in some of the western States of the Union. This question should be ventilated by this House and an authoritative decision respecting it obtained through the formation of a Committee such as the one I propose. My object in having this Committee formed is to get from the most authentic sources all possible information respecting the navigation of the Hudson Bay. It is my object to bring before this Committee any persons who may have records of importance respecting the navigation of Hudson Bay. Of its navigability there is no question. The only question is during what period of the year it is navigable. Upon that question there is a great diversity of opinion: some say that the immense icebergs and the peculiarity of the tides will be a permanent obstacle to the establishment of any permanent communication by sea between ports in the Hudson Bay and the seaports in Europe. On the other hand, it is asserted that from 1610, or during 274 years since the bay was discovered, ships have navigated it every year according to reports furnished by the Hudson Bay Company employees. This would tend to establish that there is at least a period in the year during which the waters of the bay are just as safe for navigation as the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is within the knowledge of every hon. member of this House that, before the system of navigation of the St. Lawrence was fully established, before the construction of our lighthouses, of the storm-signals, of the marine charts, and lately the establishment of the

admirable system of telegraphy, due in great part to the patriotic energy of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin), the navigation of the Gulf of St. Lawrence was considered just as difficult as that of the waters of the Hudson Bay is at this time. I am sure that it has come before the eyes of every one who reads history that, in the 17th century and during the last century, writers in many instances showed that the Gulf of St. Lawrence was impossible to navigate. In fact, it was only due to the persevering energies of the fur traders and of the adventurers seeking a north-west passage that the Gulf of St. Lawrence was opened. In fact, we find in some authors the statement that, during the winter months, the River St. Lawrence, and part of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, was but one solid mass of ice. No doubt to-day these assertions seem to be rather exaggerated, but what can prevent us from thinking that many of the statements made in connection with the navigation of the Hudson Bay are also either beyond or inside of the truth? The Hudson Bay occupies in our history a very prominent place. It was discovered, as I stated, in 1610. Champlain had founded Quebec two years previous, and in that year he left Quebec and ascended the St. Maurice in order to discover that great sea of the north, as it was then thought the Hudson Bay was, and to find a north-west passage. In the same year, an English sailor of long experience and daring energy, Hudson, who discovered also the Hudson River which flows past New York, discovered the bay, and made the entrance by the straits which to this day have borne his name. Well, from that year the bay was frequented every year, and you know very well that it has been the theatre of naval engagements which have left in the history of our country more than one brilliant trace. Years after the discovery, it was of course between the two nations—England and France—that the contest took place for the dominion of those seas; and at the end of the 17th century we all know that D'Iberville, that giant of our history, wrote to the King of France: "Sire, I have grown tired of being obliged to conquer the Hudson Bay every year"—*Je suis las de conquérir la Baie de Hudson tous les ans*. A bloody strife was then raging for the possession of this *mare clausum* or *mare ignotum*, as it is even at this time pretended in some quarters that it is. That Hudson Bay, that inland sea, that sea of the north, attracted more attention in those days, or 140 years ago, than it has attracted until some five, ten, or twenty years ago. I remember that, being a member of the Provincial Government of Manitoba, and deputed here to see the paternal Government of Canada, in order to get some assistance in one way or the other, I was once laying before the right hon. Sir John Macdonald our views of what our frontier should be in the north, and I made mention that Manitoba might be some day a Maritime Province. I see still the smile of incredulity which appeared on the face of the right hon. gentleman at that time. Of course, it might have passed like a dream to have thought of such a thing, but the agitation which has been going on for three or four months has led people to study the question, and to look up documents, has led many to make searches which have not so far proved conclusive; but, with the striking of this Committee and the authority that will be given to its decision, will, I hope, Mr. Speaker, set this matter at rest. Sir, apart from the historical interest that may be attached to that portion of Canada, the cause of the agitation that has been going on in the North-West with reference to this question is the fact that we are wheat producers; that we occupy the centre of North America; are therefore very far removed from the sea-board; and that we are obliged to seek the best outlet that will enable us to reach the market the most quickly and the most cheaply; and, if the navigation of the Hudson Bay, that is to say, if the period during which the waters of the Hudson Bay are open, is established to be three or four or perhaps five months, then the farmers in the North-West

Mr. ROYAL

will benefit on the rates of freight on the whole distance so economized, as between the port of Churchill and Liverpool and between Liverpool and Montreal. Let me give you some figures, and I will conclude these few remarks. The distance between Winnipeg and Churchill is about 630 miles. By railway route it will very likely be some 710 miles. From Churchill to Hudson Straits is 650 miles; the Straits 450 miles; and from the Hudson Straits to Liverpool 1,830 miles. The whole distance is then 2,930. From Montreal to Liverpool the distance is 2,765 miles. That is the shortest summer route; the old route was 2,990 miles. The exports of grain by Montreal last year were something like 10,498,265 bushels, that is to say, 5,798,496 bushels of wheat, 596,104 bushels of corn, a million bushels of peas, and so on. In 1881, the exports of grain reached the figure of nearly 15,000,000; in 1880, it was over 23,000,000; in 1879, 19,000,000; in 1878, 16,000,000. Now, to show how much, if the possibility of the project is once established, the farmer of the North-West will gain by the saving of such a distance, I will give you the rate of transport. A bushel of wheat from Winnipeg to Montreal, according to summer rates, costs 28 cents; according to winter rates, 49 cents; from Winnipeg to Liverpool *via* Montreal, a bushel of wheat by the summer rate 38 cents, and by the winter 59 cents. Now, Sir, according to the distances I have given, if the carriage of a bushel of wheat from Churchill to Liverpool will cost, say—from Winnipeg to Churchill, about 15 cents, and from Churchill to Liverpool, 10 cents—in all 25 cents—you will see what a saving of money farmers in the North-West will be able to make by having such a route—if, of course, the feasibility of the project turns out to be assured. Now, Sir, the average price of wheat in Montreal, in 1882, was \$1.33 per bushel. This price, of course, was governed by the price in Liverpool, and if we can save fifteen or twenty cents a bushel in the transportation to Liverpool through Hudson Bay, the farmer will, of course, obtain just that much more for his wheat. Churchill is about six degrees further south than Archangel on the White Sea, in Europe, and we know that Archangel is a place of large trade and is frequented by a large number of English vessels. You must remember, Mr. Speaker, that Archangel is situated in the 64th degree of latitude north; and Churchill would be situated south of Edinburgh, Christiana and Archangel. We all know, of course, that places situated in the same latitude in both hemispheres have not always the same temperature, owing to certain geographical and other causes; but, in this case, I believe that the ports of Hudson Bay would be just as accessible, at least for the same period, as are those European ports which I have mentioned. If we can only establish that there is safe navigation for a period of, say, three or four months in the year, then our point will be gained, and we will have another Gulf of St. Lawrence to the west of us, and other Maritime Provinces. Sir, I believe that the untold wealth and the illimitable possibilities of that land are something beyond any human conception. I hope, therefore, that the House will agree to the motion, and that the Government will assist the Committee to their utmost in elucidating the feasibility of this scheme, and finally in setting at rest this momentous question of the navigation of the Hudson Bay.

Mr. DAWSON. In seconding the motion of the hon. gentleman from Provencher, I may say that it is very desirable that something more should be known about the Hudson Bay. Last year I called for some papers, which were brought down, and the information which was obtained went to show that the bay itself is open for at least six months in the year—in fact, it is open through the whole year, except for a certain distance along the shore where it is always frozen in winter. But the information we obtained last year certainly was not very favourable as regards the

navigation of the straits. We had reports of sailors and fishermen who had spent the year in the bay, and they all went to show that in some years the straits were so blocked with ice that it was barely possible to navigate them. However, so little is known on that subject that it is highly desirable that further information should be obtained. I believe there is a channel not hitherto followed leading from Hudson Bay to Ungava Bay—the latter bay being not very far from the entrance to the straits. This channel is said to be free from icebergs, but the currents are said to be so strong as to make navigation impossible. Now, I think it is worth while exploring those straits and ascertaining whether, now that steam can be used, this channel could not be navigated. It is certainly highly desirable, in the interests of the North-West, that an outlet for its commerce should be found through Hudson Bay. So far as settlement has yet gone I believe that the traffic will go by Lake Superior, but another tract of country will be opened up which will need another outlet. Another reason for opening up a route to Hudson Bay is the very great resources existing in that region, from all that we can learn about it. Along the East Main coast, from the entrance of James' Bay to the straits, a distance of over 600 miles, there are numerous large rivers emptying into the bay from the eastward. It has now been ascertained beyond doubt that those rivers abound in salmon, and that fish of many kinds abound in the bay. Now, what a field for enterprise would be opened up if there were a line through by way of Michipicoten, or Lake Nipissing, to Hudson's Bay, what a field for various industries would be opened up to Canada, if this bay were made accessible. Not only does the bay abound in salmon and white fish, but cod fish has been found in great abundance in the straits, and we do not yet know what other elements of wealth may exist. Therefore, the opening up of this region would afford a vast field for industrial occupations, besides affording a channel for the North-West trade; therefore, I think it is highly desirable that we should have a Committee to obtain information, and to get all the knowledge we can concerning that great inland sea—that Mediterranean of the North.

Mr. WATSON. I agree with my hon. friends who have just spoken, that it is very important that the problem of the navigation of the Hudson Bay should be solved. The farmers of the North-West have especially a vital interest in the question, for they need most of all to have cheap freight rates, which, I am sorry to say, they do not possess at present. Ever since the last crop was taken off, and for the last four or five months, the people of the North-West have been discussing the problem of the navigation of the Hudson Bay. As has been stated by the hon. member for Provencher, this matter has not received proper attention from the people of the eastern Provinces; though they have also a great interest in the opening up of the Hudson Bay for navigation, we are now beginning to look to that bay for our future seaport. I believe some people regard the scheme as impracticable, but the people of the North-West who have conversed upon the subject with men who have practical knowledge of Hudson Bay, believe that it is navigable for a considerable season of the year. Last year I conversed with an engineer who had spent the preceding winter on Nelson River. He had been sent out there on a surveying party for one of the railways for which a charter was granted by this House, and he states that the Nelson River was not frozen over last year until the 1st of January. It broke up last summer on the 4th of June, and on the 8th of that month the river was clear of ice. That would give about six months to navigation on Nelson River. Of course, there remains the question of the navigation of Hudson Bay, but when we know that old fashioned tubs, old fashioned sailing vessels, have

been able to navigate the straits for the last 250 years, we need have no doubt as to the possibility of navigation by ocean steamships of the present style which should be able to navigate that channel easily, because they have not to overcome the difficulties encountered by sailing vessels which have to wait for time and tide, and which could not attempt to run the channel if ice floes were coming in the opposite direction. I believe it is of the utmost importance that a Committee should be struck, charged with the duty of obtaining all possible information on the subject, and that the Dominion Government should send a vessel to examine the route as soon as possible. We in the North-West depend altogether on growing grain, and our success depends in a large measure on the facilities we have for shipping that grain to the outer world. At the present prices of grain in the North-West, farming will not pay. The freight rates are excessive, and I think they are higher even than the figures given by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal). During last fall the freight rate from Winnipeg to Toronto was 42 cents per bushel of wheat, and, of course, that reduced wheat to a low value in the North-West. As has been explained by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), the opening of Hudson Bay will be beneficial in more ways than that of creating an outlet for the North-West. Its mineral wealth and fisheries are valuable. If we have a seaport at Nelson River, I believe it will stimulate the people of the North-West; and the opening up of a Hudson Bay route, and the construction of a railway from Winnipeg or some other point to Hudson Bay, would cause farming land in that country to advance 50 per cent. There is no country, I believe, in the world which produces grain of a higher quality or a larger number of bushels to the acre than the North-West, and if we are afforded sufficient outlets and cheap freight rates it will come to the front and become one of the most prosperous Provinces of the Dominion. We trust the Dominion Government will give this matter their serious consideration, so that in the near future the problem as to whether Hudson Bay is navigable or not will be settled, and that by practical tests made by the Dominion Government. We hope the Government will not occupy three or four years in exploring the bay, because we in the North-West want immediate relief, so much so that the people would be willing to have a direct tax laid on them for the construction of a Hudson Bay Railway. We have the assurance of gentlemen who have made it their business to make enquiries that there is a company in Liverpool prepared to place on the route a fleet of ten steamers each of 3,000 tons burthen. They have no doubt as to the possibility of navigating Hudson Bay, and what they want is that a railway should be constructed to the shores of the bay to carry the grain to the port of shipment. It is well known to hon. members that two charters have been granted by Parliament to companies for the building of that road, and this House has agreed to allow the companies to amalgamate. It is of the utmost importance to the country as a whole that the Government should endeavour to give the Company building that road not only lands—because it has been stated within the last few days that lands will not build railways, and that you cannot always sell the bonds—but also a portion of the money proposed to be voted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which would be quite sufficient to build 600 miles of railway, for it is estimated that the whole road from Winnipeg to Churchill will only cost \$22,000,000 when completed. The construction of a railway over that route would not be more difficult as regards the greater portion of it than is the building of a prairie section. We trust the Government will be able to afford the House such information as will show that Hudson Bay is navigable, that the recommendations of the Committee, when made, will be acted on by the House, and that at a

day in the near future we will have a seaport in close proximity to our wheat fields in the North-West.

Mr. CASEY. We have heard from two hon. members who have just spoken for the Province of Manitoba; we have also heard from an hon. member who does not seem to be quite certain as to the Province to which his constituency belongs, and I think it will not be out of place that something should be heard from a representative of Ontario. I happen, Mr. Speaker, to agree with all the hon. members who have spoken. In the first place, I admit the vast importance of the question as to whether Hudson Bay is navigable or not. The importance of the question to the Province of Manitoba is beyond all doubt. It goes without saying that a measure which will bring Winnipeg within 600 miles of Montreal must be of the utmost advantage to that Province. The practical effect of this scheme, if carried out, will be that the port of Hudson Bay will be as near Liverpool as Montreal now is, and Winnipeg will be only from 600 to 650 miles distant from that port; that is to say, that the people of Winnipeg will occupy as favourable a position for shipping grain as do those who live only 500 miles west of Montreal. The vast importance of securing such a result would justify even stronger language than has been used by the hon. members representing Manitoba in urging the scheme. The importance of the matter to other western portions of the Dominion does not, however, stand out so clearly, perhaps, at first sight; but I quite agree with the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), and the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), in declaring that it is of importance to the rest of the Dominion. The hon. member for Provencher has very aptly said that it would create a new Maritime Province, or at all events a new seaboard, and it would give an outlet by a new direction to the grain markets of the world. The mineral wealth, the valuable fisheries, and the agricultural capabilities of the country along the shores of Hudson Bay have been lately brought before public attention by Dr. Bell and others who have explored that region, and whose declaration as to the natural resources of that section have startled the people of the older Provinces. We know there are prosperous and thickly settled communities in Europe living at a much higher latitude than this, and there are no special conditions in the Hudson Bay district to render it more unfavourable for settlement than those places to which I have referred, and to which the hon. member for Provencher adverted by name. The only possible ground of objection on the part of hon. members from the older Provinces to the adoption of the proposed motion can be an unworthy fear or jealousy that some trade which otherwise might pass through the older Provinces might seek the Hudson Bay route. I call this an unworthy fear, for, although we must look after our own local interests, I consider that Parliamentary legislators must view these questions from a Dominion standpoint, and consider whether the proposal is advisable in the interests of the Dominion as a whole. Even on the ground of local interest, there is no greater room for jealousy in regard to this scheme than to other schemes to which the Dominion is committed. We are aware that the great trunk line of the Dominion, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is seeking outlets at points outside Canadian territory. We are aware that it has been securing connection with Portland and Boston. We are aware that this has been done by money advanced, in part, if not entirely, by the Dominion, and that in spite of that fact the Dominion is proposing to advance further sums to that railway company. It seems to me a fact which will be generally admitted, that the Dominion, as a whole, should have no ground for being jealous of any railway company, because it seeks outlets to the east other than those which have hitherto been looked upon as the natural outlets for the trade of the Dominion.

Mr. WATSON.

In this case, the wealth which would be added to the Dominion by the opening of this outlet, would be wealth added to the Dominion as a whole, not only from the increase of commerce at the port itself, but by attracting trade and commerce and navigation to that great inland sea, and developing and increasing the tax-paying power of the country as a whole. I wish to say a word with regard to the means to be adopted to carry out these objects. The appointment of a Committee is no doubt an advisable and necessary step, but it can hardly be a conclusive one, because all it can do is to obtain the best possible evidence now in existence, with regard to the navigability of the bay; and I think it will be admitted that that evidence is not conclusive. The experience of the steamers which have plied upon the Hudson Bay was not conclusive, because they were not provided with modern appliances for such a service; and I do not think there has been any systematic attempt at the steam navigation of the bay. In this direction it to be sought the only conclusive settlement of this question. During the debate on the Estimates, I ventured to urge on the Government that they should take early means to secure a vessel, built perhaps in the same way as those which ply from Newfoundland and Scotland, and manned by a crew accustomed to cruising in the ice. This vessel should be kept cruising in and out of Hudson Bay through the straits; it should be allowed to be frozen up until the navigation is impracticable in the spring, and the days and months during which navigation is practicable should be reported. By keeping this up for a whole year we would have a conclusive test of the navigability of the bay; because it is not certain that the greatest obstacles exist in winter. In fact, many scientific men think that it is more easily navigable in other seasons than in summer—that is to say, before the ice and icebergs become loosened from the shore. This, at first sight, seems a reasonable idea, and it is certainly endorsed by scientific men of the greatest experience with regard to that region. I am sorry that the Government have not seen fit to carry out the suggestion which was made, not by myself alone, but by others, that they should adopt a practical means of finding out how long the bay is navigable. I think the importance of the question would justify a much larger expenditure than would be incurred in such a test. The amount expended would be only a small fraction of the amount which we have spent from time to time in deciding on the practicability of particular routes on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, and we would then have decided, positively and perhaps forever, the question of the feasibility of such a scheme. The labours of the Committee, no doubt, will be valuable in ascertaining on what points there is no doubt, and as to what other points further enquiry may be necessary; but the work of the Committee will be valueless if the Government do not supplement their labours in some such way as I have suggested.

Mr. ORTON. The subject before the House is so important that I may be excused for making a few remarks in the way of urging the Government to use every possible means of ascertaining fully the feasibility of the route in question. If the route should be feasible there is no doubt that it will perfectly revolutionize the future prospects of this country. Not only has the Dominion a deep interest in this question, but the British Empire is also interested in its solution. The distance between Yokohama and Liverpool, by way of Port Moody and the Hudson Bay Railway route, is 1,824 miles shorter than the route by New York and San Francisco. The route to Melbourne would be 2,214 miles shorter by Port Moody and Hudson Bay than by San Francisco and New York; and the distance to Hong Kong would be shortened 2,204 miles by this route. I hope that the effect

of the labours of this Committee will be to elicit sufficient information to justify the Government in taking such steps as will result in solving completely, and, if possible, forever, the feasibility of that route. I have no doubt the Government would be justified in seeking the assistance of the British Government in carrying out the exploration, which may probably require two or three years to accomplish. While there is a diversity of opinion as to whether the bay is open around the north shore or the south, there seems to be a wide feeling in favour of the view that the straits themselves are open the whole year. If the navigation of the Straits can be made with safety, no doubt a route may be established for a sufficient length of time to make it very valuable to the future of this country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I congratulate my hon. friend for the manner in which he has laid this matter before the House, as well as the others who have taken part in this very interesting debate. The Government and Parliament have shown their desire to assist in the construction of a railway connecting Manitoba and the North-West with Hudson Bay. Parliament has granted two charters, one for a road to Nelson River, and the other to Churchill. These two companies applied last Session for power to amalgamate—a very wise proceeding, as it is clear two railways could not be built, and that a union of energy and capital and resources would be required in order to have any chance of constructing such a road. As those two railways, having Hudson Bay termini, varied very much in route, the Government treated them as separate lines, and granted them the same land subsidy in aid of construction as was granted to the other railways—6,400 acres a mile, but at a less rate. The other companies got their land at \$1 an acre; the land was given to these two companies at 50 cts. an acre; and when the companies amalgamated, the Government considered the matter of so much importance that they decided to give the amalgamated companies the separate land subsidy at 50 cts. an acre. That is, of course, a substantial aid to the railway. It cannot be expected, however, that capital will be found for the construction of this railway unless it is ascertained that Hudson Bay and Hudson Straits are accessible for a considerable portion of the year. As has been said by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, there is a great diversity of opinion regarding the length of time during which the straits can be successfully navigated. It may be true that a vessel can get through almost every month in the year; but that is not the question to be decided. The question to be decided is, whether for a reasonable number of months in the year there is a probability, amounting to a certainty, that the navigation of the bay and straits can be regularly carried on, so as to be profitable in a commercial sense? I am old enough to remember the truth of the statement made by my hon. friend, the mover of this resolution, that formerly the navigation of the River St. Lawrence itself was considered as doubtful, uncertain, hazardous, and unprofitable, commercially, almost as Hudson Bay now is. The idea prevailed, especially in England, that the river was practically not open for more than four months in the year. That idea has been, by slow degrees, dissipated. The number of months for navigation has increased, and the introduction of steam has rendered the navigation more independent of casual obstructions from ice than formerly, when the whole trade was conducted by sailing vessels. I have no doubt it will be found, when the question is worked out by experience with steam vessels, that the period during which the straits can be profitably navigated will be considerably extended beyond the present idea. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has had this subject under his earnest consideration, and has obtained from the Hudson Bay Company log books of

voyages made by their vessels for a series of years, which he is now having collated and examined carefully. From these log books, most valuable information will be obtained, which my hon. friend will place at the disposal of the Committee, showing what the variations in the seasons are, and whether in one year the navigation is open longer than another. Thus some approximation may be obtained to the fact as to how long, in an average number of years, the navigation can be considered to be fairly open in a commercial sense. The Government, I may say, has been pressed by several gentlemen in this House and by deputations, to consider the propriety of sending at once a vessel to examine the straits. One deputation proposed that we should send a sailing vessel very early this spring. That matter is now under the consideration of the Government. But it is quite true, as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has stated, that the report of a casual vessel for one season will not give sufficient evidence to be conclusive as to the profitableness of the navigation of Hudson Bay and Straits. It would be necessary, I think, to have a steam vessel fitted out, as for an Arctic voyage, and that would involve the necessity, I think, of more than one season's exploration. As the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Casey) has said, it might be well to have the vessel remain and be frozen in, and have parties stationed at different parts of the coast, for two or perhaps three seasons, in order to ascertain what really is the nature of Hudson Bay and Straits as navigable waters. The Government have now this matter under their special consideration. This will be a matter of very considerable expense, but it is one of so much importance that I think the result will be that the Government will feel themselves authorized in coming to the House and submitting a proposition for a vote for the purpose mentioned. The importance of opening up a trade there, I think, cannot be exaggerated with respect to the future of the North-West. Not only will it be the means of access to Europe for the general products of the North-West, but it will be exceedingly valuable on account of the known mineral wealth and the wealth of the fisheries that have been alluded to by my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson). All accounts seem to go to show that the mineral wealth is very large, and I have little doubt that, with further explorations, our present knowledge of the mineral wealth of that region will be greatly enhanced and increased. The fisheries in these great northern waters must be valuable; therefore, the importance of opening up these waters and the trade through them, is obvious, and I do not think can be well exaggerated. I would say to my hon. friend who has made this motion, that I see that Mr. Abbot is the only Lower Canadian whose name is on the list. I would suggest the addition of the names of Mr. Desjardins and Mr. Riopel. Mr. Riopel comes from the coast of Gaspé, and is acquainted with the winter navigation of the Lower St. Lawrence.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to hear the announcement of the hon. gentleman as to the probable intentions of the Government with regard to this question. I think for some time it has been made very plain that, in view of the great interests involved, we should obtain that more exhaustive information which the hon. gentleman intimates he will ask us to provide the means of obtaining. My own opinion has been for some time past that this is a matter for the joint action of the Imperial and the Canadian Governments, and in view of the circumstance that the Imperial Government has not unfrequently utilized vessels of the Navy for such purposes, I think that an application of the Canadian Government for the use of a vessel, indicating their readiness to pay any extra expenses which would be involved in the prosecution of a survey by a vessel of the Imperial Navy beyond those required in ordinary stations, and making arrangements for a lengthened investigation,

would be probably satisfactorily received. There is another point of view in which it is not unimportant that an effort should be made in that direction. No doubt the capital which may be required to secure the execution of this great scheme, involving, as it does, the creation of a new line of communication across the Atlantic as well as the railway line, must principally be obtained in England, and great credence will be placed on the reports of the officers and scientific persons appointed or accredited by the Imperial authorities. In that respect, it would tend to the advantage of the scheme that, if possible, such arrangements as I have suggested should be made. I would suggest also, that no delay take place, as the emergency in the North-West is pressing. The suggestion of the hon. member for West Elgin, that the vessel should remain a very considerable time will, I hope, be adopted. Much has to be done in the way of indirect exploration, irrespective of the simple question of the ice, which is, in one sense, the more important one. More information should be obtained as to the various harbours and other subjects of enquiry in an exploration of this kind, and the time spent in the bay, although not devoted to the single question of the ice, will be well spent if arrangements are made to have scientific persons form part of the staff especially chosen to undertake the work. With reference to the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the liberal provision which has to be made for the railway, certainly 50 cents an acre is a price only half that which has been set down for the land of other railways in the North-West. But if I rightly understand the arrangements made—although I am sorry to say the details have not been laid on the Table—I believe the grant for the railway in this direction is of lands in the neighbourhood of the railway itself, and that they are not supposed to be quite so valuable as those through which the other railways run.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so.

Mr. BLAKE I think the hon. gentleman's statement has to be taken with a certain discount, with which we are accustomed to take his statements. The ordinary assumption will be that the lands through which this railway runs are not worth half as much as those through which other railways run.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quite true, the lands are not supposed to be so valuable as those lying further south. Therefore, the grant has been doubled in quantity and the price diminished by half.

Mr. ROYAL. As other names have been suggested to be added to that Committee, I would, with the consent of the House, suggest that Mr. Macmaster's name be added to it, as he has given some study to the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. There can be no objection to the admission of the name proposed. But the hon. gentleman has not shown the usual courtesy observed in the constitution of such a Committee, since out of the fifteen names selected only two are from this side of the House. I am sorry the hon. gentleman should have felt himself so separated from us in a question of this kind that he would not trust some little share in the deliberations of the Committee to this side of the House. I think as the hon. member for West Elgin has paid some attention to this subject, his name should be added.

Mr. ROYAL. I have not the least objection that the name of the hon. member for West Elgin be added.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The rule cannot be dispensed with and the number made more than fifteen.

Mr. BAKER. I can assist the hon. gentleman by asking that my name be withdrawn. I have had twenty-five years of navigation and I do not propose to have any more.

Mr. BLAKE.

Motion agreed to, with the addition of the names of Messrs. Casey, Macmaster and Riopel and the withdrawal of the name of Mr. Baker.

#### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, NAPANEE.

Mr. ALLISON, in moving for copies of papers and correspondence relative to the appointment of a Collector of Customs at the Port of Napanee, said: I move for these papers because there are several worthy young men in my county better fitted in every respect for this position, whose claims could not have been properly represented to this Government at the time this appointment was made.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no correspondence in connection with this matter and I do not see what object the hon. gentleman can have in having his motion carried. I may say to the hon. gentleman, that in this case, as in other appointments, there are always others desirous of obtaining the positions filled who think they are better fitted for and better entitled to them. Before the hon. gentleman has been many years in politics, he will find this feeling in all parts of the country.

Mr. ALLISON. If there are no papers I withdraw the motion. But there must have been something to guide the hon. Minister verbally, or otherwise. I have no doubt that there are worthier men in Lennox whose claims could not have been properly presented. As there are no papers, I withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

#### FAIRFORD RIVER (MAN.) IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. ORTON, in moving for copies of all reports, correspondence, memoranda, Orders in Council and other documents in reference to the improvement of Fairford River, the outlet of Lake Manitoba; the removal of the sand bar at the mouth of Red River, and the obstructions in Nelson River, the outlet of Lake Winnipeg, with a view to draining the submerged lands in the Province of Manitoba, said: The object I have in asking for these papers is to ascertain what the Government is doing in reference to this very important subject. It may not be known to the hon. members of this House that this involves the reclaiming of an immense tract of some of the best land in the Province of Manitoba, which is submerged in consequence of the overflow of Lake Manitoba and the Red River, westward from the city of Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie, by which a very unfavourable opinion is given to the people who travel in that direction. Again, there is an immense tract to the south of the Assiniboine near to the town of Morris, comprising some thirty townships, in what is called the Boyne Swamp. On the west of Lake Manitoba, there is also an immense tract of land which is submerged and the land rendered almost useless. Also, between the two lakes, Lake Winnipeg and Lake Manitoba, there is another vast tract. I may be allowed to explain some of the causes why this land is submerged. The waters in the various streams in the North-West during the high water time are loaded with vegetable matter and with the soil of the country. When the rivers overflow, this vegetable and earthy matter is deposited upon the banks of the rivers, and also upon the banks of the lake, causing the banks to be very much higher than the surrounding country. The result is that, between the Assiniboine and Lake Manitoba, there is a basin, and, when the water overflows, it cannot get at low water either into the river or into the lake. The same occurs on the south of the Assiniboine, though the banks are higher, and the water overflows. In consequence, I may say, of the overflowing of Lake Manitoba, the waters of the Assiniboine are very much increased and the overflowing of the Assiniboine is greatly more than it would otherwise be. The result is,

that an immense quantity of water overflows the south bank, and forms what is called the Boyne Swamp; the same holds good with regard to the lands submerged between the northern and southern portions of the Assiniboine before it turns westward to the Red River. There is an immense basin between the lake and the river and even on the borders of Lake Winnipegosis as well as Lake Manitoba. There is a complete basin between Lake Manitoba and the Assiniboine, to the west of that lake. This will explain why these marshes exist and are not drained during the low water time. I may mention that there is a fall between Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba of 19 feet, and between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg of 41 feet. The Fairford River, or the Partridge Crop, as it is commonly called, is the outlet of Lake Manitoba and also the outlet of Lake Winnipegosis. In some seasons, this river is comparatively narrow, and in consequence the outlet is more or less impeded. In some seasons, when the watershed is very great, it fills the streams which empty into Lake Winnipegosis, and Lake Manitoba becomes very high, and lands, which some years ago were excellent farm lands, occupied by settlers, are now submerged. One of the improvements that is required is the enlargement or deepening of Fairford River, and, from what I can learn, it will not be a very expensive undertaking. The bed of the river is somewhat hard, it is true, but not rocky. It consists of what is commonly called buckshot earth, that is, it is a mixture of clay and gravel, with perhaps some boulders. Dredging alone, perhaps, would not answer the purpose, but, from what I can ascertain from those who seem to know something about it, the river can be improved, perhaps, by dredging alone, and certainly by the use of some nitro-glycerine, which would loosen the earth, so that very little difficulty would be found in deepening the Fairford River, and so preventing the overflow of Lake Winnipeg and the Assiniboine River. An improvement might also be made by straightening the course of the Assiniboine River. The ice jams that occur there, in consequence of the tortuous, winding character of the river, increase the overflow very much, and, if the Government would straighten some of the bends in the Assiniboine River, by cutting a channel through, that could be avoided. I may say, in connection with this subject, that it is thought by some that, in order to completely and thoroughly drain the Province of Manitoba, it may possibly be necessary to make some improvements also on the Nelson River. There is no doubt that on the Nelson River, 30 or 40 miles from its source at Lake Winnipeg, there is a bar which prevents the water from flowing out freely into the Nelson River. However, that, doubtless, will be a matter to be considered in the future. The bar at the mouth of the Red River is another impediment which it is absolutely necessary, in the interests of the navigation both of the Red River and Lake Winnipeg, to remove, and I believe something is being done there. The rapids at St. Andrews also form an impediment on the Red River where improvements might advantageously be made. Now, though the expense incurred in making these improvements may be considerable, when we recollect that there is an amount of land which is estimated at closely upon 3,000,000 acres which can be reclaimed, the expense is a mere bagatelle compared with the benefit which will be derived from the expenditure, and I trust that the Government will take this matter up very seriously. Indeed, I may say, that the people of the Province of Manitoba, especially in that part surrounding these marshes, feel that this is one of their great grievances, and they believe that they have not the remedy applied because they have not the control of the lands of the Province, and the Provincial Legislature have not the revenue to make the improvements, which may appear to be of a local character. It is my opinion that a great deal would be done by the Government to allay the dissatisfaction in that

country were they to take up this question seriously and show that they have a deep interest in the welfare of that Province. From another point of view, I think you may say that it is important to the whole of the settlement of the North-West that the Province of Manitoba—the gateway, the entry into our great North-West—should be made to appear as presentable as possible to those who are emigrating into that country, and those who pass through for the purpose of ascertaining the value of our great North-West. I know very well, that in consequence of the damage caused by the overflowing of the Assiniboine, there has grown up a strong feeling in favour of the Province obtaining the lands under its own control. But, whether the Government sees fit or not to give the Province of Manitoba the control of its lands, I certainly think the proceeds of their sale, after giving a reasonable share toward the construction of the public works that are being made there, should be devoted as much as possible to the improvement of that Province. This is one of the most important and urgent improvements that are required at the present time in that Province. There is no doubt the people also feel the want of railways; but that is a question of a different character.

Mr. SCOTT. This question of the lowering of the waters of Lake Manitoba was brought before the Government some years ago. The hon. Minister of Public Works sent out a corps of engineers to ascertain the cost of lowering the water of that lake; but nothing has been done since. In addition to the large quantity of lands that would be reclaimed by this proceeding—to the amount of between two and three million acres—another very important improvement would be effected. Lake Winnipegosis empties into Lake Manitoba through the Water Hen River. On Lake Winnipegosis there are some very valuable timber limits—the most valuable in the Province of Manitoba. Some of the limits were disposed of about six years ago, but up to the present time the purchasers have not been able to use that timber by reason of the impossibility of navigating the Water Hen River. In the Session of 1881-82 the hon. Minister of Public Works, from representations made to him, placed the sum of \$5,000 in the Estimates for the purpose of having a thorough survey made of this Water Hen River. The report made was that it would be unadvisable to improve the navigation of that river, as by so doing a larger body of water would flow from the Winnipegosis into Lake Manitoba. Therefore, I claim that the Government would not alone receive the benefit of reclaiming the two or three million acres of land which would then be available for agricultural purposes, but that it would receive a great amount of royalty yearly from the owners of the timber limits on the east side, and principally in the islands in Lake Winnipegosis. I trust, therefore, that the Government will resume this enterprise, which has now been delayed for a number of years, and will speedily take some means by which the Fairford River may be opened up, so that the waters of Lake Manitoba may flow more readily into those of Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. WATSON. As I have some considerable knowledge of the question under consideration, I may perhaps, be permitted to say a few words upon it. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) has taken up this matter. I brought it up last year, and got some information from the hon. Minister of Public Works as to his intentions with reference to the improvement of the Fairford River, or the Water Hen River. My hon. friend from Centre Wellington is a little astray in what he has said regarding the flooding of the lands. There is no basin existing between the Assiniboine River and Lake Manitoba; on the contrary, there is a good deal of fall between the river and the lake. When the wind is from the north, the waters flow round on the south shore of Lake Manitoba, and when the wind is from the south, they flow back again.

The tide rises in this way about 2 feet on each side of the lake, and consequently a good deal of land is overflowed. A great portion of the land on the south side of Lake Manitoba is marshy, owing to this reason; and the wet season of the past year has doubtless made it worse. An encouraging feature in the case is the fact that the water of the lake has gone down about 2 feet within the last few years. I do not think the deepening of the Fairford River is what is required to remedy the evil complained of, because the deepening of that river would spoil the navigation of Lake Manitoba in a dry season. What is required is a channel at the mouth of the Fairford River to carry off the overflow in wet seasons. If this is done, I think the result will be to reclaim the lands and to keep the water at a certain height in both wet and dry seasons of the year. Concerning the improving of the Water Hen River, I have some information derived from the captain of the steam tug which has navigated Lake Winnipeg the last three years. He thinks it will not be a very difficult matter to improve the navigation of the Water Hen River. That river is about 30 miles in length, and a connection can be much better and cheaper made by cutting a canal about a mile and a-half in length, and by putting in a lock. This would shorten the route between Lake Winnipegosis and Manitoba by some 30 miles, and I think this could be done cheaper than by improving the navigation of the Fairford River.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Where would the lock be?

Mr. WATSON. At a point between Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba. The Water Hen River runs in a north-easterly direction, and turns right round and comes back to nearly the same point. A canal of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles in length would cut off 30 miles of distance, and consequently would do away with the excessive flow of water out of Lake Winnipegosis, though at high water it would probably overflow the shores of Lake Manitoba. I trust this matter will receive the early consideration of the hon. Minister, not only for the purpose of reclaiming the lands on the shore of the lake, but for the purpose of improving the navigation between Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba. As has been stated by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scott), there are large timber limits up there that cannot be successfully operated at present. We have tried already to navigate the Water Hen River, but without success. That river runs for a distance of about 12 or 15 miles into what is called the Water Hen Lake. It is almost impossible to run logs down that stream, owing to the fact that the Water Hen Lake has a rough, stony bed but 2 or 3 feet deep. There is a great deal of shallows in the Water Hen River and at no period of the year would it be of any use for running logs for more than about 4 miles. The captain of the steamboat whom I have already mentioned, tells me that the water is 2 feet lower in Lake Winnipeg now than it was four years ago; but the channel in the narrows, between the north and south ends of the lake, remains about the same depth—it is 6 feet now, and it was 6 feet deep four years ago, notwithstanding that the water is 2 feet lower in Lake Manitoba. Apparently the current between both ends of the lake keeps the channel clear. The widening of the mouth of the Fairford River will not interfere with the navigation of Lake Manitoba at the narrows, the only place where the water is shallow. I trust the hon. Minister will give this matter his attention at once. It will not only open up the timber limits, but greatly improve the facilities for trade. The operation of these limits would also give cheap lumber for the plains in that vicinity, which is another point well worth consideration. This would require the improvement of the White Mud River, which would need to be dredged in order to allow the passage of vessels as far up as the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. If this were done, it would open up a route for navigation from Lake Manitoba to points in the

Mr. WATSON.

Province, and the North-West, up to the Saskatchewan. I hope the Government will allow the motion to be adopted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to these papers being brought down, but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the report of the Public Works Department for 1881-82, at page 96 of the appendix, there are 20 pages of a report from the Chief Engineer of the Department, and Mr. Geddes was specially sent to the point in question to investigate this matter. I would ask the hon. member not to insist on having these reports brought down again, as they have already been printed. I will bring down papers that have not already been submitted. I am not in a position to say what the Government may do; but I may remark that we are now building a dredge for the purpose mentioned in this motion, and to meet other requirements in the North-West, at Red River and Lake Manitoba. I cannot go further, because the matter has not yet been decided by Council.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand that the dredge is intended to open the river?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say that. If the hon. gentleman will refer to those reports, he will find the matter is not so simple as some hon. members believe. It is a very difficult matter, and is an engineering question, which engineers will have to deal with. Besides, it is a matter which will cost something like \$300,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. Minister says the Government are building a dredge: where is it being built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is being built on the shores of Lake Manitoba, I think, and I understand it will be ready next season.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understand a dredge is being built on Lake Winnipeg.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say exactly the spot where the dredge is being built, but I will give the information to the hon. gentleman subsequently. Of course we will not be able to send it everywhere, but we will send it where we can. This whole matter, which is one of importance, will have to be considered as to whether we will undertake it or not; but there are engineering difficulties that have been pointed out, and which appear in the report to which I have referred.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. ORTON. I desire to offer a few remarks before the motion is submitted to the House. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) thought I was incorrect when I stated that there was a basin existing between the Assiniboine River and Lake Manitoba, but I think if he remembers the position of Long Lake he will agree that I was correct; and also in regard to Fairford River, that hon. member also took a somewhat different view. From what I can learn, not only is there a bar which requires to be removed, but other work is necessary. If the bar were removed it would do a great deal of good undoubtedly, but it is generally considered that such would not be sufficient to cover all that is required, in order to give a sufficiently free outlet to Lake Manitoba.

Motion agreed to.

#### BANKING FACILITIES.

Mr. ORTON moved that a Select Committee be appointed consisting of Messrs. Wallace (York), Sutherland, Taylor, Thompson, Hesson, Landry (Montmagny), Benoit, Auger, Kinney, Landry (Kent), Scott, Gordon, and the mover,

to enquire as to whether cheaper and easier banking and other financial facilities cannot be afforded Canadian agriculturists; with power to send for persons and papers. He said: Mr. Speaker, in order to make clear to the House the object I have in view in asking for the Special Committee mentioned in the resolution, I desire to refer briefly to our present banking system and its operation upon our industrial population. The general banking Act provides apparently, by a certain clause, that money can be loaned to the general public at no higher rate of interest than 7 per cent.; but so vague is that clause it would seem to require another Act of Parliament to interpret what the meaning of that particular clause is: or, in other words, I do not think it has ever been found practicable to recover from banks any amount charged over 7 per cent. So I desire to try and see if some plan cannot be adopted by which farmers can get money cheaper. I do not see how it can be done by the general banking system as it at present exists, and I may refer further to that system in order to show that it is utterly inadequate to the wants of this country. The capacity of our present banks to accommodate the people by credits is limited. It is limited, in the first place, by the limit placed upon their circulation. Our banks are prohibited by the general banking Act from issuing \$2 of their own promises to pay, for every \$1 they possess in the form of specie or Dominion securities. They are also hindered by the amount of their deposits. It is well known that during periods of depression from almost any cause, and especially the depression which may, and always does arise to a greater or less extent, from a failure of the crops, the deposits in our banks are withdrawn. Large deposits do not find their way to our banks under such circumstances, and their capacity to give the necessary accommodation to the business public is curtailed at the very time when it is most needed, and the result is general commercial disaster and distress amongst our people. I am sorry to say that, according to the system which now exists, the burden of these disasters falls eventually upon the agricultural class. We know that when the deposits are reduced the banks are obliged to curtail their accommodation to the public; they cannot discount the paper which they have been accustomed to discount. Business men who base their business on a belief, which appeared when they entered it to be well grounded, that they would receive a certain amount of accommodation so long as they were able to present paper which is considered good, find that, notwithstanding that their paper may be of the highest standing, they cannot always get a line of discount. The result is that the wholesale men have to press the retail men for early payments. Manufacturers have also to press the middlemen who are engaged, like the retail merchants, in dealing with the farmers, and the consequence is that the farmers are pressed just at the time when there should be some means of enabling them to tide over the misfortune of a bad crop. My own opinion with reference to our banking institutions is, in the first place, that the system is neither a safe one for the public nor one which should exist in a country like this. We know very well that as long as the banks are allowed to issue their own paper, a commercial panic is likely to occur, in consequence of the banks becoming afraid that a run may be made upon them by those who hold their paper. I have always believed—and I believe a great many people of this country believe with me—that the basis of our financial banking system should be the Government of our country. The Finance Department of the Government should be more completely and thoroughly than it is at the present time, at the head of our banking institutions. It should also have in its possession the latest and most reliable statistics in reference to the trade of our country—not only as to the condition of our industries, but in reference to our mineral wealth

and our agricultural resources, as well as in reference to the markets both domestic and foreign, so that they might be enabled to gauge and regulate the amount of money in circulation by the wants and requirements of the people. As the first step in that direction, I think the plan might be very wisely adopted of giving to those who are engaged in creating the largest amount of wealth—and of course I mean the farmers—easier banking facilities, by the establishment of farmers' banks for the purpose of lending out money to farmers at short dates, and at reasonable rates of interest. Hence, my request for a Committee. I wish to trace a little further the unjust position in which the Canadian farmers are placed. When their crops fail and they are pressed by the retail men and the middlemen for payment, they have no facilities for getting temporary accommodation and tiding them over until they can either get a better crop, or are enabled to overcome other misfortunes which may befall them through losses by fire, sickness, or other disaster. When such a misfortune happens them now, the only way in which they can get the accommodation they require is to go to a private lender of money, or a private bank, or, if the sum needed be a large one, they are obliged to go to the loan societies, all of whom charge the highest possible rate of interest. As a matter of fact, therefore, the farmer is really obliged to pay a very high rate of interest in order to get temporary accommodation, and he is thereby crippled very much in his efforts to produce wealth from the soil. We find that private banks are springing up in every portion of this Dominion. They may be useful institutions, but there is one thing very certain: they are extorting very large rates of interest, and chiefly from the farming population. Not only are they charging high rates of interest to the farmers, but they are crippling the ability of our banks to accommodate the business public. We find that a private banker, with a capital of \$20,000, can get a line of credit in the chartered banks for double that amount, thereby, I maintain, taking from the business public the money which is required to carry on their business, and lending it again to the farmer at a much higher rate of interest than is paid to the bank. Then the stockholders of our banks are not always men living in our country, and the profits which are made by our banking institutions are largely taken away from Canada to a foreign country, the wealth of this country being thereby, to a certain extent, reduced. Loan societies are institutions to which the farmers have to resort when they are obliged to borrow a larger sum than they can get on any security they can offer in the shape of endorsed notes or chattel mortgages. They are often induced by these loan societies to borrow a larger amount than they require. They are also put to enormous expense in searching titles, papers, &c., and are put to heavy legal expenses. The result is that almost every farmer in this country who borrows from a loan society, sooner or later loses his farm. Happily, the farmers are not so thoroughly in the power of the loan societies as they were a few years ago, before the Bill was passed which I had the honour of introducing here, limiting the time to which their mortgages could extend to five years instead of twenty years, as was the case formerly. One of the greatest difficulties the farmer had to contend with at that time was that he could not get any release at the time money was cheap, and could not sell his property. With the five years' term, that evil is not so great; but through the operation of our banking system, he is forced to borrow money when it is scarce, and when the rates of interest are at the highest point. When the banks press the wholesale merchants, the wholesale merchants press the retail merchants, and the retail merchants press the farmers, and money is scarce in the country. Then is the time that our agriculturalists are obliged to go to the loan societies, who charge them the highest rates of interest that can be

obtained. To-day, in Manitoba, we find the loan societies lending money and taking mortgages right and left from the farmers of that country at 10 and 12 per cent. If these men had some facilities for obtaining temporary loans from farmers' banks, such as I think might be established in this country, they would not be obliged to become the slaves of these loan societies, as unfortunately, many of our best farmers have been in the past. One of the objections I have to loan societies is that a great deal of their capital is British capital. Thus a large portion of the interest which is paid by the agriculturalists of this country is sent to a foreign country, and thereby our country is impoverished to that extent; and we all know that in a very few years the principal is eaten up in interest, so that the farmer, after paying back what he originally borrowed, still owes the principal. Now, Sir, I shall just ask the House to listen briefly to an outline of my crude ideas in reference to how I think farmers might receive better accommodation. It is not my intention to place these ideas before the House in the expectation of their receiving the endorsement of this House, but they are such as have appeared to me to be feasible. The object of the Committee will be to consider, not only my views, but what views other hon. members of the Committee may have upon this question, in order, if possible, to arrive at some means of remedying one of the greatest evils that exist in this country. If the Government should see fit to charter farmers' banks, subject to all the inspections and all the regulations that are imposed on other banks, and give them a basis of circulation such as I shall indicate, providing that money should be lent to farmers at no higher rate than 5 per cent., such a measure would be of great advantage to the whole country. I maintain that 5 per cent. is as high a rate of interest as any farmer can afford to pay. If he pays more than that, and has his farm mortgaged for one-half or one-third of its value, he is virtually not the owner of the farm; for he is paying as much in interest as that farm would bring if rented. I think the Government should give to these chartered farmers' banks the privilege of obtaining a Government issue of Dominion legal tenders to the extent of one-half of the assessed value of the improved farms of stockholders or borrowers; that is, any farmer desiring to borrow or to become a stockholder in such a bank might deposit in that bank a first lien on his land to the extent of one-half of its equalized assessed value, which could be verified through the officers of the various municipalities. I think the Government ought to give the same privilege to these banks as they give to other banks—of issuing \$2 in legal notes for every dollar they hold in specie or Dominion securities. These banks might also be utilized by placing under their management the savings bank business of the Dominion. One-half per cent. might be given to the Government for the expense of the legal tender issue, and one per cent. or one-half per cent. would amply pay all the costs of management, leaving with the farmer, who desired to deposit in the bank, a lien of 3 per cent. on the latent capital which he holds in his farm. I would propose, also, to limit the amount of money that might be loaned by these banks. In the first place, they should be limited to loan only to farmers, and in the second place they should be limited to loan on notes or endorsed paper, to a limited amount, say \$1,000—that is, upon notes at short dates, such as two, three or four months, renewable if required, at 5 per cent. They should also have the power to loan, year after year, at 5 per cent., to any farmer who desires to borrow money and place in the bank a first lien or mortgage on his farm to the extent of one half of its assessed value. By this means those that are well-to-do would not only derive a considerable profit from their saved wealth, sufficient to pay their taxes and any other incidental expenses, but they would aid their fellow farmers to get money at a cheap rate,

Mr. ORTON.

and the basis would be a perfectly sound one. The effect of this would be, in my opinion, to increase the agricultural wealth produced in this country to an enormous extent, and thereby increase our exports and bring into this country a very great increase in gold or in gold's equivalent. This would, consequently, prove a safeguard, to a very large extent, against the recurrence or depression or stagnation in trade, and further cause the greater part of the business of the country to be done on a cash basis. The farmer, instead of having to go on credit, would at the end of the year, have paid his debt. At present we know that merchants, if not paid at the end of the year, are obliged to carry over the farmers, if possible, and charge them interest. In some parts of the country the custom is still—I know it is in my county, and the hon. member for North Wellington, I have no doubt, knows it well—to charge on a running account 10 per cent compound interest every six months, sometimes every three months—not only to charge the farmer the highest credit price for his goods, but also, if he cannot pay, compound interest every six months at 10 per cent., thus increasing the amount he owes to a very large extent over what he would have to pay for the same goods had he paid cash. I think that all classes would be benefited by the establishment of these farmers banks. We all know that our manufacturing population and our commercial population, the residents of our cities and towns, largely depend for their prosperity on the success of farming operations, and if the business of farmers could be done for cash, not only would merchants and manufacturers of every kind succeed better and fewer failures occur, but all our labouring population would receive more employment. We have another weakness in our present system which I think this would, to a certain extent, obviate. We all know that commercial panics have a very serious effect upon our present banking institutions. Even when such depressions occur in the country bordering on ours, or one with which we have considerable dealings, they are very apt to produce more or less commercial depression in our own country. There is another danger under our banking system, to which I wish to refer, that this would also obviate. We know that under the present system, at times when money is scarce, when deposits have been removed from our banks, when our exports have not been as large as usual, banks are obliged to refuse to discount paper; but they have the power of selecting to whom they shall refuse credit, and it frequently occurs that banking directors receive large amounts, or that, through the offices of banking directors, favouritism is shown and money is lent to those engaged in the most risky, and in perhaps, illegitimate kinds of businesses, while those engaged in legitimate business, are still refused accommodation. I think that farmers' banks would have a tendency to obviate difficulties arising in that way. With regard to the basis upon which farmers' banks should be established, I think that those who advocate a gold basis cannot object, because it is well known that the gold loaners of Great Britain are ready to-day to lend to any extent to the farmers of our country—to a larger extent than I ask as the basis of this issue of Dominion legal tenders. We know that our farmers, at any rate in Ontario, are not assessed for much more than half of the real value of their property, whereas loan societies or, in other words, the gold loaners of Great Britain, are willing to lend their gold to our farmers to the extent of one-third, even one-half of the real value, which is much more than I ask as the basis for this circulation. There is another reason why this circulation can never depreciate in value, and that is, that it is better than a simple Government issue. A simple Government legal tender issue would not be as good, for the simple reason that in the case of any war complications or threatened invasion, it would depreciate very much in value, whereas an issue which depended for its basis

upon the important landed property of the country would not depreciate. Capitalists well know that if this country should ever be conquered, and I am sure, with our hardy population, it never will, the land would not change its proprietorship. Money based on the landed property of a country is perfectly safe. It may be said that farmers are very poor business men, very careless, and that great deal of trouble will arise if money is loaned to them through banks. I must acknowledge that perhaps it is true that farmers are not accustomed to business, as ordinary business men, but we have amongst our farmers some of the best business men of the country, and I believe all our farmers can and would very soon acquire business habits. Therefore, that could be no possible argument against this scheme. To show that it is not altogether a wild idea, I will read a telegraphic despatch from Great Britain which I noticed in a recent paper. On the 8th of this month I noticed in the *Mail* the following despatch:—"Irish Lands Mortgage Bank project—the establishment of a land mortgage bank, backed by the Government, is projected in the North of Ireland, to assist the occupiers of the soil to become owners of their farms." Now, Sir, in reference to the scheme, of course I desire to lay my views before the Committee, and to have the whole question considered and all the information we can possibly acquire obtained, so as to give this important question very careful consideration, in order that the Government may be in a position to know of any facts that can be obtained that they may not be in possession of at the present time. I may add that the Torrens system of transfer of land would be a very great boon, and would simplify any banking scheme of this kind very much indeed. I hope that the scheme may be carried out, as the expense would be thereby very much lessened. I do not imagine that our legal friends in the House will, perhaps, view with as much delight as I do the possibility that that law may come into effect. I know that it could be very easily, in my opinion, carried into effect in the Province of Ontario, for I do believe that, through our county council system, the titles of all the property in our counties could be obtained very cheaply and readily, so that the titles could be settled for all time to come. In the North West the Torrens system would be an immense boon, and this farmers' banking system, in co-operation with the Torrens system in that country, would be an immense boon to the agricultural population that is going into the North-West. I shall not detain the House any longer, but I do hope that this House will not consider this question in a light manner. I believe, Sir, that nothing can possibly conduce to the welfare of this country more than to afford our farmers better facilities for developing the wealth of the soil, and anything in that direction should be welcomed by those who desire to see this country prosper.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Mr. Speaker, the object sought for by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton), if it can be accomplished, I think is worthy of every consideration, and, although it might at first appear to be somewhat of an impracticable scheme, it seems that others who have given a good deal of attention to banking business entertain the idea that it can be carried out. The Grangers—a very large class of the people, especially in Ontario, belonging to the agricultural class—also hold the same idea as the hon. member for Centre Wellington. Some two or three years ago they proposed a scheme for the purpose of raising money amongst farmers to lend to farmers, and, in their prospectus, I find that they proposed to lend at a much lower rate of interest than was demanded either by banks or by loan companies. They said that farmers were a distinct class, and could not afford to pay as high a rate of interest as those engaged in mercantile pursuits or in manufacturing or other lines, because they had only one

return for their labour in the year. The crop had to be sown and then, after it was grown, it had to be cut and taken to market, and then they got the return once in the course of the year; consequently, the interest they paid ought to be at most a very low annual rate. I have no doubt that many hon. members of this House have given some attention to this, and have been disposed to invest money in farms. If they tried to rent any of those farms, they would be unable to realize more than 3 to 5 per cent. on the money invested, after setting apart a reasonable amount for fencing and for keeping the buildings in repair. If money invested in that line, by men with money to spare, cannot realize any more, it cannot be expected that farmers can exercise any more economy or greater prudence in the affairs of their homes that would enable them to realize more than men engaged in those lines of investment. Again, if a merchant is investing his money, though he may receive only a small rate of interest every time he turns it over, he has the advantage of turning it over three to four or five times in the course of the year; and, if he receives only 2 per cent., it amounts in the year to 8 or 10 per cent. The farmer is deprived of this. Again, it may be said that the security is not good, but I ask, if a merchant's security given to a bank is good, with the peculiar nature of his transactions, that he may be a rich man to-day and a poor man a week hence, is it not more probable that the security given by a farmer would be a great deal better, seeing that it is landed security and cannot change hands so readily and cannot be disposed of so easily as the property of men in other lines. I believe that, if any principle could be devised—I do not pretend to say the scheme is a practical one, but it seems it has been thought of by men who have been engaged in devising means for relieving the necessities of the agriculturists of the country, finding their returns annually were not sufficient to warrant them in paying the large amount of interest they are paying now to banks or loan companies—if this Committee could devise any means, or find any other way by which a banking system could be established that would give farmers their money at a lower rate of interest, it is worthy of every consideration, and I hope the hon. gentleman who has this in charge will continue, as he has in the past, to show an interest in behalf of the agricultural class in this country, and that he will finally accomplish something in the direction of being of great service to them, and ameliorating the hardships many of them have to contend with. The fact that the Grangers have taken it up shows that it may be made a success, and the fact that men in Ireland and England are proposing to-day to establish banks on a somewhat similar system—we have not the *minutiae* of their system before us, but it appears to be something of this sort—is presumptive evidence that there can be such a thing. I hope the hon. gentleman will go on with the Committee, and put the scheme in a practical shape, so as to be of use to that large and deserving class who represent the agriculturists of this country.

**Mr. HESSON.** Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my views with reference to this very important question, and I think it will be conceded generally by the House that it is a very important question and worthy of the consideration of a deliberative body like this. I hope it will not be regarded by the House in a trivial way, and that they will not look upon it as a matter of very small consequence to the farming interest of this country. We know that it is the great interest of this country and will always remain so, and every facility that can be afforded to the toilers and workers on the farm and of the soil must ultimately be to the advantage of every business man and every citizen of the country. Now I hold that there is no basis, not even a gold basis, superior or even

equal in any respect to that of the real estate of the country. There can be no better basis than that. Gold may be carried away, may be squandered, may be misappropriated by the parties entrusted with the management of it, but the freehold remains, if not to the original owner, at all events to the country; and it is, as my hon. friend the member for Centre Wellington says, true that a large amount of capital is invested in this way which is apparently lying idle and yet is in itself intrinsically of greater value than the gold. Now, Sir, if the crops fail, the result may be disastrous to the farmer, and compel him to go to some of the money institutions of the country and borrow at a high rate of interest which, instead of mending matters, only make them worse. He is compelled to go to some of those shaving institutions with the history of which, in very recent days, we are all supposed to know something. The farmer may borrow on good terms indeed, but it very often results in the loss of his farm, as the chartered banks do not like to discount farmers' notes. They prefer tradesmen's notes—that class of paper that they can turn over quickly, and that is not so likely to be renewed from time to time. But that kind of accommodation is not what the farmer wants. He wants accommodation that may help him through a bad harvest, and which may sometimes extend from year to year. As a rule, their capital is invested in real estate, in machinery, houses, and things of that sort—their whole capital is so locked up that they have not a dollar that can be deposited as the kind of security that the chartered banks are permitted to issue notes upon. They are in a difficult position; their farms are locked up, and they have only to rely upon the produce of their farms when sold, or to rent their farms for about 3 or 4 per cent. of their value. Now, Sir, if we will just take a glance at the position of the Province of Ontario with regard to its farming interest, we will be able to understand the question better. While the hon. member for Centre Wellington was making his remarks to the House, I made a little calculation which will enable me to show to the House that there is an immense amount of capital of the very best kind that could be given to the Government as security for the circulation of Dominion notes—which I hold the Government alone have a right to issue. There are about 440 townships in Ontario, leaving out towns and villages. I would average these at a value of about \$2,000,000 each. The assessed value, as the hon. member for Centre Wellington says, might be a little over that; but, within my own knowledge, \$3,500,000 or \$4,000,000 is the assessed value of the townships in my own part of the country. But, for the sake of being within the mark, I will say \$2,000,000. Multiply 440 townships by \$2,000,000 each, and you have \$880,000,000 worth of real estate for Ontario in farms alone. Now, suppose that only one-fourth of that number would be free—would be such a property as the Government might prefer to hold as security for this issue. One-fourth of \$880,000,000 would be \$220,000,000, as the property that would be free from all claims whatever. The owners of this property would be the absolute freeholders of the country; they would be the only portion of the farming community that would have sufficient confidence in this institution to become stockholders. I will assume that only one-fourth of the whole number would be counted as freeholders, without a mortgage on their property, and who might become stockholders in such a bank. That would reduce the amount to \$55,000,000, a sum equal almost to the entire paid up capital of the chartered banks of the country. The entire paid up capital of these banks is a little less than \$61,500,000. Now, when we come to deal with the chartered banks of the country, we shall see that they are not doing business upon a gold basis; and I have no hesitation in saying here, Mr. Speaker, that

Mr. HESSON.

the theory that they are is a fallacious one, and I wish that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House would divest their minds of that theory, and that proposition, that the business of the banks of Canada is being done upon a gold basis. No such thing exists. When you take the total liabilities of the banks, these liabilities ought to comprise their paid up capital, because every stockholder must feel that he is interested in that stock to the extent of his paid up capital, and that he may draw gold for it if he chooses. The circulation amounts to \$34,000,000 of their paper issue; each holder of that feels that he is secure for his gold. Add to that the \$61,000,000 of paid up capital, and you have \$94,000,000 of liability to start upon, to the stockholders and billholders. Now, come to the depositors, and where are they? About \$11,500,000 are deposited in the Dominion and chartered banks of Canada to-day; about \$97,000,000, leaving out fractions, are deposited by the general public. Leaving out the paid up capital, if you do not wish to protect the stockholders, or to put them in the same position, of being secure for their gold if they chose to draw it, leaving that out of the question altogether, you have \$142,000,000 of liabilities in gold. Now, Sir, it will be just as well for us to look this question squarely in the face. Let us remember that any day we may have such a state of things as that which existed in a bank whose case we were considering only a few days ago—a state of things which may exist even under the most careful management. Banks may, under bad management on the part of the directors, find it impossible to meet those liabilities if they are pressed, and they may be pressed, as any private individual may be pressed. In that case what will be the result? Mr. Speaker, the entire specie held by all these chartered banks is less than \$6,500,000 to-day. If you call this \$6,500,000 a firm basis for \$142,000,000, leaving the poor stockholder out of the question altogether, I ask you if that is the kind of basis you want for a gold issue? If so, then I would prefer the farms as security. I say, that if we deal with these men as honest representatives should deal, who profess to have the farming community at heart, we should at least place them upon an equal footing with the chartered banks of the country. I believe my hon. friend from Centre Wellington will be satisfied with very much less. He does not ask that they should be permitted to issue their promise to pay, as is granted in the case of the chartered banks; and I quite concur with him there. I think that privilege should not be extended to the banks. I go further, and say that the Government ought, within a reasonable period, and from time to time, as it is possible, cause all the present bank circulation to be withdrawn and substituted by a Dominion note issue. That is an honest basis. Then the property of the public will be responsible for the circulation. Crises could never arise then, such as we have witnessed from time to time, when the depositors, under the influence of excitement or fear, have withdrawn their deposits. These emergencies could not arise if that bank circulation was entirely withdrawn. My hon. friend, the Finance Minister, would not be called upon to redeem that circulation by the people coming to him and demanding gold. There would be no other circulation to take its place. We have no gold circulation, and we might as well honestly face that fact. The hon. Finance Minister would not have five, or ten, or twenty million dollars of notes presented to him for redemption by the people: if they did it would be for the purpose of investing in Dominion bonds at 4 or 5 per cent. It would be only an exchange that they would be asked to make. What is the position of the tradesmen and the merchants of the country to-day, elsewhere? The Government do not find any difficulty when they buy their foreign bills of exchange. It is well known that those who do business abroad are obliged to buy at the chartered banks or at private banks,

sterling bills to pay drafts abroad. That can be done with Dominion notes as well as Bank of Montreal bills. It has been suggested that if I went to Japan to buy a cargo of tea or to the West Indies to buy a cargo of sugar, I could not carry out the transactions with Bank of Montreal bills or the best bills ever issued by private banks; but would have to buy exchange, which would depend on the value of exchange in other markets. The difficulty which the hon. Finance Minister may have to face some day is in danger of being greatly intensified. The Act of Parliament compels private banks to hold a certain percentage of Dominion notes, to the extent of 40 per cent. of their entire circulation. There are from ten and a quarter to ten and a half millions of Dominion notes locked up in the chartered banks of Canada. What is to prevent those great monetary institutions from accumulating Dominion notes by issuing their own bills in lieu of them, until some fine morning they come and ask the Finance Minister to redeem a large portion of that circulation. That could never arise if they were compelled, like other persons, to deal with their own resources and not trade on the credit of the country. It may be said that farmers would not be capable of managing banking institutions. What are the facts with respect to the private banks in Canada to-day? They are quite as successful as the chartered banks; but they are of that class of institutions which are more likely to shave a little, and those banks will take paper and securities which other banks will not accept. There are sharp business men at the head of those institutions, and to a large extent they trade on their own capital, unless they have the confidence of the public, and deposits are made with them; while, at the same time, they have no power to issue a circulation. That class of men might very profitably be absorbed into the management of farmers' banks, and if the Government took the responsibility of issuing Dominion notes for the circulation of a farmers' bank, under a charter granted by this House, these gentlemen would be found to give good satisfaction in the management. I feel the time must come, and the propositions recently placed before the House show its necessity for the Government to make a new departure. We can never look forward for the time to arrive here, under the present condition of things, when we shall have an honest gold basis for the circulation of the country. So long as we are exporting \$7,500,000, the balance must go out either in the shape of increased indebtedness abroad or in sterling bills or gold, which is equivalent to them. A new loan will be placed on the market shortly, according to the proposition made, and the effect will be to increase still more the demand on our gold resources. The time has come when that should be changed, and the Government instead of going abroad to borrow money, should take the securities of our own people and not borrow another dollar abroad. The loan of \$22,000,000 should be in Dominion notes, and the Government should have 5 per cent. profit out of it. I am not afraid to say that the Government should obtain as good terms as wholesale men and buy exchange for that circulation; that it should be provided here, and it would be the best circulation ever offered. It is but a short time since I made a trip in the United States. I took Bank of Montreal bills to Chicago; but the people there did not want them, for they said they could not look into the bank's affairs and see whether the managers were doing their business in a proper way or not, and whether the circulation was good. I then pulled out Dominion \$2 notes, which were accepted, for the Dominion is pledged to redeem them as the United States are pledged to redeem the circulation of their country. When you come down to private banks, the matter is entirely different. As the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) has mentioned, the Government should issue the paper and take mortgage as security, and that

security would be better than gold, and the farmers would then be enabled to handle their crops, because every farmer might hold stock up to 50 per cent. of the assessed value of his farm, and would have the advantage of obtaining 3 per cent. interest on the stock, which is almost equivalent to the rental of a farm. Again, a poor, unfortunate farmer, who is compelled to borrow money, either from misfortune or bad management, would be placed in a better position. I suppose four out of every five farmers in the newer parts of the country, when disastrous crops have been the result of the year's operations, have to borrow money under very trying circumstances. They cannot go to the banks and obtain it at 7 per cent., or secure it at that rate from private individuals, except in wealthy communities, but have to pay the banks high rates. Those parties who own land could give such satisfactory security to a farmers' bank as would cause them to lend money at 5 per cent., and this would enable them, probably, to redeem their bonds, and place themselves in a proper position, and not sacrifice the fruits of their toil. I hope the Government will grant the Committee, and that the result of the Committee's efforts may be in some way to devise a scheme which will assist in giving to this country better security than exists to-day in the hands of the chartered banks. We may fairly say that when British money lenders loan out their funds to farmers here, and pay agents commissions, we should be prepared to take the same security. I hope the Government will allow the motion to pass, and that the Committee's report will be such as will provide a boon to the farming community.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have listened with great interest to this debate, and especially to the speech of my hon. friend who moved the resolution; but I must confess that I am not yet convinced by the arguments which I have heard. However, as I am not a financier, I have no objection to our having a full opportunity of examining into this subject, but I do not think we can agree to have a Special Committee on the question, when we have a General Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce. I think to that Committee the subject can be safely referred, more especially as my hon. friend who moved the resolution and the hon. gentleman who spoke last have joined to this subject of the establishment of agricultural banks, secured on the real property of the country, a scheme for the alteration of the present general banking system—in fact, calling on the Government to assume the whole of the paper circulation of the country and become the bankers of the Dominion, as well for all purposes as for agricultural banks. The subjects are so closely allied that they cannot be treated by two separate committees; they can be as well dealt with by one large Committee. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution is a member of the Banking Committee, and I have no doubt, after the instructive discussion we have had, that the hon. gentleman will move in the Banking Committee to have a special sub-committee to examine and report upon this branch of the subject, and that the general committee will be only too glad to grant a sub-committee, and to make my hon. friend its chairman. On the report of the sub-committee being made, the whole subject will, no doubt, be fully discussed and considered by the Banking Committee. I hope my hon. friend will be satisfied with this statement and will not press his motion.

Mr. ORTON. I am satisfied.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that the Committee on Banking and Commerce can deal with questions which are not referred to them by this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole question of banking and commerce is referred to the Banking Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no. Only such bills as are sent by this House.

Motion withdrawn.

#### DELAYS IN THE TRANSMISSION OF NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS.

Mr. SPROULE in moving for copies of all correspondence or complaints to the Postmaster General relative to delays or neglect of postmasters in transmitting newspapers and periodicals to the office of destination, since January 1st, 1883, said: I do not make this motion so much for the purpose of getting the returns printed and laid before the House, as to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to the fact that numerous complaints are being made, from time to time, on this subject. I find in my part of the country that every week or two complaints are made in some of the papers that in certain post offices papers are not delivered to subscribers. Others say that postmasters think that papers and periodicals and other printed matter, are scarcely worth attending to like letters, and that consequently they remain in the post office for a length of time before they are delivered. My attention has been drawn to the matter by several publishers in my part of the country, and some of them have supposed that if the hon. Postmaster General's attention was drawn to it he might send a circular to postmasters generally, which would have the desired effect. I believe that plan was adopted to meet similar complaints in the United States, and that it had a good effect. If, as I am informed, it would involve considerable trouble to get copies of this correspondence, I would content myself with simply calling the hon. Postmaster General's attention to the subject and leaving it in his hands.

Mr. CARLING. I am not aware that any correspondence has taken place with regard to the distribution of newspapers, but as the hon. gentleman has drawn my attention to the matter, I will have it enquired into, and, if an evil exists, will endeavour to have it remedied.

Motion agreed to.

#### KINGSVILLE HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. LISTER, in moving for a copy of all petitions respecting the Kingsville Harbour Works and all communications and correspondence between the Government and any person or persons relating to the same, said: I may say, in the first place, that I make no charge against the Government as to the subject-matter of the motion. What I have to say is, that upon information received from that part of the country, I am led to believe that the expenditure at Kingsville is altogether an improper expenditure. I am led to believe that the Government, before the expenditure was undertaken at all, had been petitioned by the people of Leamington, and by the masters of vessels, asking the Government to make the proposed expenditure there instead of at Kingsville. I am told that the expenditure at Kingsville will not be of any practical benefit to the owners of vessels or to vessel men. I am given to understand that the hon. gentlemen who represent the North and South Ridings of Essex, instead of considering the advantage of the owners and captains of vessels, were influenced by political considerations—that, for the purpose of benefiting these hon. gentlemen in their elections, the public interest was overlooked, and the works were commenced at Kingsville instead of at Leamington. When the papers come down, I may have an opportunity of speaking further on this subject. I trust that this charge is not true; but it seems to me from my informant's letter, that the evidence tends very strongly to that conclusion.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). When the papers come down, I am of the opinion, from what I know of the sub-  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

ject, that the hon. gentleman will never bring the subject up again in this House, because, after he has examined the papers and knows the facts, he will not have the audacity to get up and presume to make such a charge as he dares to make this evening. He will then find that it has been upon the recommendations of engineers, covering several years, that Kingsville has been preferred to any other point. He will find that the greatest pains have been taken to ascertain the best harbour. He will find that it would have cost six times the amount to construct a breakwater at Leamington than it will at Kingsville. He will find that Leamington is too much exposed to be of any use as a harbour of refuge, but that, owing to the natural bar at Kingsville, a very good harbour of refuge can be constructed there at a very small expense. It is immaterial to me, as the member for North Essex, whether the harbour be at Leamington or at Kingsville, or anywhere else. It was at my instance that it was placed at Kingsville; but if I had wished to serve my friend, the hon. member for South Essex, I would have had it at Leamington, where it would have been of much service to him, and the fact of its being at Kingsville has been an injury to the hon. member for South Essex. When the hon. gentleman sees the papers, I am satisfied that his mind will be quite set at rest as to whether or not there was any political intrigue in connection with that harbour.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken uses very strong language indeed when he talks about audacity. He seeks to take the responsibility for these improvements off the hon. member for South Essex, and seems to assume it himself, in order, if possible, I suppose, to prevent the feeling which exists against these works from turning against the hon. member from South Essex. As I stated, when I made this motion, I did not do it from any personal knowledge of the work which I had myself. It may be that it has been properly done or improperly done; when the papers come down they will show. In the meantime, I do not think that the hon. gentleman was justified in using the word audacity. I suppose any hon. member in this House has a perfect right to bring any matter he thinks proper before the attention of the House. I am sure the hon. member for South Essex must be very grateful to the hon. member for North Essex for taking from his shoulders the responsibility of this job, if job it is. I can only say that the hon. member for North Essex seems to take great interest in the affairs of South Essex. I know that before the election he promised the people of South Essex that if they would support the Conservative candidate they would get a post office. Strange to say, a post office has been commenced. So it seems that the hon. member takes great interest in the public affairs of the South Riding.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). If the hon. gentleman had been desirous of obtaining information, he would have waited to make his attack after he had obtained the papers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Motion agreed to.

#### SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

Mr. KAULBACH, in moving for copies of all Orders in Council, or departmental orders, and all communications and correspondence respecting the passage of the Act 45 Vic., chap. 19, of the Acts of 1882, entitled, "An Act to exempt Vessels employed in Fishing from the payment of Duties for the Relief of Sick and Distressed Mariners," and all correspondence for the repeal of this Act, said: I regret having to occupy the time of this House with any comments upon this motion; but in the interests of the fishermen of this Dominion, who have suffered in some instances very severely, I am constrained to offer some few remarks to

show how unfairly this class of people have been dealt with by the amendment of the Act of 1868. Since 1868, and previous to the passage of the Act amending the same, fishermen, as well as mariners engaged in foreign trade, were entitled to the benefits of the Sick and Distressed Mariners Fund, which they considered an inestimable boon, and which privilege they exercised whenever occasion required. But through the intervention of unwise promptings on the part of some person, with the view to economy, and at the same time to prevent American fishing vessels with sick seamen entering the ports of the Dominion, paying the required sick mariners tonnage dues, and thereby obtaining the benefits alike with our own fishermen, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was induced by 45 Vic., chap. 19, of the Act of 1882, to amend the same by an Act intituled "An Act to exempt vessels employed in fishing from the payment of duties for the relief of Sick and Distressed Mariners." By using the word "exempt"—only a polite and mild way of putting it—little, it appeared, was thought of the amendment at the time, but when this Act was brought to practical use, it was found to be extremely harsh, restrictive and oppressive. I would give some instances as to the position in which some of the poor sick and distressed fishermen of my county were placed last year in consequence of the restrictions of the Act referred to; but the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries having given so favourable an answer to my enquiry on the notice papers today, when I submitted it to the House, he stating that a Bill would be prepared to meet the requirements sought for, and submitted to the House for approval, I will not occupy the time of the House with further comments, except to say that had the would-be representative who occupied a seat in this House last year, discharged his duty fairly and honestly in the interest of the mariner and fisherman, he representing, or pretending to represent, the largest and finest fishing constituency in the Dominion (I mean Lunenburg) gone to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and stated his case, he (the hon. Minister) would, in his willingness—which he has ever exercised to do what is right—have given as a result a favourable answer, and the fishermen of this Dominion—not alone Lunenburg—would not have been inconvenienced to the extent they were last season, but their sick would have had the medical treatment and kind attendance the marine hospitals offer to the sick and distressed mariner. The party who came here last year, I have no hesitation in saying, occupied that seat most illegally, as was proved by the court in October last, at the trial before Mr. Justice Rigby in the Superior Court. He occupied that seat against the wishes of the people, not having a majority of votes—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. KAULBACH. The question was asked—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please confine himself to the question.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think I am quite in order when I say to you that I am desirous of placing this matter in a position to show that had the party representing the constituency of Lunenburg brought the matter to the notice of this House, the request would have been granted in the way I mention, he having been placed in that position by a partisan judge.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept my ruling and confine himself to the question.

Mr. KAULBACH. I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

#### LIGHTS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. VALIN, in moving for copies of correspondence, in relation to the placing of gas floating lights in the River St. Lawrence, below Quebec, for the better guidance of steamers and sailing vessels navigating the said river, said: Not only the Province of Quebec, but the other Provinces, are interested in this important question, and I hope, therefore, that what I have to say will receive the attention of the House. A large sailing vessel or steamer coming from sea, on arriving opposite Pointe des Monts, experiences difficulty in navigation, owing to the fact that the great attraction from the iron deposits in that vicinity has a considerable effect on the compass. It will, therefore, be obvious that owing to this, considerable risk is run by vessels as they pass Bic Island, and proceed up the St. Lawrence, passing White Island, Red Island and Groen Island, where there are dangerous reefs. Thence, they come to St. Roch's traverse, where the channel is very narrow and dangerous, and higher up many places have to be passed where the water is very shallow. Suppose, for instance, a large vessel like the *Parisian*, with from 800 to 1,000 passengers on board, is making this passage during a very dark night and with a heavy sea, so that the buoys are invisible, how is the poor pilot to guide the vessel between these buoys through these shallow waters when it is impossible for him to see them? With the gas floating buoys all danger from that cause would be obviated, as they would show very plainly the water edge, thus enabling the pilot to judge the distance and avoid the bad leakages that to day very often take place. Often the poor pilot is brought before the board and has no defence to offer, because his only reliance was on the lead which he had ordered to be cast overboard by one of the sailors, who often has not reported correctly the number of fathoms. The poor pilot consequently is condemned to lose his branch and rendered unable to support his family. Sometimes he is suspended for months and sometimes for years. The safety of our river would be greatly increased by the establishment of these gas buoys. Large steamers, such as the *Allan's*, which are not insured at all, in order to give confidence to the passengers, and some of which cost as high as \$450,000, are greatly exposed owing to the want of those improvements which are now the order of the day in England and elsewhere. We should place these improvements on our rivers in order to give confidence to the underwriters, who always believe they have a very bad risk in the St. Lawrence, and by placing these gas buoys we would destroy that bad reputation. I hope, therefore, the Government will give due consideration to the matter, and see that these gas floating buoys for the guidance of these large vessels are placed in the St. Lawrence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of the hon. the Minister of Marine, I may say to my hon. friend the member for Montmorency that the correspondence in reference to the placing of the gas floating lights in the River St. Lawrence will be brought down. I must say that the hon. gentleman takes a great interest in these matters, with great propriety. He understands the position that these vessels are in when they go up the St. Lawrence, but he must not forget, on the other hand, that the Government, as well as Parliament, has provided for the lighting of the St. Lawrence, especially in the last fifteen years, in such a way as to reduce the liability of these vessels to wreck to a minimum. At all events, if these floating lights are considered better than the others, or if, instead of gas, it might be electric floating lights, of course the Department of Marine will give to this matter all consideration, and the

hon. gentleman may rest assured that the Department will not fail to do its duty in that direction.

Motion agreed to.

#### LIGHTS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER.

Mr. VALIN (Translation), in moving for copies of all petitions or papers asking for the placing of lights on the River St. Lawrence, north of the Island of Orleans, in the county of Montmorency, in order to protect and facilitate navigation during dark nights, as there are many boulders in that part of the river, which is visited by a great number of vessels doing the local traffic, said: Mr. Speaker, I hope the Government will give to that part of the River St. Lawrence the few lights that are absolutely necessary when nights are dark. Sea-going vessels do not come to this part of the river; the traffic goes on the other side of the channel, opposite the Island of Orleans, but we have a large population on this side—that is to say, north of the Island of Orleans. We have a great many boats which are used to carry building stone to Quebec. These boats are constantly moving up and down the river, so that, night and day, very often, these boats so laden with stone, are exposed to serious dangers, and it will be easily conceived that such a boat is soon broken up and shattered to pieces if she meets with an accident, for I know that at that spot the shoals are very wide and covered with boulders. The poor boatman frequently sees his craft, which composes his whole property, completely destroyed because he has not been able to guide it safely through this intricate channel. For this reason he needs a little protection. Moreover, we have in that part of the river a great number of steamboats doing service between Quebec and Ste. Anne, this last place being a resort of pilgrims, visited by large numbers of people. In fact, last year over 80,000 pilgrims visited this place, and on one day we had the sorrow to see a steamboat stranded on the boulders, and so badly shattered that it could not be repaired and was a total loss. It is very true that most of the steamboats which travel in these parts are doing day service, but if it should happen that they should have to pass there during the night, such steamboats would be exposed to such accidents as may befall vessels of any other kind. Therefore, I hope that the Government will take into consideration the motion I now make and that they will be pleased to grant our request.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation). The two last lines of the motion of the hon. member will have to be taken off, as they express an opinion. Such remarks go very well in his speech, but not as well in his motion. I must tell the hon. member that his request will be granted. I have observed that he had pretty well strewn his speech with big boulders, probably in order to throw them at my back while I was listening to him. These boulders come under my Department, and have nothing whatever to do with the Department of Marine. I am happy to see that my hon. friend has only used imaginary boulders, and that he has called my attention on this matter. He may feel sure that I shall not forget what he has just said, and that if anything can be done in the direction pointed out by him, it will be done.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. IRVINE, in moving for copies of all correspondence which passed between any Department of the Government or member thereof, and any person whomsoever in relation to the appointment of James H. Jacques and Charles Kearney, of Carleton County, New Brunswick, both or either

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

of them, to positions in the Civil Service of Canada; and also, copies of all correspondence and enquiries made by the Government in relation to their positions in the Civil Service, said: I moved a resolution similar to this on the 10th of April, 1883, and I received the following answer on the 4th of February instant:—

“In returning to you the enclosed Address from the House of Commons, bearing date 10th April last, calling for correspondence re appointments of James H. Jacques and Charles Kearney, in the Civil Service, I beg leave to state that there is no correspondence in relation thereto on record in this Department.

(Signed) “J. JOHNSON,  
“Commissioner of Customs.”

In reference to the appointment of Mr. Jacques, the reason I moved last year was that the office was created by the hon. Mr. Mackenzie's Government, and a Liberal was appointed to it by that Administration. During the time he had that position, the Conservatives in the county declared that the office was a sinecure, and, in some way which I am not able to declare, the Liberal resigned; the office remained vacant for a time, I cannot state how long, but the present incumbent was appointed by the present Administration, and he is a Conservative. I beg leave to say that the Conservatives and Liberals in the county now agree that the office is a necessary one, and all are agreed that the officer who was removed was a very good man, and all are agreed that the present incumbent is a capable one. We are all agreed upon that, that the office is necessary, only it is now filled by a Conservative instead of a Liberal. I can promise this, so far as I am concerned, that I am perfectly satisfied with the way in which the duties of the office are being performed, and when my party get into power, which they will very soon, judging from the result of the York election, I will not remove him or recommend his being removed. There is another sign that I see on the political horizon, that the political crib will soon be empty, and the Tories never like to feed at an empty crib. In reference to Mr. Kearney, I have a stronger objection to make. On the 10th April, last year, I made the statement that the office was a sinecure, that there was no need of the appointment. I make the same statement here now and, if he is not removed, I will make it next year; and, if he is not removed, I will, if I am spared, make it the year after. I have not the power to make recommendations to the present Administration, but I have the power to protest when they abuse the power invested in them, and by virtue of the power vested in me as the lawfully elected member for the county, I protested last year and I protest again now. The grounds of my protestation are that it is not necessary to have an officer there. I live within four miles of this very road, and I know that the distance between the American boundary and the St. John River is about eight miles. As I said last year, the Mackenzie Administration created an office, and appointed a collector of Customs as well as a preventive officer, and gave him a salary of \$300. In 1882 the Government collected \$700 there; and in 1883, I think, they collected \$500. They give this gentleman, appointed by the Mackenzie Administration, \$300, and they give the gentleman appointed by the present Administration \$200—I think in the whole \$500, just the amount collected; so it is a square thing. I have not any objection, because I think the money might just as well go that way as any other. That is not exactly my strongest point. I made the statement last year that he was the most extensive merchant in the village, and I do not fear contradiction in that statement. The hon. Minister of Customs did not seem to be aware of that fact; he did not know the gentleman he appointed, and, strange to say, there is no correspondence in the office. I do not know what little bird made the recommendation for the appointment, but some person did

make the recommendation. Last year the hon. Minister of Customs gave me the following answer, which I find on page 507 of the first volume of the *Hansard* :—

"But, I must confess, this is the first time that I have heard that this gentleman is one of the largest importing merchants of that village, and that is a matter, I assure him, that is worthy of consideration."

Now, I take it for granted that, owing to the great amount of energy displayed by the hon. Minister of Customs, it certainly did not take him a year to ascertain whether this gentleman is just what I stated him to be or not; and if he disputes my statement, all he has to do is to consult the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, his own colleague in the Government, who knows that gentleman as well as I do. I make the statement here again, without fear of successful contradiction, that this gentleman is doing the largest business of any man in the village, and I say it is an injustice, a glaring injustice, first, to appoint him, and secondly, to keep him in office after the *exposé* I had made. It is a flagrant piece of injustice, an outrage on the rights of the people there, to keep a merchant in that position. I have not power to remove him, but I have power to protest, and I will continue to hurl my protest at the hon. Minister as long as this man remains in that office. You can keep him in if you like, but there is a limit to your power; for as there is an end to all things, there must be an end to your power. You can keep him in if you like, but I dare you to do it. I use that strong language, and I shall continue to protest till you dismiss him. He is a wealthy man—worth more property than I am. He was not appointed because he was poor, but he was appointed just before my election, for a certain purpose—a purpose, however, which he did not accomplish. And still you keep him in for a paltry sum of \$200 a year—a man that reckons his wealth by tens of thousands. In return to the enquiries, I shall be glad to see the papers in reference to the enquiries made by the Government on the subject last year. I would be glad to have my statement contradicted—no; I would not, for I know it is incontrovertible.

Motion agreed to.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for a statement: 1. Of the cost of the first forty miles west of Callander, built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; 2. Of the mileage, built by, and the payments in detail, with dates, made to the construction company in respect of the line west beyond the above forty miles to Sudbury Junction or beyond; 3. The cost of any work done by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on this section since the cancellation of the contract with the construction company up to 31st December last, and of such cost up to the date of the accounts given to the Minister of Railways; 4. Of the names of the persons with whom the contracts of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for such work were made; 5. Like particulars as in numbers 2, 3 and 4, in respect of the line from Port Arthur, eastward; 6. Statement of the cost of the Algoma Mills Branch, divided into the usual headings under which railway construction works are divided. He said: I suppose the House will agree that fuller information than has been already brought down, is material for us to have. The first branch of this proposed address is for a statement of the cost of the first forty miles west of Callander, built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman, in the interesting financial statement he made to the House, lumped together the whole of the expenditure upon what was called the Nipissing division, thus including the expenditure made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company before giving the contract to the construction company, with the expenditure made under the contract with the construction company, and consequently made it impossible for us to ascertain, either what

the company's own work cost for that forty miles, or what amount was paid to the construction company. The second division of this address is "for the mileage built by, and the payments in detail, with dates, made to the construction company in respect of the line west beyond the above forty miles to Sudbury Junction, or beyond." We are not informed of the extent to which the sums, which the hon. gentleman specified as having been expended on the Nipissing division, are added to the completed line, and the extent to which they are due. Therefore, we do not know what the cost of the completed line, beyond the forty miles, is. Then it is also necessary, in order to understand what was paid to the construction company, to know "the cost of any work done by the Canadian Pacific Railway on this section since the cancellation of the contract with the construction company, up to the 31st of December last." There is some confusion between the financial statement and that which was laid on the Table of the House. The latter mentions the date of the 21st of December, while the statement made by the hon. Minister the other day, in one instance, at any rate, brought the payments up to a more recent date. Therefore, it seems impossible to reach conclusions without obtaining a statement—if there be any variation—of what the amount of payment was up to the date of the company's own statement of the 31st of December; and of the other statement—if there be any variation—up to the date at which the hon. Minister made his statement to the House. Then I ask for the names of the persons with whom the contracts for said work were made. I find that has been omitted—although I do not say by error of the officer, because I am not certain, but it may have been my own error. It is material, and the House ought to be informed what contracts have been made by the Government itself on other portions of the work, and copies of the contract are also material for obvious reasons, and for another reason which may not be so obvious. It was but to-day that I learned, upon what I believe to be reliable information, that one, at any rate, of the contracts which have been made upon either the Lake Superior or the Nipissing division, contained a bonus for that rapid construction of which we heard a good deal of talk, of half a million of money. And, as we have been told that no appreciable increase in the cost of this enterprise is occasioned by the rapidity with which it has been, and is proposed to be, constructed, it would be not unimportant to see the contracts, to ascertain whether they contain a large provision—as I am informed this one does—for extra price in respect to extra speed. Then I ask for the same particulars as in Nos. 2, 3 and 4, in respect to the line from Port Arthur, eastward. The other day I was desirous of knowing how much was claimed by the construction company, and what like particulars as those just described, as applicable to the Nipissing division, are applicable to this other division. Then I ask for a statement of the cost of the Algoma Mills branch, divided into the usual headings, under which railway construction works are divided. There we have a different piece of work built by the company itself, of which the hon. gentleman has given us the total costs. That total cost sums up to about \$20,300 per mile. Of course, we are familiar with the usual sub-headings, into which railway construction works are divided—earthwork, for instance, ties, building culverts, rails, &c. No doubt the accounts have been kept in the usual way, and we can ascertain what the general run of that work has been with much more accuracy and satisfaction by obtaining the division. That is important to us, because as far as one can judge from the general statements made with regard to the work on Lake Superior and Nipissing divisions, a very considerable portion of the mileage which has been constructed, and a very considerable portion which is yet to be constructed, will be not very unlike, in point of cost, to the Algoma Mills branch, running through a

somewhat similar country, being in the same vicinity, so to speak, and being somewhat of the same character. To know the divisions of the sub-heads will be, I say, not unimportant. I have endeavoured, as far as possible, from the very imperfect statements which we now have, to ascertain what amounts have been paid to the construction company upon the Nipissing and Superior divisions. For that purpose I have estimated, in absence of that information which I asked from the hon. gentleman to furnish, that forty miles west from Callander has been built by the company, and I compute the cost at the same rate as for the Algoma Mills branch. Deducting that amount, \$812,000 from \$3,250,000, and \$2,300,000, which are the sums the hon. gentleman gives as the total expenditure on the Nipissing and Superior divisions, I have arrived at the conclusion that about \$4,750,000 will be the amount paid the construction company, subject however to a further deduction, as to the amount of which we have no idea. How much of the total sum has been expended by the Company itself since the construction company ceased its operations, I cannot make a conjecture until this return is granted. Inasmuch as the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and particularly its operations with the construction company, are of very considerable importance to us, who are now called upon to decide whether a case has been made out for the continuance of this work under the Company's supervision and by Government assistance, to a very large amount, I do not assume for a moment that the hon. Minister will decline to accede to the proposal that we shall be further informed, as this motion proposes we shall be.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not object to the passage of this motion, and I will obtain, as far as I am able, the information asked for. I do not know how far I shall be able to comply with the wishes of the hon. gentleman in obtaining the information asked for; all that can be obtained will be laid before the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE moved for statements: 1. Of the mileage built by and the payments in detail, with dates, to the construction company, in respect of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, from the point forty-five miles east of the Saskatchewan going westward; 2. Of the cost to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the line from the above point to Calgary, and also from Calgary to the summit of the Rocky Mountains; 3. Of the estimated cost to complete that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway left unfinished by the construction company, between Callander and Port Arthur, and, separately, of the equipment for this part; 4. Of the estimated mileage cost of this part divided into the usual headings, and that of the very heavy section of 100 miles so divided; 5. Like statement as in numbers (3) and (4) to complete that part left unfinished between the Rocky Mountains and Kamloops. He said: The construction company's contract for the western part of the line terminates at the point mentioned in the first sub-section. We have no details at all about the division of the work from Winnipeg west. The hon. Minister gave us a sum of \$17,530,000 in round numbers, as the expenditure of the Company from Winnipeg westward, that is to the summit of the Rockies; but there is no division at all of that great mileage and very large amount. This motion proposes to obtain what the mileage built has been and what payments have been made to the construction company in regard to that part; and another motion I am about to make, will deal with the part east of that point. I ask for a division of the amount paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the construction company, from the point forty-five miles east of the Saskatchewan to Calgary, and also from Calgary to the

Mr. BLAKE.

summit of the Rocky Mountains. As I am informed the part of the line from the eastern point to which I have referred, to Calgary, may be treated as a prairie line. Within a few miles of Calgary, some two miles, there occurs some heavy rock cutting, and although there is some very easy work between that and the summit, yet, upon the whole, the character of the work may be said to somewhat change there, and I thought it was not an inconvenient division to make of the question of expense. So much with regard to the statements of the past. The first and second portions of the motion simply require information as to what has passed. The third, fourth and fifth portions—are with respect to estimates, and these are very important. The hon. Minister has stated to the House that \$27,000,000 is the estimate which is made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as the cost to complete the whole unfinished Pacific Railway, including the two main portions—that portion from the point beyond Sudbury Junction to Port Arthur, and from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops. He has said that this sum includes all equipment; but we have no statement as to what amount is estimated for equipment, and as it now seems the \$27,000,000 is rather that portion which belongs to construction rather than to equipment, and is divided between those two great sections—the section whose eastern terminus is a considerable distance to the east of Port Arthur, and the section whose western terminus is at the summit of the Rocky Mountains. It is obvious that those amounts were lumped together. They are different works with many hundreds of miles between them, but the estimates have been separately made. Those estimates are of very great consequence. Upon them depends, to a considerable extent, the decision which will be reached as to the financial standing of the Company, as it is, and as it is proposed to make it, under the proposals of the Administration. It has already been pointed out to the House, on more than one occasion, that the estimates in gross given to us without any detail, vary very considerably from the estimate made some ten or twelve months ago, of the cost of those works, and therefore it is of more importance that we should know what these estimates are. So far as I can judge of the estimates to the west of the summit, they must be of the vaguest possible character; for I do not believe that the road has been located through the Selkirks for a considerable portion of the distance, and what description of estimate it is, which has been submitted, and based on what principles, it is difficult to conceive. My own conjecture, from the meagre information which has been furnished to us, is that to the portion of the work in the prairie country east of the point at which the construction contract commences, at a cost of \$14,000 per mile, there is left of the construction company's work in the western section \$9,130,000; of which the part to Calgary might have cost something over \$3,500,000; from Calgary to the summit, \$3,000,000, leaving \$2,500,000 unaccounted for. As my hon. friend from Huron pointed out the other day, the estimate at present given as the estimate, and the estimate under the contract with the construction company, differed by something like \$15,000,000 or \$18,000,000—the contract with the construction company affording results for unfinished work for \$16,000,000 or \$18,000,000 more than the unfinished work, it is said at present, will cost. These figures are large, and it is important that they should be checked. It is important that the material from which a conclusion could be reached, should be furnished us. The hon. gentleman said, with reference to the motion which has just been passed, that he would let it go, and he would procure the information if possible; but I need not tell the hon. gentleman that it is quite possible for him to get the information, as such returns are ordered to be furnished by the Railway Company, and, as the Railway Company is a suppliant for

aid, whatever Parliament requires in the way of information before giving that aid should surely be vouchsafed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have only to repeat what I said before, that I have no objection to the motion, and I will do the best I can to obtain the information required, as early as possible. I may say, however, that I do not consider, in the least degree, that the Resolutions before the House at all depend on any answer that can be given, or upon a proper consideration of any answer that might be given, in response to these motions. The Resolutions have not been submitted to the House on estimates made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at all. Before the Canadian Pacific Railway Company intimated to me what their estimate was of the work remaining to be done, I had taken up that question with the Chief Engineer and had gone carefully into it, and it is on the statement of the officers of my own Department that these resolutions are based—statements upon the accuracy of which I have the best reason to rely, because I am in the judgment of the House when I say there has never been a Minister of Public Works or a Minister of Railways who has found the estimates of his engineer more thoroughly and constantly verified from year to year, than I have found the estimates made by Mr. Schreiber, in relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I challenge, without fear of contradiction, a comparison between the accuracy of his estimates and the reliability of their character with the estimates made by any Government or Minister in regard to any public work. It is upon that which I relied in accepting the estimates which I have accepted from the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have not arrived at these conclusions altogether from information which they have furnished to me, but because I found, on the closest examination, that they were verified by my own officers—those who had the best means of obtaining information on the subject. I should have felt it necessary to have gone into much more accurate and extensive details on the statement of the Company, if it had not been that I had better means, as I considered, of arriving at a conclusion than depending on the statements of any parties who might be interested in making those statements. I repeat, that I shall take pleasure in furnishing, as early as possible, all the information which the Department can furnish, and in obtaining, further, that which is not in the possession of the Government, so far as we are able to do so.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad that the hon. Minister of Railways has said that the Department has certain data showing upon what these estimates are based. I would, with the consent of the mover, ask that the motion be amended by adding the words "and all data on which the said respective estimates, as to cost of construction, are based." It will be interesting to know whether these data are from some actual surveys or from something of a vaguer character.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad to know from the hon. Minister of Railways if we are to understand from his recent statement that Mr. Schreiber has made a full examination of the western section which is to be built to Kamloops; if I remember aright. Heretofore, most of us have been under the impression that no final survey of that route has been made. Are we to understand from the hon. Minister that we were in error; that an actual location survey has been made, and that Mr. Schreiber has estimated, with the minuteness which is usual in such cases, the cost of constructing the road from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knew perfectly well, when he asked the question, that no such location survey has been made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That shows how much the estimates are worth.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose there is no objection to the amendment?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. I have only this observation to make to the hon. Minister—that I did not at all intend this proposal with reference to estimates to be confined to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's estimates. I, myself, attach very much more importance to the estimates to which he has alluded. Nor was I ignorant, or forgot the fact he stated, that he had estimates in his own office on the subject. The hon. gentleman will observe that the estimate he gave to the House was an approximate estimate of about \$27,000,000. My anxiety was to have that amount divided, so as to learn how much belonged to the Rocky Mountain section, how much to the other part, how much to equipment, and how much to construction. Therefore, I acceded to the amendment, and hope we shall get the information which is in the hon. Minister's control.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE moved for statements: 1. Of the mileage cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway line for the 615 miles west of Winnipeg to a point forty-five miles east of the Saskatchewan; 2. Of the mileage cost of each 100 miles of this part going westward, separately stated; 3. Of the mileage cost of the above, divided into the usual headings; 4. Of the names of the contractors for any works on this part; 5. Copies of the contract for such works, including Shepperd & Langdon's. He said: Analyzing the hon. Minister's statement with reference to the branches, I find that he states that 269 miles of branches altogether have been completed, of which ninety-three miles belong to the Algoma branch, leaving 176 miles to the North-West. It is stated also that there is another amount of mileage under construction, but there is no information, in connection with the sum which the hon. gentleman states is for the branches: as to how much is applicable to the part under construction, and how much to the part which has been completed, assuming that the whole amount, \$1,882,000, is applicable to the 176 miles that we give as the ascertained cost of the North-West branches, some \$10,700 per mile. But we have no information as to the cost of the prairie part of the line—I mean that part of the line constructed under contract by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—the 615 miles which bring us to the point at which the construction company's work commences. The only information, therefore, upon which we can proceed at present, in making an estimate, is the Company's own statement of what it cost to build 176 miles of prairie line, and the general information one has upon this subject. You have in last year's report an announcement that the earthwork up to that period of the prairie line had been, I think, as much as 15,300 yards a mile. We have the usual statement about the ties, and some information about the rails, from which one might direct a calculation, as I understand that the earthwork cost about \$3,060; the ties about \$1,300; the rails, including the whole cost of transportation, about \$5,000; making, in these three items, the sum of \$9,360. What the other items are, or how far the whole cost is, if any, in excess of the \$1,882,000, I, of course, have no means of judging. But it is important that we should understand what the cost has been, and also that the cost should be divided. Here, again, it has been intimated to me that very large prices were paid for extra speed of construction—that the conditions were arranged in such a way that a sum very much in excess of what somewhat slower progress would have entailed, was paid to the contractors of the line. In these and other obvious views, I ask for copies of the contracts, as well as other information which is applied for in this motion.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE moved: 1. For statements, in detail, of the sums of money payable and the amounts of stock deliverable to the construction company under its contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the work done thereunder; 2. Statement of the moneys paid, with dates, and the amounts of stock delivered, with dates, to the construction company under the contract; 3. Statement whether money was paid to the construction company in lieu of stock; and if so, to what extent; and at what rate was money substituted for stock in such payments; 4. Statement of the circumstances under which the construction company was overpaid \$600,000; 5. Copy of the settlement and release between the construction company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the closing of their contract. He said: By the contract with the construction company, which the hon. gentleman brought down the other day, it was to receive for the eastern section—that is, the part east of Port Arthur—\$14,100,000 in cash, and \$20,000,000 in stock of the Company. From the statement, which the president made in his letter of April, 1883, and conjoining those statements with the copy of the circular of December, 1882, we may assume, in the absence of information, that, as between the construction company and the Company itself, the stock was rated at about 60 cents on the dollar, which would give the \$20,000,000 of stock a cash value of \$12,000,000. But, as I say, this is only conjecture, and it is important that we should know what the truth is, and what makes the contract price for the Lake Superior-Nipissing section equivalent to some \$26,100,000 in cash; but the cash to be paid by the Company to the construction company for the work on this section was to be paid in proportion as the work proceeded, the railway company retaining 10 per cent. It is important to know what sums were payable, and what stock was delivered to the construction company for the work done. The same observation applies to the western section, for which \$17,800,000 in cash and \$25,000,000 in common stock was to be paid, which, rating the stock at 60 cents on the dollar, would give us \$32,180,000 in all for the work between a point forty-five miles east of the Saskatchewan and Kamloops. This was to be paid for in cash and in stock, in proportion as the work proceeded. There was no agreement to pay for the work, earliest done, in cash, and that latest done in stock; and yet we find that all the work which has been done, as far as we can judge, has been paid for in cash, and that no part of it has been paid for in stock. It is important that we should know at what rate the stock was taken, when cash was substituted for stock by some arrangement of which we know nothing, between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the construction company, for upon this question, of course, depends the ascertainment of what the real nature of the contract was, as interpreted by the two parties to the contract. It is also to be observed that this contract, as far as we can judge, seems to have been departed from almost from the time of its initiation, because the Company declares that no further amount of stock than the \$25,000,000 and the \$30,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 were issued to the original subscribers and \$30,000,000 to the New York syndicate, has been subscribed at all; that is to say, in other words, that no amount of stock at all was issued to the construction company, because it was the remainder of the stock, \$45,000,000, which was to be swallowed up in the operations of the construction company. Yet none had been issued. Therefore, it would seem, from the very beginning, this contract was departed from, since the terms and exigencies of the contract called for the payment of only a comparatively small proportion in cash, less than one-half, and more than one-half in stock. The result has been, the cash of the company has been exhausted in paying the construction company, contrary to the terms of the contract. That is not all.

Mr. BLAKE.

A 10 per cent. deduction is provided by the contract, but it seems it was not made. Besides not making the 10 per cent. deduction, it seems \$600,000 has been paid the construction company in actual excess of the value of the work done. These considerations render it important that we should get further information with reference to this construction company, about which we can learn so little. The hon. gentleman has not yet been able to supply us with what he undertook to procure—a copy of the articles of association and the names of the associates of the company. We do, however, find some little information about it. We find that it is located, by the terms of the contract, at Walton, in the State of New Jersey. I asked an hon. friend to find out where Walton, in the State of New Jersey was. He searched all the gazetteers and the postal directories, but it seems to be a place too large and important to render it necessary that its name should appear in the gazetteer and postal directories, so that those who are obliged to resort to those sources of information to find where Walton is, are unable to ascertain its whereabouts. But, no doubt, some day or other we will ascertain where Walton is. I do not know whether there be two Northern American Construction Companies in the State of New Jersey or not; but if there be two it is a curious coincidence; and if there be but one, it would seem we have had something else to do with the North American Construction Company, for I find in the letter of explanation which Mr. Snow, the chief engineer of the other favourite enterprise of the hon. gentleman—the great European—but I will not trouble the House with trying to repeat the long name of that very short line—Mr. Snow, in making an explanation of certain discreditable circumstances which had occurred with reference to that enterprise, to Mr. Macdonald, says:

“In September last the North American Construction Company, was duly incorporated under the law of the State of New Jersey, by capitalists in the States for the purpose of building railroads and making investments in the Maritime Provinces, but more especially for the construction of a through line from Montreal to Newfoundland.

“The Short Line Railway Company entered into a contract with this construction company to build its railway, which it proceeded to do, by sub-letting the grading, bridging, and furnishing sleepers and timber to different contractors.

“The North American Construction Company has therefore, been at work in this Province for the last ten months, has expended and paid out for work, material and supplies, over \$200,000 of its own money, as shown by its receipts and vouchers, has not received or asked for any aid or subsidy, and has fully completed and graded, bridged and crossed twenty-one miles and over half graded fifty miles additional.

“On or about the 20th of July, the president of the Construction Company notified me that there would be some delay in meeting the requisition of the June estimates. He said there were various reasons for this—the disturbed state of the money market in New York, the uncertainty of perfecting the necessary arrangements for obtaining continuous and connecting rights and powers from Montreal through. That the seeming hostility of the different Governments and cities and the apparent apathy of the press, had tended to create an impression that the road was not needed, and also there was a great disinclination to invest in a road lying in Nova Scotia alone. That he hoped that this association would soon change their views, and future requisitions would be as promptly met as heretofore. That the contractors need have no fear about the final result or ultimately receiving their pay in full.”

I do not know whether this is the same North American Construction Company or whether we are fortunate enough to have two North American Construction Companies engineered by United States capitalists, located in the state of New Jersey, and taking an active and benevolent interest in the construction of railway works throughout Canada. If we have two, they seem to be in many respects identical. They have the same difficulty in getting money, and they stop working readily as it suits them. This company intimated to the chief engineer that they intended to stop payment; I suppose the other company intimated to the Canadian Pacific Railway that they intended to stop payment. On the whole, it is important we should know, having at length, after great difficulty, obtained this contract of the North American Construction Company; finding it is of a peculiar character; finding its mixed transaction in stock

and cash; finding that no stock has been paid over at all; and that, contrary to the contract, all that is done has been paid for in cash, thus exhausting the cash resources of the Company and placing them in a position which obliges them to apply to Parliament earlier than they might otherwise have applied; finding that the Company has been actually overpaid in cash for the cost of its works; not being able to find a local habitation for the construction company, or anything more than a name; finding that it is suspiciously identified with the company which has been operating with the hon. gentleman's pet contract in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, I think we may fairly ask for further information as to the relations between the Canada Pacific Railway and the construction company. We can ask that with the greater freedom and certainty of this motion not being denied, when we remember that from the hon. gentleman's statement, the two companies are, to a large extent, identical, because he said very many members of the Canadian Pacific Railway are members of the construction company. I shall not enlarge upon that topic. I have referred to it before and will have occasion to refer to it again, but it furnishes us good reason why we should have the fullest information as to the dealings between these wholly dissimilar corporations.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE moved: 1. For a statement of the consideration paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the St. Lin Branch or Laurentian Railway; of the payments made on this account with dates; and of the payments yet to be made thereon, including interest as well as principal; 2. For a statement of the particulars, with dates of the payments made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in respect of the Canadian North-West Land Company's stock; and of the names in which it stands; 3. For a statement of the particulars, with dates of the payment made by the Company in respect of the securities or property of the South-Eastern Railway; of the persons to whom it was made, and of the persons in whose names the securities and property stand; 4. For a statement of the particulars of the payments made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the purchase of the charter of the Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company, and of the names of the payees, said: Last year, Sir, in the course of the annual discussion upon the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I made a statement of such information as I was able to gather with reference to the purchase of the Laurentian Railway, or St. Lin Branch, which is the first branch of this proposed address, and I can do no better than repeat the information I then communicated, which was the best I was able to obtain:

"Then I see that they have made another little purchase. They have bought the Laurentian Railway, together with the St. Lin Branch, and there again you find a purchase which I cannot connect with the true interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but for which, notwithstanding, we will have to pay. This small road, running from Ste. Thérèse to St. Lin, somewhere about fourteen miles, they made a bargain for apparently about the same time at which they bargained for the large road. They bargained for the large road through the then First Minister of Quebec, the present Secretary of State, and they bargained for the small road through L. A. Sénécal, the president and practical proprietor of the road. Now, that little branch was built on a financial scheme, and it received about \$60,000 in aid from the Quebec Government. It was to have got some \$50,000 from municipalities, and there were shares to the amount of \$45,000 subscribed for, making a total of over \$160,000. Still the road only cost about \$140,000, and the contract was made on terms for the bonds, stock, etc.; but unfortunately, things took such a shape that the contractor handed over the bonds to Colonel King and Mr. Hurteau, at two different times, and apparently all that was advanced by those unto whom the bonds ultimately fell was a sum of about \$60,000. Mr. Sénécal became the proprietor of all of them I believe, or of all but a fraction of them, for somewhere about \$60,000 or \$70,000. In that position, at the same time when the large sale was made, the small is made; and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company acquires the Laurentian railway, as it is called—a fine title, by the way, for a branch fourteen miles long—and agrees to pay these bonds in full with interest upon them calculated at 7 per cent., which, as far as I can see, has not been paid for a long number of years; so that the price

to be received would be nearly \$400,000 for the St. Lin Branch, representing an investment to the fortunate proprietor and vendor of \$60,000 or \$70,000, for which he receives nearly \$400,000 for a road costing perhaps \$140,000 to construct, and being worth no more."

Then I ask for a statement of the particulars, with dates, of the payments made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in respect of the Canadian North-West Land Company's stock. It appears, from the explanation given by the hon. member from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), the other day, that the statement of the hon. gentleman that these moneys were expended in sustaining the stock, was not critically correct. I suppose that he had not been thoroughly accurately informed by the Company upon it. It was not connected with sustaining the stock, but it was connected with an operation for obtaining an issue of that stock upon the market. The Company, finding that the public would not take up all the shares, took up shares to an amount which was, of course, much larger than this sum of \$600,000, that would represent \$1,200,000, supposing the whole were paid up, because it was only half paid up—a sum of \$1,200,000 upon which they have paid \$600,000. I cannot agree with the view that that makes the transaction an unexceptionable one. I am sure it would not have had a very good effect upon that stock if it had been known that the vendors of the land of which the projected company were to be the purchasers had themselves, in order to complete the operation, taken up a very considerable portion of the stock. It would have been an indication which would have been rather looked upon by the public as one suspicious, and as one calculated to prevent them from investing in it if that had been ascertained; and I dare say that all concerned may now regret that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did take up these shares in order to float this company, which it appears was not capable of being floated, but has rather sunk. Then, one wants to know the names in which the stock was taken up and the names in which it stands. If \$600,000 of the Company are invested in stocks of this description, it is important that we should know how they stand. Then, no particulars or dates have been given, although it was promised and agreed that they should be given, by resolutions which passed the House, as to the payment made by the Company in respect of the securities or property of the South Eastern Railway, or of the persons to whom it was made, or of the persons in whose names the securities or property stands. This is an enormous transaction, or at least it would be enormous if we were discussing it irrespective of the much larger figures in connection with this Company, but it involves something like \$1,582,000, and as \$1,582,000 of money is now standing out in somebody's name in connection with this purchase or advance, it is important we should know in whose name, and all the particulars of it. The hon. gentleman stated that this transaction, like all the other transactions which are included in the sum total of the \$3,500,000 of the statement of the affairs of the Company, was only one of a number which were advances, and would result in being only advances, and would be returned; but, if my information is correct, this payment is made—in one form, it is true, as a possible advance—but substantially in connection with an option purchase of the South Eastern Railway, the Montreal, Portland and Boston Railway, and another railway, and I apprehend it will be found to be something of much greater consequence than a simple advance, although an option is reserved, I believe, to the purchasers to treat it as such within a period which may or may not have expired. The remaining branch of the motion has reference to the payments made for the purchase of the charter of the Atlantic and North Western Railway Company. A lump sum of \$149,000, if I remember aright, is given us for payments for charter and for

works, and it would be well to distinguish between these, and to let us know how much is paid for charter, and how much is paid for works.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for a statement: 1. Of the net price received by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for each lot of \$10,000,000 of stock comprising the \$30,000,000 issued to a syndicate, with the dates of the payments made in respect thereof; 2. Of the date on which the \$20,000,000 remaining of the original stock of \$25,000,000 was taken; and of the dates at which the \$5,000,000 paid in respect thereof was paid, said: It appears, from the statement laid on the Table of the House, that the stock which was issued to the Syndicate was issued in three different lots of \$10,000,000 each, or rather it does not wholly appear from the statement, but it appears from that statement and also from the information published at the time. The return, however, is not full. The return indicates the average price which was received for that stock to be 52½, from which, if we deduct certain commissions and other expenses which have to be deducted, the net returns seem to be 51, but that is averaged over the whole lot of \$30,000,000, whereas what is important to know is the rate at which each lot of \$10,000,000 was issued under the contract. It is also important to know at what rate the \$20,000,000 of the original stock of the \$25,000,000, remaining unsubscribed after the subscription of \$5,000,000, required by the contract was taken, and at what date the moneys paid in respect of that stock were paid. The return develops some peculiar arrangements in respect of that \$25,000,000. The chartered contract of the Company requires that they should have taken and paid up in full \$5,000,000 of stock, that is to say, that they should show that there was \$5,000,000 subscribed and \$5,000,000 paid upon that amount. Well, they did that. They took up \$5,000,000 of stock and they paid \$5,000,000 upon it; and then, some time afterwards—I do not know how long—that is some of the information I asked for—but some time afterwards, they allotted themselves other \$20,000,000 of stock at a rate of 25 per cent., paying \$5,000,000 for \$20,000,000 of stock; and then they prescribed 5 per cent. per annum on the nominal stock as the interest which they should collect from themselves during construction, thus taking a rate of interest of not less than 20 per cent. upon their investment in respect to the \$20,000,000 of stock which they secondly subscribed. Their statement in the returns is that the \$20,000,000 was issued at a price which made the average price 25, that is, that the 20 and the 5 they had already taken, had paid up at par an average price for the whole lot of 40, and it is from that I deduce the result that they paid 25 per cent. to themselves—charged themselves only 25 per cent. for \$20,000,000 of stock. This arrangement, I think, is of a very questionable character. Its result was, practically, according to their view, to turn the first \$5,000,000, instead of being stock paid up in full, into stock on which 40 only was paid up. But if that is not the result, we find \$20,000,000 upon which 25 p. c. only is paid up, and which yet is treated as paid in full, and which is to receive interest and dividends as if paid up in full, and upon which, as I stated awhile ago, no less than 20 per cent. interest is payable during construction, and no less than 20 per cent. is payable out of the capital, of which we are providing the largest part by the arrangement for the guarantee that has been already made, and the rest of which is to be provided for out of the capital account of the company during the remainder of construction. That is rather a handsome interest for the patriots to charge, who, from great public and national considerations, are constructing the railway for us, and who have pointed out to us so earnestly the reasons why the interests of the country require us to furnish them with further funds that

Mr. BLAKE.

they may the more rapidly construct that work. Then, if you take it at 40 per cent., which is the way they put it in the returns themselves, averaging the cost at \$25,000,000, you find the rate of interest for which they have stipulated, even at that rate, is 12½ per cent., and that we are to secure to them some 7½ per cent. for ten years; and as in the other, they were securing much more, so we are now securing for ten years 7½ per cent.; and they expect to raise a considerable sum afterwards of the capital on their land grant bonds. Then, Sir, we sell \$30,000,000 to the Syndicate at a price which, as I have pointed out, we do not as yet thoroughly understand, because an average price is given—but no doubt it was at a price lower, for some means or other, and for a net of 51. Well, that issue even to the Syndicate itself, was an advance of 100 per cent. on what we paid for \$20,000,000—more than 100 per cent.—and 30 per cent. on the average price of their own stock. They charged the Syndicate—their friends in the Syndicate—that much; and they arrange with the Syndicate that the public should be invited to take it at a still further advance, at a price of 60 per cent., which would be an advance of 140 per cent. or nearly two and a-half times as much as they paid for the \$20,000,000, and 50 per cent. advance on the average price of their whole \$25,000,000 stock. Now we have heard a good deal of disaster, and about the low price of this railway stock, and about the public not absorbing that stock at what is really a fair and intrinsic price for it; but when the public learns that the original projectors of the enterprise took \$20,000,000 of this stock, at 25 per cent., or, taking their whole investment, the \$25,000,000 at an average of 40, and themselves sold the first lot of \$30,000,000 at a net of 51—I think when the public learns that, they will think, perhaps, that they are, considering the prices which the Company themselves value the stock at what the original corporators valued the stock at when they were taking it for themselves—paying a pretty fair price for it. I find the average prices of Canadian Pacific Railway stock in New York for the week ending 28th April, 1883, 59½; 5th May, 67½; 12th May, 62½; 19th May, 61½; 26th May, 61; 2nd June, 61½; 9th June, 62½; 16th June, 63; 23rd June, 63½; 30th June, 63½; 7th July, 63½; 14th July, 62½; 21st July, 59½; 28th July, 59½; 4th August, 59½; 11th August, 55½; 18th August, 55½; 25th August, 56; 1st September, 56; 8th September, 57; 15th September, 57½; 22nd September, 58; 29th September, 57; 6th October, 56½; 14th October, 55½; 20th October, 52½; 27th October, 56; 3rd November, 62½; 10th November, 62½; 17th November, 62; 24th November, 60; 1st December, 59½; 8th December, 55½; 15th December, 56; 22nd December, 54; 29th December, 54½; 5th January, 1884, 55½; 12th January, 56; 19th January, 57; 26th January, 54½ to 54½, ex-div.; 2nd February, 55½; 9th February, 55½. Thus, you will see that the stock kept for a considerable time at or about the price that the public was invited to believe it was worth, or some where about 60, and that it has been hanging pretty steadily since that period at about 56 on the average, although, of course, those weekly averages do not represent the fluctuations which, in that stock as in numerous other stocks—as in all Pacific stocks during last summer—have existed. I have given you the averages for each week ever since the stock was first placed on the market of New York, from the 28th of April to the 9th of February. You will see that, putting to one side the periods during which this stock ran to 60 and 61, it runs at an average of about 56. We are called upon to deal with this Company in order to prevent disaster—in order to help them to keep this stock at about 56. Now, what is 56? We take \$20,000,000 at 25, so that 56 would be about 124 per cent. in advance of what they themselves take. What is 56 again? Compare it with the average price of the whole \$25,000,000, and it is 40 per cent. advance—even 56

is 40 per cent. advance upon the average price to the Syndicate of the whole stock they took. What is it compared with another thing? It is 10 per cent. in advance of the price they themselves attributed to the stock when they sold the first \$30,000,000. They sold it for 51 net, and they complain that 56 now is a disastrous price. Under these circumstances it seems to me to be important that we should ascertain what the operations of the Company have been with reference to this stock—this Company's subscription for the stock, its payments upon stock, and its arrangements with the Syndicate, to whom they issued the \$30,000,000 of stock, with some greater degree of minuteness in detail than as yet they have favoured us with.

Mr. MULOCK. I observe, on looking over the returns made to the House in obedience to an order of 29th January last, that the terms on which the \$20,000,000 were issued are not given; but it is stated that the \$20,000,000, together with \$5,000,000 were issued to realize, in all, 40 per cent. on the gross amount. We know the \$5,000,000 were issued at par, and it leaves it to be simply a mathematical calculation in order to determine at what price the second issue was made. However, in the statement furnished by the Company, it is not stated specifically what were the terms on which the \$20,000,000 were issued. No doubt they were issued on the terms stated by the last speaker, namely, at a discount of 25 per cent. I may correct the last speaker, as far as I can from the information I have been able to gather from the return furnished. I find it is stated in the return that the rate of 6 per cent. was paid until last December. Now, the last issue, \$30,000,000, was made on 29th December, 1882, according to this return, and the \$20,000,000, therefore, were issued prior to 29th December, 1882. The 6 per cent. interest was paid for a period up to that date. Accordingly, 6 per cent. was paid on the par value of the \$20,000,000 for a certain length of time; in other words, instead of 20 the rate was 24. I think it is material to know to whom the allotment of \$30,000,000 was made. It is stated in the return that it was made to a syndicate, represented by one W. L. Scott. It is important to know who constituted the syndicate; who are the persons who received the \$30,000,000. I think it is also due to the House that the return asked for should have been made more formal and complete. The return asked that the House should be informed as to the terms on which the respective issues were made, and it is no answer to say that one \$5,000,000 issue was issued at par, and that it, with another issue, realized a certain sum; that is not a business-like statement which a man would enter in his own books. I am bound to say that if the books of the Company are kept in proper form, and no doubt they are, the terms will be explicitly set forth, that \$5,000,000 was subscribed on certain terms, another \$20,000,000 on certain other terms. In order, therefore, that this information may be placed clearly on the records of the House, I ask leave to move the following amendment:

At the conclusion of the first paragraph of the motion, add the words "and the names of the persons comprising the said syndicate, and of the respective amounts of the said stock taken by such persons." Also add the following words at the close of the second paragraph "and the rate at which the same was issued."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I offer no objection to the adoption either of the motion or the amendment. I do not intend to allow myself to be drawn into a discussion of side issues raised in connection with the very grave question which is now before the House. I can well understand, finding the position they occupy with regard to this debate, that hon. gentlemen opposite should feel very anxious to raise side issues, and attempt to draw the attention of the House from the position they occupy in the discussion of this question. The hon. member who has moved this resolution no doubt felt a little uneasy when he found that the hon.

member who performed the duty of replying to him had left him without a single inch of ground to stand upon; that point by point he took up every question raised by the hon. gentleman, and disposed of them in such a manner as practically to have terminated the debate in this House. That, I say, is the position in which hon. gentlemen find themselves; and I am not all surprised, under those circumstances, that by a series of resolutions asking for minute information, asking for a variety of matters which have no practical bearing upon this question whatever, they should endeavour to draw off the attention of the House. But I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, how he supposed the original promoters of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were going to obtain money? That they require to obtain money, everybody knows. Every person knows that the House has before it evidence as clear and indisputable as possible, that outside of all the money they received, and all the assistance they received from the Government, they required a large amount of capital in order to engage in this enterprise, and to start it. Now, what is the fact? The hon. gentleman first takes exception to the subscription by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of stock for the purpose of floating the North-West Land Company. Why, the hon. gentleman knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had engaged in that transaction; that on the success of that scheme of selling a large quantity of their lands to the North-West Land Company was the very foundation of their making the lands they had received from the Government available for the purpose of getting money in order to carry on the work; and yet the hon. gentleman throws doubt on that transaction. He wishes to deny them the means of assisting in organizing a company upon a sound, substantial basis; upon a basis which would give them an ample return for their money; but of course the hon. gentleman and his friends in this House and out of it had undertaken to decry and discredit the North-West Land Company and every other enterprise connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. No doubt the hon. gentleman gloats over the fact that his speech tended to depress, and he hopes that his remarks to-day will further depress the stock of the North-West Land Company, although he knows hundreds of good men in this country interested in that Company will be injured thereby. But great as is the interest of large numbers of our people in every section of the Dominion in that enterprise, the hon. gentleman adopts the same tone as is adopted by the press supporting the party, and is ready to throw discredit upon that and every other enterprise in this country, if it will only embarrass and injure the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the great work in which they are engaged. The hon. leader of the Opposition first wished to deny them the means of getting money for their lands. Take this statement as he makes it to-night, and what does it amount to? It amounts to the fact that this syndicate—these gentlemen who made a contract for the purpose of constructing this great national work for Canada—put \$10,000,000 of their own cash into the enterprise, before they asked a dollar from the outside public. Sir, the hon. gentleman admits that they paid \$5,000,000 down in cash, and notwithstanding that admission, first, he says, they paid the \$5,000,000 in cash to start the Company; then, that they subscribed the whole stock and took it; and then, he says, they took \$20,000,000 more at twenty-five cents on the dollar. Putting down \$5,000,000 in cash in the first instance, and \$5,000,000 in the second instance, and letting the stock stand at forty cents on the dollar—assuming that to be true—what does it mean? It means that they took out of their own pockets, before they asked a dollar from the people of this country, or any other country, \$10,000,000 of their own money and put it into this enterprise; and yet the hon. gentleman would undertake to throw discredit on them for doing so.

I ask the hon. gentleman what he would have given for the stock at that stage of the proceedings? Suppose the \$20,000,000 stood at forty cents on the dollar, there is not a gentleman in this House, there is not a man with a head on his shoulders in this country, not a man connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway here or elsewhere, who at that stage of the proceedings, could have sold that stock for ten cents on the dollar, or could have obtained it from the public. Why, Sir, the press, representing a great party of this country, were telling the people then, as they are telling them now, that those who were putting their money into the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway would never see it again; that all they could hope to get would be the interest which was obliged to be paid during construction on the original issue of stock. Take the *Globe* newspaper since this debate commenced, and what do you find? You find it declaring to the people of this country and to the world that this road will not pay expenses when it is opened from end to end; that the men who have taken stock at forty and fifty cents to the dollar will never see a farthing of their money. I ask the hon. gentleman, if his own statement is to be accepted, if these men put \$10,000,000 of their own cash into the enterprise when it was in a condition when it could not be offered to the outside public, I ask him whether it is a crime in his estimation, or whether they are to be held as having done anything which was not creditable to them and advantageous to the people of this country? I say again, but for the fact that men of great wealth, great resources, men who could put down \$10,000,000 to start this enterprise, and who had the courage to deal with it in spite of the hostility they met with in this House and elsewhere—but for that fact we should have no assurance, as we now have the most complete assurance, that at an early day Canada will be crossed from sea to sea by a great national line of railway, of which any Canadian will be proud. I say, taking the hon. gentleman's own statements, as he sees the opportunity of making them; accepting them to be accurate and true, they will reflect the highest credit on the gentlemen who expended \$10,000,000 of cash before they asked one dollar from the outside public, and when, if they had done it, no one would have got ten cents on his stock. Why, Sir, the organ of the hon. gentleman, the organ of his party, the paper which is giving from day to day to the country the sentiments of the Liberal party, says that the stock is not worth ten cents, much less twenty-five cents, on the dollar to-day, and that people who have invested in it after the two years of construction are completed—for that is the term of the guarantee of interest—will not get a single farthing of interest or principal. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has read us, and I wonder that he did so at so late an hour in the evening—he has kept us out of our beds listening to him as if he was anxious to waste the time of the House—he read quotations of the sales of stock which have been made week by week, month by month and day by day over a long period. Does he not know that every man is intently watching the sale of this stock every day, and that we all knew as much of the matter before he dragged us through all these weary details of monthly, weekly, and daily quotations as we do now? Why did not the hon. gentleman, when he was speaking of the difference between forty cents on the dollar, when the enterprise was in its infancy, and its price now of fifty-five or fifty-six cents—why did he not have the candour to tell the House that in the latter case the stock has the guarantee of money, put up by the stockholders, that it has \$16,000,000 behind it, and that that is the reason of the difference? Instead of their being a just comparison between forty cents on the dollar, when according to his own showing these gentlemen invested their money in the purchase of stock when no one else would touch it, instead of this being a just comparison with the fifty-five or fifty-six

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

cents which it now brings, he should take into consideration the \$16,000,000 deposit for the purpose of getting that value; and if he takes that off, he will find that, so far from their having any such price, the stock is actually at a lower figure than it was issued at to the Syndicate, who first purchased before that deposit was made, and which deposit is made out of the pockets of the shareholders themselves. I said I did not intend to be drawn into this discussion, but I merely wished to draw the attention of the House to the measures taken by the hon. gentleman for the purpose of relieving himself before the House from the position in which everybody knows he and his friends stand in this debate. I ask, notwithstanding all the ability which has been displayed by the hon. gentleman, by the ablest member who can deal with it from that side, what have we heard? Instead of the hon. gentleman being able to controvert a single point or question I raised, he kept us hour after hour dealing with long, wearisome details, without raising a single point that would induce a person to take his pencil and make a single note. One would suppose that the hon. gentleman was speaking against time, when hour after hour he dragged us along in regard to one of the most important questions ever submitted to the deliberation of a Canadian assembly, without offering a sentiment or a proposition which was worthy of engaging its attention for a single moment. And when the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) had torn away the flimsy covering and left the hon. gentleman's speech in tatters, he had not an inch of ground to stand upon; but sitting down, with his wonderful industry for examining a question through a microscope—a question big enough to be seen and recognized by every intelligent man in this country—he applies his microscope and draws up a series of resolutions to distract the attention of hon. gentlemen from the real position of a question, upon which, looking at it from a debating point of view, the hon. gentleman has made the most pitiable exhibition that was ever witnessed in this House. I do not wonder, I do not blame the hon. gentlemen; it is because they feel and know, on this great question, not only that they are speaking in opposition to their own inward convictions, but in opposition to the pronounced public sentiment of the intelligent people of this country of all classes. They are paralyzed by the fact that party exigencies are driving them into opposition to this scheme, for no other purpose than to discredit the Company to whom they feel hostile, and at the same time discrediting the country of which they form a part. I say that I am not surprised, under these circumstances, that overpowered by the fact that in the three years which have elapsed since the contract was made, Canada has witnessed—what the most sanguine man in the House never believed he would see—the progress and advancement, not only of this gigantic work but of the country itself, that surpasses anything to be found in the past history of Canada. Under these circumstances, Sir, the hon. gentleman of course feels that Othello's occupation would be gone were he to do that which I believe he would have done, if he consulted his own interest as the leader of a great party, if he consulted the interest of that great party, if he consulted, above all, the interest of his country, if he had the magnanimity to say: I admit that in the past I took an erroneous view of this question; I did not believe that such progress could have been made, that such results could be achieved—as every man who will not shut his eyes and close his ears from every kind of evidence must admit—as have been achieved in this country; and, finding what it has done in the past, feeling what a shock would be given to ever commercial and financial enterprise in the country if this gigantic work were not proceeded with at the same rate of progress as in the past, I am bound to say that a case has been made out, in which it is perfectly plain and obvious

that Canada, that the Government of this country, that the Treasury of this country can secure, without the contribution of an additional dollar, the completion of this great national enterprise, which is to give us a great line of intercommunication, binding the Provinces of this Dominion together, giving them free intercourse, one with another, giving free current to the trade of the country from one end to the other, opening and developing the great prairies of the North-West and the great mineral resources of British Columbia, and carrying from sea to sea the people and the products of this Canada of ours; and the time has come when I feel that I cannot ask this House to hesitate for a single moment when it has the opportunity of securing the completion of this great enterprise at the same rate of rapid progress as it has shown in the past, and I must give the proposition my hearty support. I say if the hon. gentleman had adopted that course, he would have stood higher in the estimation of the people of this country; he would have had a more solid and united party at his back than he has to-day. Why, Sir, what is he doing? He is obliged to compel every man who is giving a support to the hostility which he has evinced towards these resolutions—every man who lends his support to this continued systematic obstruction to the grandest enterprise Canada was ever engaged in—he is compelling every one of those gentlemen to take the position, in the eyes of an intelligent people, of doing all he can to prevent the advancement and the successful completion of a great national work, which has already shown to the people of Canada that it can accomplish for us more than it has accomplished, and more than has been accomplished by any other enterprise in which this country has ever been engaged.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman, Sir, has not been addressing himself to the Opposition; he has been addressing himself to his own followers. Where there is so much smoke, there must be some fire—is it true fire? The hon. gentleman obviously was touched. He suffers from the passion of anger slightly. He is excited. He is aroused. He says he will not be drawn aside to discuss the question—it is not the time to discuss it; and immediately he proceeds to discuss it. He proceeds to a comment and a criticism on my speech, and to a comment and a criticism on the speech of the hon. gentleman who followed me. We may perhaps differ in opinion as to the respective merits of those two speeches. Perhaps neither of us is the most dispassionate and disinterested judge of their respective merits. I do not certainly, on my part, intend to apply any epithets, either condemnatory or otherwise, to either of those speeches, which are not now before us. But I mean to say to the hon. gentleman that he will not dictate to me to-day, any more than I have suffered him to dictate in the past, what my course shall be. At one moment he declared that I felt myself driven by the exigencies of party leadership to oppose the resolutions, and the next moment he said I should have stood higher as a party leader if I had not opposed them at all. Well, I have told the hon. gentleman before that my ideas of party exigencies and of party leadership entirely differ from his; I have told him that I do not consider myself under any obligation as a party leader in opposition to this Government to oppose any measure which I believe on its merits ought to be supported. I have told him that I never asked any of my friends to join in opposing any measure, except on its merits. I believe that we are not bound to oppose measures because this Government proposes them, and I believe we are not bound to support measures because this Government proposes them. It is because I conceive the hon. gentleman's proposition to be indefensible that I oppose it, not because he proposes it. I am quite free to admit, from the hon. gentleman's long course, that I look with some degree of suspicion

on whatever he proposes; yet, notwithstanding the quarter from which it comes, if he brings down a proposition, and the reasons for supporting it be sound, I will support it. But the hon. gentleman would not give me credit even for supporting the proposition to build the railway through the prairie country. My reward was, two Sessions afterwards, an indignant attack for presuming to oppose him in the construction through the prairie section. The hon. gentleman says I have denounced and embarrassed and obstructed the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and have oppressed and depreciated the value of their stock. Will the hon. gentleman but recall my speeches in the last two Sessions of Parliament? Will he but recall his own and his leader's utterances with reference to those speeches? Will he recall the statement made by both of them, that those speeches were exceedingly important in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway—that they did not wish to say one word against them—that they did not wish them criticised, because they were anxious that they should have all the weight that they could have in foreign markets and elsewhere in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Will the hon. gentleman remember that I have repeatedly stated what I have affirmed to-night—that the contract was a contract which had in it the elements of a magnificent fortune? Will he remember that my position was that the Company got too much and gave too little—that they had this road for nothing, with millions besides; and how those statements could have oppressed the stock, obstructed the progress, and injured the prospect of the Company, perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain at some future day. It was not until the last Session of Parliament—even then, when I made two speeches to which the hon. gentleman and the hon. First Minister gave the character I have just now described—that I indicated the position that the launching out into the other enterprises into which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have launched out, and the speed with which they were rushing might be the forerunners of difficulty and even of disaster; and I think the House will agree with me that if I committed an error it was in delaying until last Session to so speak, and in speaking so moderately instead of more decidedly last Session, because the fruits of that policy which I indicated as containing the seeds of disaster have ripened to the extent involved in the Resolutions now before the House. For all that, the hon. gentleman cannot point to one word said by me which would be otherwise than a word in favour of the prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What I say now is, that because the Canadian Pacific Railway comes before us asking aid, and because, as the hon. gentleman has himself admitted, they have put themselves before us, and the Government has put itself before us, in such a position that it was its bounden duty to give a frank and full statement of the affairs of the Company to that Parliament and to that people from which he was demanding so much in their interests, we have a right to insist on that statement being given. The hon. Minister said he was not going to take the Company's statements. He must have a formal investigation; he must have, not one, but two accountants go down to whom the Company must submit their books to be investigated; the books are to be audited by two officers of his, who are to make just such investigation as would be necessary to convince the persons about to lend money, or to go into partnership with a respectable firm of the soundness of the firm's affairs and the accuracy of its statements. We get some information, and that information I do not criticise, but draw from it statements and inferences, and the hon. gentleman is touched. He gets up and makes this speech, which, I suppose, was brewing in his mind this last hour, for while, during four or five motions, he restrained himself and kept quiet, he could not remain

quiet until the end. Twenty per cent. fetched him, and he must give us this diatribe, in which he went over a great number of things, but did not touch the subject of my remarks. He said that I had been answered fully in my speech of the other evening. Well, I did not repeat my speech of the other evening. I am not discussing this question now. But he says I have shown you that the Company paid \$10,000,000 of their own money before they asked the public to subscribe. No, the hon. gentleman has not. They may have done so, but they have not yet shown it. We asked for particulars relative to these statements, and the period at which the company paid their subscriptions on the stock they took and the relative dates of issue to the Syndicate. He says the stock would not have been worth ten cents on the dollar at the time the Company went into it if that stock had not been backed with their own money. I deny the statement. My opinion is the system is an erroneous one—one not contemplated by Parliament at all. I do not think there is a man in the House—except perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways himself, who may have had more intimate knowledge than the rest of us—who had the slightest idea that the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway was at the furthest to be raised beyond \$25,000,000 when the contract and the Act of Parliament was passed. We discussed the contract throughout on this basis. We discussed the question of tolls upon the idea that the maximum of stock would be \$25,000,000, and I say that a system of finance under which a \$100,000,000 of stock is raised, when Parliament assumed that the maximum would be only \$25,000,000—not because the road wants \$100,000,000, but because this affords an opportunity for stock watering and stock speculation which would not be afforded if the much smaller amount had been issued at par, and a dollar of money given for every dollar of obligation given by the Company—because this change takes place after the fashion I have mentioned of giving stock to the new syndicate at twenty-five cents, and then saying they are meeting with disaster because the public will not take the balance at fifty cents—I say that operations of that description entered into for the purpose of stock watering and stock speculation, is an operation not contemplated by the contract, not calculated to be really beneficial to the country but calculated to involve us as a people, so closely allied as the Government is becoming, by virtue of these resolutions, to the Company—not merely by the creation of the Company, but also by the relations of the Government, the Parliament and the people with the Company—in all the discredit which belongs to the system of stock watering as it exists in the United States. If you will consult the statistics, you will see that in the United States the total expenditure upon railways in the preceding year, if I remember aright, was something like \$1,000,000,000; you will see that the addition to the nominal stocks and bonds of the railway companies approximates to \$2,000,000,000; so that in a certain period in which \$1,000,000,000 has been added to the real value or the real work, \$2,000,000,000, or nearly twice the amount, has been added to the nominal stocks and bonds and capitals assumed to represent the expenditure of these various companies. That is the description of operations to which we are now asked to give our assent—to give facility for speculation—because the stock is at a low ebb. I ask is it not relevant to know what the Company themselves valued the stock at; the price at which they took it themselves, the price at which they issued it to the Syndicate, and the price at which the Syndicate sold it to the public. As to the hon. gentleman's statement that the stock was sustained by the guarantee, and that you must deduct a certain amount because of the guarantee, I say it is not so. The stock was sustained at the prices which it has since attained, and the prices were higher before the guarantee than those which it has attained in some instances since. The public was

Mr. BLAKE.

unable to perceive what was so very plain to all the capitalists and financiers in Europe and America, that if the Company took off its resources a very large sum and invested it at 4 per cent. to secure a dividend for ten years, it would add enormously to the value of the stock of a Company engaged in a large enterprise, and wanting all the money it could get to complete its work, instead of putting it aside to pay a dividend. All the capitalists of Europe and America, the hon. gentleman said, were of that opinion. But what the capitalists thought, they would not back by their money and not one of them would take hold of it. That is the state of things to which the hon. gentleman alludes. The hon. gentleman turned back to the old motion, to the motion which is not now before the House, and he said I took exception to the creation of the North-West Land Company and threw doubt on it though I knew that Company would be injured thereby. I have stated the arrangements made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with the North-West Land Company is an excellent good one for the Company, but not so good for the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I will say again that if the Canadian Pacific Railway, being themselves the vendors to the North-West Land Company, had announced to the intending investing public that they themselves were taking shares, he may judge for himself what effect that would have had on the intending buyers. What is worthy of complaint and of observation is that these shares were taken, as I believe, unknown to the public, by the Canadian Pacific Railway and had according to the statement of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, in order to prevent the proposed subscription failing. To avoid failure, the Company took \$1,200,000 of stock and so the enterprise was floated. That transaction was not right; and whether it tells for the Company or tells against the Company, if such a transaction as that takes place with reference to a Company with which this country is so intimately connected, and with which it will be so much more intimately connected, I shall at all events avail myself of my privilege on the floor of Parliament to state my opinion about it.

Amendment (page 225) agreed to.

On the main motion being put,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House, but I must make a single observation in regard to the point which the hon. the leader of the Opposition made, as to the speeches which he delivered in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's enterprise, and which he thinks should entirely absolve him from any charge of obstruction or hindrance of that great work. I quite admit, Sir, that the hon. gentleman did speak, on the occasion when the contract was submitted to the House and again a year ago, in very extravagant terms with regard to the great value of the subvention that was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the great wealth which the parties engaging in it were about to receive; but he forgets that he had discounted that speech by the speeches he had made for five long years, when he was connected with the late Administration. He forgets that he is capable one day, when it suits his party exigencies, of declaring that the land in the North-West is of no value, and a year afterwards, when the party exigencies demand it, of saying that it is worth \$4 an acre for 25,000,000 acres. The hon. gentleman must remember that it is not very easy to give value to statements made by an hon. gentleman according to the demands of the exigencies of the party, and regardless of the facts upon which they are based. If the public and the country did not attach such great value to the exaggerated statements he made as to what the Canadian Pacific Railway were receiving and the great fortunes the Company were likely to make out of their con-

tract, it was because they knew what the hon. gentleman's opinions were, as expressed year by year during the five years' Administration of the hon. Mr. Mackenzie. They knew, Sir, that the value that that hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and the late hon. Finance Minister, who sits by his side, placed upon the land in the North-West was not of a very exaggerated character. They knew that the late hon. Minister of Finance had stood up in his place in this House and declared that Foster could have carried out his contract, and came to them and said: I can carry out my contract for the eighty miles of the Georgian Bay Railway, for which you have given me, among other things, 20,000 acres of land in the North-West per mile, if you will take the land and give me twenty-five cents an acre for it. And they refused. Why did they refuse? Not that they did not want the contract that they had made to be carried out, but because the twenty-five cents was, in their judgment, more than the land in the North-West was worth. We have that in evidence. We have the statement made by the late hon. Minister of Finance, and given to the world as their estimate of what the land in the North-West Territory was worth, until we made a contract to give 25,000,000 acres of it to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as a subvention. Then all their views were changed. Then all the values and calculations of this hon. gentleman as to the land in the North-West were entirely changed, and he found it convenient to give to that land, which he had given the best evidence in the world he did not consider worth twenty-five cents an acre, a value of \$4 an acre. Now, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman surprised that he was not able to raise or assist the Company much by any statements he might make in this House as to the value of the subvention they had? He knows that the statements now submitted to the House, which cannot be controverted, prove the utter fallacy of all the calculations he made, and all the statements he put forth as to the enormous wealth this Company were going to acquire. What is the fact? The fact is that, after obtaining all the money they can obtain by the sale of \$55,000,000 of stock, after first putting \$10,000,000 of their own money into it, and then all the money they could obtain out of the disposal of \$65,000,000 of stock, they find that they are unable to obtain the money from the lands, to obtain the money from the sale of stock, after having resorted to a measure in which they had advice from gentlemen whose opinion on financial questions, I do not hesitate to say, will be held to be quite equal to that of the leader of the Opposition. I think that hon. gentleman would hardly put his opinions on a question of finance against the opinions of a gentleman who was distinguished as one of the most successful managers the Bank of Montreal ever had—Mr. Angus. I think he knows that Mr. Stephen, who had been president of that bank, and Mr. Angus, who had been one of its most successful managers, would be able to form as valuable an opinion on a financial point as the hon. gentleman could form; and although it was a disaster, and although it utterly failed in accomplishing its object, it was in consequence of the renewed attacks upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the condition of other similarly situated stocks in the New York market—a crisis in regard to questions of that kind which had been without parallel for many years in this country. Otherwise, I think everyone will agree that that effort would have been successful. I say that, when the hon. gentleman now quotes the price of the stock, he must do so in the light of the fact that it does not stand in the position of the stock when they gave forty cents, according to his statement, but it stands with the guarantee of the Government of Canada of 3 per cent. on that stock for ten years. The hon. gentleman was not candid when he was treating the present prices of

the stock and its value in the money market, and contrasting that with the unguaranteed stock which he said they had taken at the rate of forty cents on the dollar. I showed the House that there was no parallel, because, in the one case, you had a great completed road, earning money, and in the other, the works in their infancy, when no one could predicate anything in regard to them; and, I say, Sir, that the price paid, if the hon. gentleman is correct, on the first \$20,000,000 at forty cents on the dollar, is a higher price than that at which, with the works in their present position and with the guarantee of the Government of Canada, they are now quoted on the market. I will not detain the House further on the matter, as that was the only point the hon. gentleman made in relation to it. But I say that he did not undertake to meet the point I made in regard to the organ of his party and the press sustaining him. I say that, when the hon. gentleman makes his statement, in the payment of forty cents on the dollar for stock, they benefited themselves unduly, in the infancy of the enterprise, he ought to take into consideration the fact that, whatever speeches he may make here—and, as I have shown, the hon. gentleman is equal to the occasion, whether it is to depress the value of the lands in the North-West or the value of the enterprise, or anything else, and the hon. gentleman knows the course he took when I asked the House to give 100,000,000 acres of land in the North-West to secure the construction of the railway—he ought not to forget that at this moment the organ of his party, the paper to which his friends in and out of this House look for the sentiments of the Liberal party, is now heralding to the world the declaration that the persons who buy a dollar's worth of stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway will never find their money again. They heralded all over this country, from end to end, the declaration that the stock is entirely worthless; that the Company will not be able to pay working expenses when the line is built. The hon. gentleman, although he made some strong statements in regard to the position of the country and the value of their enterprise, must not forget that all the time he was confining himself to the great importance of constructing the prairie section only, instead of giving us the Canadian Pacific Railway by constructing the two ends, which two hungry ends would more than devour all that the centre portion of the line would make. That was the position of the hon. gentleman, and it was not very well calculated to enhance the value of this enterprise. I say that the course of the hon. gentleman has always been obstructive; I say that the course of his party around him, in regard to this great enterprise, has, under all circumstances, been obstructive; I say the position these hon. gentlemen have taken, whether in power or out of power, has been to do all they could to prevent the construction of a great Canadian Pacific Railway, for the purpose of sustaining the views to which, unfortunately, they committed themselves in regard to this great question, and to do which they are compelled, in order to discredit this enterprise, to discredit the country itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take issue in the most express terms with the last statement made by the hon. Minister. I say, Sir, if there are any men on the face of the earth who have dishonoured or discredited Canada from the day that the Canadian Pacific Railway was first talked of, they are those hon. gentlemen sitting before me. The effrontery of these men is incredible! After my hon. friend has stated his objections in as calm and dispassionate a speech as could possibly be made, we have this hon. gentleman and his friends coming up here to say that the obstacle to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway is the unpatriotic conduct of members of the Opposition. I ask again, Sir, have those hon. gentlemen forgotten who made the name of Canada discredited throughout the whole

civilized world by their infamous conduct of ten years ago? Now, Sir, if those gentlemen want to discuss this question fairly and impartially, we are prepared to do it. If they want to go back to the past history of this question, if they want to have all the infamy—I repeat the word, all the infamy—which they brought upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which they brought upon Canada—if they want to have all these things recapitulated, we are prepared to go through it. We are prepared to show why it was that hon. Mr. Mackenzie met with difficulties in the construction of this road. And I say this, Sir, that no man could have done more in the time and with the means at his disposal, than hon. Mr. Mackenzie did in the construction of that difficult portion of the work which he, and he alone, carried through; and when we recollect, Sir, that this hon. gentleman tried his hand at it, and all he ever did was to lay down 100 miles of railway, so badly planned, so badly engineered, that the first thing the Canadian Pacific Railway engineers did was to pull it all up, Sir, the less he talks to us about obstruction in constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway the better for himself, and the better for his party. But, Sir, he tells us just now that we were setting ourselves against public opinion. Does he know enough French to read the French press of this country? Has he ever looked at the organs of the gentlemen who support him—or of the gentlemen who usually support him—and does he see what they are saying about these Resolutions? Does he not know, as I said here a few nights ago, that for every dollar you give to the Canadian Pacific Company you will have to pay another dollar, in all human probability, to meet the demands of his followers who won't be dragged through the mire unless they get a consideration for it? Sir, the hon. gentleman, if he is going to discuss this matter, if he is going, contrary to his own declarations, to force us against our will to discuss this matter now, he would be infinitely better employed in reconciling the manifest discrepancies which my hon. friend has pointed out to him. Let him explain, if he can, these suspicious features in the construction company's accounts; or, if he cannot do that, let him hold his peace until he brings us the information we have asked for. Now, the hon. gentleman alluded to a statement I made—or that he says I made—with respect to a demand of Mr. Foster about ten years ago. Sir, it is perfectly true that land in the North-West in 1874, ten years ago, before any railway communication was made with it, either by us or by the Manitoba, St. Paul and Minneapolis Railway Company, was not of any practical value. That land was not assigned. Nobody ever supposed—I never supposed, no man ever supposed—that land in the centre of the continent could be made valuable till that railway went there. Sir, what these men did was this: They waited till there were two railways into that country, until the land had become of great value, and then, when the land had become of great practical value, they, by some bargain made in defiance of the then law, gave away the most valuable sections of that land. That is what they did. That land in 1879 had become very valuable indeed. No man disputes it; every man knows it; and what was the case in 1879 could be no rule for the value of unassigned land in 1874. No man knows that better than the hon. gentleman, although I think I heard him, who now complains that we valued the land at \$2 an acre—I heard that hon. gentleman, I think, unless my memory deceives me, rate those lands at \$5 an acre eight or nine years ago. Sir, I repeat, we are perfectly willing to discuss these questions fairly and reasonably; but we will not submit to be told—by the heroes of the Canadian Pacific Railway Scandal, at any rate—that we are obstructive of the progress of this work; that it is our fault if transactions of this doubtful character are looked on with suspicion by the capitalists of the world. I do not know what capitalist it

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

was, or what financier it was, who told him that if you had \$45,000,000 of stock to sell, which you expected to sell for some 80, it was going to strengthen your case to take \$24,000,000 and place it in the hands of the Government of the day to secure a guarantee of 3 per cent. for ten years. I have never yet heard any reasonable explanation, either by himself or by his friends, or his press, showing that after \$55,000,000 of stock had been issued and sold, as they said, it was a wise measure to guarantee the whole \$100,000,000 to the extent of 3 per cent. for ten years. I could have understood that being an advantageous measure, had it been done when the stock was first emitted; but I do say, that done when it was, it was not a wise thing, and the result shows, under whatever advice it was done, that I am right. It was not a thing that was calculated in any way to raise the value of the stock. Any man who saw the original memorandum, the original declaration, emitted by those gentlemen, which intimated that \$100,000,000 were going to be guaranteed, that the Company were going to deposit \$24,500,000 of money or money's worth, must have seen that it would cause a more formidable strain on the resources of the Company, far more than any prices they could expect to get for the remaining \$45,000,000 of stock, could have warranted. That hon. gentleman might do well to address himself to the task of explaining these things, if he is able to do so. No explanation has been offered of that yet, no more than of the discrepancies to which I have referred. Now, Sir, I do not want to detain the House, but I must say this to the hon. gentleman, that we are not going to submit to be told that we are unpatriotic, and that we have gone out of our way to injure the Canadian Pacific Railway or the North-West. I repeat again, that the North-West has been most miserably misgoverned—has been greatly injured; but the causes, Sir, are: first, the Tariff policy; next, the land policy; and third, the railway monopoly of this present Government.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

A return showing in detail the amounts expended from 1st January, 1880, in repairs on the Pelée Island, Long Point and Rondeau Light Houses; also showing the date of each payment, what the payment was for, the amount paid and the persons to whom paid, together with a copy of each voucher;—also, copy of all correspondence between the Government and John Corbet, and the Government and Wm. Grubb, or any other person relating to the Pelée Island Light House, since 1st January, 1880.—(Mr. Lister.)

Copies of arrangements made between the Dominion Government and the Quebec Central Railway Company, whereby the said Company enjoys the right of way over that part of the Intercolonial Railway known as the St. Charles Branch.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:20 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 12th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### FRAUD IN SALE OF PATENT RIGHTS.

Mr. MULOCK, from the Select Committee on Bill (No. 26), for the better prevention of Fraud in connection

with the sale of Patent Rights, reported said Bill with amendments.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 80) to amend the Act incorporating the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

Bill (No. 81) further to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Battleford and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 82) to legalize a certain agreement between the Village of Parkdale and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and other Railway Companies, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Wallace, York.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Royal.)

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

The Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Charles Tupper, "That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions (page 84) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway," being read,

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who spoke last in this debate (Mr. Woodworth) concluded with a few remarks expressive of how deeply important he felt the subject matter to be. As I anticipated, having realized the importance of the subject so much, he did not devote much attention to its discussion. I regret exceedingly that he should see fit to take up so much time with matters entirely foreign to the Resolutions which had been submitted by the Minister of Railways. His speech in some instances was amusing; and in others it was not. I agree with him as to the importance of the vote which hon. members are called upon to give, and I hope during the rest of the discussion those who take part will confine themselves more closely to the real point which we are called upon to discuss and decide. Historical reviews are very interesting at times; but I think if the hon. gentleman wished to make a speech for his constituents, and he said that was his object, he should have taken an occasion when there was a less interesting and important debate in progress. I have one complaint to make against him, and one only, that when he introduced in the debate an old and venerable friend in the story of John Randolph, of Roanoke, and told the story which has been in every one's mouth for the past twenty years—and the story has stood me in good stead many a time, as it has no doubt other hon. members—he should have so altered the phrasology and clothed it in such coarse and vulgar language that I think I would be scarcely able to recognize it. I will, if he will accept a suggestion which comes from a very humble source, recommend the hon. gentleman, whose power of elocution are very great and whose memory is remarkably good, when he desires to recite those little pieces of poetry, to adopt the plan of reciting them at those interesting penny readings established from time to time by church societies and others for the purpose of supplementing their exhausted revenues. It is hardly fair to take up the time of the House in reciting Longfellow's "Ship of State." Nor do I desire to follow the hon. gentleman in the long review he gave of Canadian Pacific Railway matters, eight, ten or twelve years ago. His historical review was more extensive than that made by any other hon. member who has taken part in any debate since I have had a seat in the House, for it commenced with the building of the walls of

Jerusalem and ended with Longfellow's "Ship of State." There is one remark made by the hon. member, and only one, to which I feel called upon to call attention and controvert, and that is the statement—and I do controvert it, because he made it, as he declared, so that it might go on the record as a matter of history—that the right hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government had been driven from power, in 1873, because he introduced a policy for the construction of a railway from ocean to ocean. Sir, if the hon. member knows or has read anything of the history of those days, he ought to know that the right hon. gentleman was not driven from power because he proposed any such policy. The right hon. gentleman was driven from power for a political crime, and not because of any particular policy. I am not going to take up the time of the House in following the hon. gentleman, but at the same time I am not going to sit silent when I hear our political history travestied by hon. gentlemen opposite. We were satisfied to let that matter rest in oblivion for the present, at least; there was no occasion for introducing it here, and its introduction does not add to the kindness of our debates in any way. But, Sir, if we are challenged to put on record our disapproval of the course which the hon. gentleman adopted on that occasion, I think it will be found that no one on this side of the House will shrink from his duty in expressing his disapproval, or voting his disapproval, if required to do so. I think, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman, he might have spared himself, and spared the House, the attack which he made on one of the most respected and venerable members of this House. He undertook to charge the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) with disloyalty, with want of patriotism, with being a man who has decried the country of his adoption, and done other things in the way of sacrificing his country at the shrine of party. Sir, if there is one man in this Parliament, one man in all Canada, who deserved less than any other man the aspersions which the hon. gentleman attempted to cast upon him in that respect, it is the hon. member for East York. Sir, that hon. gentleman has spent the best part of his life fighting on behalf of principles which we on this side, at any rate, hold very dear; and I do not think an expression can be quoted from his lips, either in this Parliament or out of it, which could be construed by his most virulent opponent into a charge of want of loyalty or lack of patriotism. He needs no defence from me; his name and fame and reputation will live in the hearts and history of his country, when the names of those who would be his detractors have long passed into oblivion. I was not surprised that the hon. gentleman attacked the leader of the Opposition, but I think that he might have had the grace—when that hon. gentleman rose in his place and denied the charge made against him, that he was the standing counsel for the Grand Trunk Railway—I think he might have had the courtesy to accept the denial and withdraw the charge.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I did; and I said "our counsel."

Mr. DAVIES. No, Sir, the hon. gentleman did not withdraw it; the only remark he made was a very contemptible attempt at wit. Now, Sir, what arguments did he and the two hon. gentlemen who preceded him on that side of the House, advance in favour of the proposition which the hon. Minister of Railways has submitted in the form of these Resolutions? They charged the Liberal party of this House, and of this country, with want of patriotism. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) started the cry. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) repeated it, and the hon. member for King's County, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth) joined in this chorus of reciprocal malignity against the party to whom I have the

honour to belong, and the press of that party, for the action they have seen fit to take in regard to this question. Sir, I do not think anything in their actions or in their past history justified such a charge. What is the cause of this repeated attempt to denounce the Liberal party for want of patriotism and for decrying the country? Is it because they have preferred truth to exaggeration? Is it because they have refused to bow down to the political idols which hon. gentlemen opposite have set up for us to worship? Is it because the hon. leader of the Opposition refused to adopt the traditional *role* of the 4th of July orators, and proclaim that Canada is the best and the most beautiful country in the world, and is able to whip all creation? The hon. leader of the Opposition when he speaks of the resources of his country, speaks in tones and in language which commend themselves to the opinion of reasonable men; he does not adopt the *role* of exaggerated nonsense; he does not degrade the praises of his native country into a farce; he does not besneer it with praises which do not belong to it, but he proclaims what her resources are in language as eloquent, and more eloquent, I venture to say, than any other hon. gentleman of this House is capable of employing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," but I would ask them is it for that that they denounce him for want of patriotism? is it because we have dared to raise our voices and proclaim that a high system of taxation is not conducive to the welfare of our people? Is it because we have told hon. gentlemen, time and again, that the trade relations of this country should be made as free as the law can make them? If not for these things, then I do not know for what we are denounced. But I can tell hon. gentlemen that the country at large, I believe, thoroughly understands that there is as deep a love of country, as strong a desire to advance the interests of this Canada of ours, and perhaps a more honest desire to advance her interests among the leaders of the Liberal party, than exists in the breasts of many hon. gentlemen who are so loud in their proclamations of their own patriotism. Now, Sir, while these charges are being made from time to time by hon. gentlemen, a stranger listening to them would imagine that they had always adopted the *role* which they say the members of the Opposition should now adopt. I say, Sir, that that has not been their past record or their past history. I say that these charges come with peculiarly bad grace, from some of those who preceded me in this debate—men who only five years ago made day and night hideous with their wails, as to the condition into which this Canada of ours had fallen. I remember when a picnic could not be held from one end of Canada to the other without the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) being present, and decrying the condition of the country, and deploring the state into which it had fallen, in lamentations, compared with which the lamentations of Jeremiah were feeble. There was no depth to which the country had not fallen, according to that hon. gentleman; and I am sure that if any intending immigrants, from the old country had read any of the diatribes delivered by that hon. gentleman, they would not have thought of coming here. Fortunately, however, people abroad did not read those speeches, though, I am sorry to say, that too many people at home were induced to listen and to give heed to his seductive tones. The hon. gentleman laughs, but I fancy a great many people are getting their eyes opened on that subject. I wish to say a word or two as to the remarks made by the hon. member for Cardwell—not that I think he grappled with the question before the House, or with the arguments of the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), but because he made one or two statements which should, I think, not go unchallenged. Sir,

Mr. DAVIES.

he spoke in the first place of the hon. member for Huron—and so far as his personal altercation with that hon. gentleman is concerned, as it is none of my business, I shall leave them to fight it out themselves—but he spoke of his having left the Conservative party. Well, if he did, I know the hon. gentleman well enough to believe that he had good reason to leave it; and it would be interesting to me, though perhaps not very interesting or palatable for some hon. gentlemen opposite, if some day he took the opportunity of stating the reasons, which induced him to leave that party. I do not know whether the hon. member for Cardwell would consider those reasons very palatable; but, at any rate, I will leave that question to him and the hon. member for Huron. The hon. member for Huron made use of an argument which, to my mind, seemed a strong one. He said there was a very strong analogy between the position in which we are now placed with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the position in which the country was once placed in reference to the Grand Trunk Railway. He said we had to give a large amount of money to the Grand Trunk Railway many years ago, under circumstances very analogous to those under which we are asked to make this grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. member for Cardwell challenged the accuracy of that statement, and I listened very attentively to his remarks, because I supposed that I was going to hear him show the particular point in which the analogy did not hold good; and I must say, Sir, that the explanation given by the hon. member for Cardwell thoroughly convinced me, if I had any doubt before, that the statement made by the hon. member for South Huron was strictly accurate. Why, Sir, no enquirer who desires to know the history of this matter, need do more than take up the hon. member for Cardwell's own speech. Every line of it, which has reference to this particular branch of the subject, bears strong evidence that the position in which we are now placed is just the position that Canada was in then; and reasoning by analogy, I conclude that the position of Canada ten years hence, with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, will be just the position we now occupy with reference to the grant made to the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not want to use a stronger argument than is conveyed by the hon. gentleman's own language with reference to the loan made by this country to the Grand Trunk Railway. He says:

"A prospectus was issued bearing, if not the direct, certainly the indirect endorsement of the Government of this country, promising to those people in England who should put their money into the Grand Trunk Railway, a dividend of 11 per cent. at least."

Has the hon. gentleman ever read the official memorandum published by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and signed by Mr. George Stephen, the President? That official memorandum—which bears almost the direct official endorsement of the hon. Minister of Railways and of himself, Sir, a very strong supporter of the Government, both in this House and in the press—makes statements almost precisely similar to those made in the prospectus issued by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and promises a dividend of 11 per cent., the very sum promised to those who would invest their money in the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway. Then the hon. gentleman goes on:

"The Government guaranteed £3,000 a mile for the railway, and took a first lien upon it as security."

We have paid so much a mile, and we are taking a first lien upon the railway as our security. In everything the two cases are precisely similar—

"But we all know that when the road came to be built, when the results came to be ascertained, it was found that instead of its paying the 11 per cent. then promised, there was no percentage at all for the people who had embarked their money in the enterprise."

Whether that will or will not be the case with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, is a question which the

future alone can divulge; but I know, and the hon. gentleman knows, that the opinion of those who are very competent to judge, is that there will be a very similar state of things as the result of our advance and of our mortgage on the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows very well—and if he now affects he does not, he can turn to his own speech and those made by his leaders and he will find—that when the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was first introduced, it was strongly urged that for years that road could not pay. One of the arguments then made use of to justify the enormous sum which was voted was, that for many years after it was built, that railway would not be able to pay its way, and therefore it should be endowed to the enormous extent that it was with moneys and lands; and I say, judging from the facts and reasoning from analogy, that the future of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be just what the past of the Grand Trunk Railway has been, so far as our relation to it is concerned, and I fear very much that the moneys we are advancing to supplement the enormous subvention given before will be money lost to Canada just as the advances to the Grand Trunk Railway are lost. The hon. gentleman, in picturing the position of the Grand Trunk Railway, goes on:

“And when the question came before the people and the Government of Canada, as to what was to be done with regard to that guarantee, it presented itself in this form: Here were men in England who, on the strength of a prospectus practically issued by Canada—backed, as it was, by the Governor General, by her Majesty's representative, in this country—put their money into that work, without any hope of getting it back again, and without any interest whatever, except the interest which they expected to get in the form of a dividend from the construction of the railway. There was Canada, with a railway built with English money, and benefiting by the rapid development of every interest in the country which followed immediately after its construction; and the question which presented itself to us, as honest men, was this: ought we to exact the pound of flesh? Ought we, who have derived, and are deriving all the direct and indirect advantages resulting from the expenditure of that money in our midst—from the expenditure of the money itself, and the development of the country through that expenditure—ought we to exact our interest before the people in England get a dollar?”

The conclusion he came to was that the country ought not to do so. It did not; and, Sir, we shall probably stand in exactly the same position in a few years hence. People in England have, in the two past years, been asked to invest their money in this enterprise, on the faith of statements guaranteed by the Governor General in his speeches delivered to this Parliament, guaranteed by every speech which the hon. Minister of Railway makes, guaranteed in every way in which an official guarantee can be given; and if the time comes when that railway shall fail to pay any dividends, the question will be asked in this House, just as the hon. member for Cardwell says it was asked in the case of the Grand Trunk Railway: What, are you going to exact the pound of flesh?—are you going to foreclose your mortgage, and take the money which we have put into this enterprise? Before that time comes the magnates who now hold this stock and control this Company will, in all probability, have slipped out, and the holders of the stock will be the unfortunate people who have invested their money in it. I do not say that this will take place, but it is probable; and if it does take place, it will be a perfect analogy of the case of the Grand Trunk Railway. Therefore, so far from meeting the argument advanced by the hon. member for South Huron, the hon. member for Cardwell confirmed it; and I regard it as a remarkably strong argument. We have a right to infer what will take place from what has taken place, under similar circumstances; and so reasoning, I, for one, have come to the conclusion that the day will not be far distant when the representatives of the people of Canada in this House, will have an appeal made to them, not to exact their pound of flesh, not to foreclose their mortgage, but to make their lien for what we are now advancing secondary and subservient to the stock which the investors hold in the

Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, there was another argument advanced by the hon. member for South Huron which struck my mind as a very strong one. That was the argument with reference to the estimates of the probable cost of finishing this road. One very important question which every hon. member who votes on these Resolutions has to ask himself is this: Is this sum which we are now giving a final sum? Is this the last time we shall be called on to supplement the enormous sums already voted to that railway? And the hon. gentleman argued to this effect: That if the estimates which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had already made were correct, this sum could not be a final sum, but that we should be called upon to vote many millions more before many years rolled by. How did he make that out? He said that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had contracted with the construction company for the latter to build the remaining portion of the road and to build it for the sum—I am not going through the details of his calculation at all, but simply take the results as he brought them out—for the sum of \$23,000,000 odd for the western, and \$21,000,000 odd for the eastern, which, adding cost of equipment, would make a total of \$43,000,000. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company contracted with the construction company to pay them \$48,000,000 to build the unfinished portion of that road. We are now told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the same amount of work, which a very few months ago it was estimated would cost over \$48,000,000, can now be done for about \$29,000,000. The difference between these two sums is \$18,000,000; and one of two results follow: either that the construction company was being paid \$18,000,000 too much, or that the estimates now being presented to this House, and which we are asked to vote, are \$18,000,000 too little. Which horn of the dilemma will the hon. gentleman take? Neither is very palatable to him, because it has already been said officially in this House, in unequivocal terms by the hon. the Minister of Railways, that this construction company embraced the leading members of the Syndicate themselves. Therefore, if they were paying themselves, in the form of a construction company, \$18,000,000 more than properly they ought to have paid themselves, they were guilty of something that was very reprehensible. But the hon. member for Cardwell takes the other position, that they were not paying themselves enough. He says that the construction company abandoned that contract because they were not getting enough. If they abandoned it, I put this question to the hon. member, and I would like to get an answer from the other side of the House: If those railway contractors—men who are much more capable of estimating the cost of the work than I, or possibly any other member of this House—if they, having the experience of many months in partially constructing the road—came to the conclusion that \$43,000,000 was too little, with what face can we be asked to declare that \$18,000,000 less than \$48,000,000 is sufficient? To my mind the estimate now presented is too little. Railway men, engineers, men of experience, abandoned—according to the hon. member for Cardwell—their contract of \$43,000,000, because the amount was too little; yet we are told we can build it for \$18,000,000 less. Does any hon. gentleman believe that? I do not. I believe that \$18,000,000 and something more will be asked from this Parliament, before many years go round, to finish that road, which the construction company undertook at one time to build. The hon. member says the security is ample. We are not discussing a mere matter of security. The Government of Canada has not become a loan company to lend money to every one who wants to borrow it, simply because the security may happen to be sufficient. That is not the purpose of a Government. If the loan is so good, if the security is so ample as the mem-

ber for Cardwell, following the statement of the hon. the Minister of Railways, wishes us to believe it is, how came it that no financial company in the world could be found to advance the money? How is it the security is not looked upon as good by financial men, who have money to invest, either on this or on the other side of the Atlantic?

Mr. HESSON. Yes, it is.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for North Perth says it is. I hope to hear his argument. I hope he will be able to show why it has been necessary for the Government to make the advance. I was a little surprised and somewhat grieved that the hon. member for Cardwell, occupying the prominent position he does in this House, and occupying a prominent position out of this House, as editor of a newspaper, should have taken the responsibility in the speech he made—a semi-official speech made, I take it, almost at the suggestion of the right hon. the First Minister himself—of stating, in the language he used, that the farmers of the North-West; those men who have gone in there to carve out homes for themselves, and who as we have heard through his paper and the other newspapers of the country, have been clamouring against the land regulations and the other grievances under which they have suffered for years past—I was sorry to hear him make the declaration that they were a spoon-fed lot, and had no grievances. Was that a well-weighed statement, or simply a haphazard statement which he now desires to withdraw? He compared their hardships with those of the pioneers of Ontario. I do not wish to decry the hardships which the pioneers of Ontario and the pioneers of the Maritime Provinces had to undergo. They had their hardships to undergo when they came to settle the country. But I fancy that if the hon. member for Cardwell were to leave his editorial sanctum and his seat in this House, and go to the North-West and there build his little shanty, and live there through the cold winter with the thermometer at times down to thirty degrees below zero, he would find it was not all plain sailing. There are hardships to-day in the North-West as there were years ago in Ontario, when Ontario was being settled. It would, indeed, be most surprising to me that those men who know what politics are, for many of them are emigrants from the older provinces of Canada—it would, indeed, seem to me most extraordinary that they would leave their work, at the busy season of the year, assemble in their thousands and proclaim that they had serious grievances which demanded redress, if they had none. Is that all sham? Does the hon. gentleman wish the House to believe that the large meetings held in the North-West during last autumn—the conventions representing 30,000 farmers there, in which their grievances were set forth—does he mean to state that is all moonshine? Does he mean to say that these men were only repeating the cry of the wolf when there was no wolf? I do not think he substantiated his bold assertion that there were no grievances in that country. Is it no grievance to them that the lands of that country were to a large extent locked up in colonization companies.

Mr. HESSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. member came from the colony I come from, he would think differently. He would find in the early history of that colony that it was locked up in colonization companies. That it was divided up into 67 townships, and those townships were owned by the favourites of the then Government of England. It was peopled by pioneers from the old country. He had better ask those people, some of whom I myself have seen driven out from their happy homes, and reduced almost to starvation, because they could not pay the rents these landowners exacted—he had better ask them if there is any hardship in introducing the old landlord system of England into this country. That is just what these colonization companies

Mr. DAVIES.

mean—the introduction of the landlord system, in one shape or another, into the North-West. It was a grievance to lock up so many acres of land, as was attempted to be done by the organization of these land companies.

Mr. HESSON. Will you answer a question?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman will, I am sure, have full time to speak, and this House will be only too glad to listen to him. I am answering the reckless statement made semi-officially by the hon. member for Cardwell, that the people of the North-West had no grievances to complain of. I have stated one. I will ask the hon. gentleman whether there was no grievance in locking up the mile belt from homestead and pre-emption along the line of the railway? I will ask him whether it was no grievance that the whole of the lands in Southern Manitoba were locked up from homestead and pre-emption? I will ask him whether the constant and ever-recurring changes in the land regulations of that country were no grievance—changes which were made so frequently and so often that no settler knew, and no pioneer knew, what land he could take, or what regulations he was serving under? Are these no grievances? The uncertainty produced by these frequent changes was one of the greatest grievances, and, last, not least, bad as the land laws themselves were, the administration of those laws was worse. Although we have not visited those lands ourselves, we know that those grievances exist. I have heard from numbers who have visited the North-West from the Province from which I come, and I know the statements I have made are well within the bounds of truth. It was unbelievable of the hon. gentleman to make the assertion he did in face of the fact that, almost at the time he was speaking, a deputation from those very farmers, representing 20,000 or 30,000 of them, was here interviewing the Prime Minister and asking that some of their grievances should be removed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If I may be allowed to interrupt the hon. gentleman for a moment, I would say that the hon. gentleman has entirely misrepresented what I said—unintentionally misrepresented, of course. I did not say that the farmers of the North-West had no grievances, but I said that they had the grievances incident to settlement in a new country, that they applied to both sides of the line, that they were not to be compared to the grievances of persons who settled in the old Provinces and the complaint I made was that, by the manner in which they were discussed, in relation to persons moving from the North-West Territories into Dakota, the impression was left that they were greater than prevailed in the States of the neighbouring republic.

Mr. DAVIES. Sir, the glossary the hon. gentleman has put upon his language is intended to minimize that language, but I am going to read what the hon. gentleman did say, as reported in the *Hansard*. The hon. gentleman, after referring to the grievances of the pioneers who settled in Ontario, said: "When you go to Ontario to-day and hear them tell the story of their settlement, one cannot but feel almost indignant that their sons should be grumbling because they have not a railway at their own doors and are not spoon-fed by the Government. The grievances in the North-West, what are they?"—and the hon. gentleman turned round and faced his party when he asked the question—"hon. gentlemen opposite have manufactured the most of them."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman imagine we manufacture things which exist, real grievances? Did we manufacture them out of nothing?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Had we the promulgation and formation of the land laws? Did we lock up the land belt? Did we prevent men from settling on the best land for pre-emption

and homestead? Did we form those colonization companies? Did we create one of the grievances under which the country has been suffering for the last three years? Not one; and the hon. gentleman knows it well. What member of the Opposition has gone out to incite the farmers of the North-West to rebel? Their meeting in convention and the statement of their grievances were spontaneous.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh!

Mr. DAVIES. Were they not? Then I say that the laugh of the hon. gentleman is a very bitter slur upon the intelligence and ability of the 20,000 men who were represented in that convention. And, mark you, the pioneers who go to settle in that new country are generally the very best men; a man who leaves his home in Ontario or in Prince Edward Island, or in the Maritime Provinces, with all its comforts, and goes out to face the North-West, is generally a plucky, stalwart man, and to say that 20,000 of these men can be led by the nose by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and induced to say that they have grievances when they have none, is to insult my intelligence and to insult their honesty. Now, I wish to make a few remarks upon the speech delivered in this House by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). He followed the hon. the leader of the Opposition in reply to his speech, and I think I may fairly say that he had no reason to make the complaint which was made by one of his profession in this House a short time ago, that he was called upon to speak to a subject without a brief. I think, Sir, the hon. member had been supplied with a remarkably extensive brief by those for whom he spoke—for whom he officially spoke. He did not scruple to say that he spoke on their behalf, and I have no hesitation in saying he had been supplied with an excellent brief. In one thing I can agree with him. I will join most heartily in the expression of hope which he used that the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government will live to enjoy health and strength when the North-West Territories are filled with a million people. I hope he will do so; but I hope he will do it as the leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and not in the position into which he stands to-day. What is the language which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company put in the mouth, as I understand it, of the hon. gentleman from Richmond and Wolfe? He comes here, Mr. Speaker, whining like a spoiled child—I can use no other language—whining that this scheme of theirs has gone astray, and that scheme has gone wrong, and something else has happened which ought not to have happened, and all because there are some naughty people in this House and some naughty rivals out of it, who will not do exactly what they want; because there are speculators on the New York market, who will not "bull" their stock when they want it "bulled," and will not "bear" it when they want it "beared," and they come here whining that the country of the North-West is being decried by every one, and that they have rivalry to endure which it is impossible for them to endure. What nonsense! They knew well, when they undertook this large contract and went into the stock markets of the world, that they had to encounter rivals as well as anyone else who goes there. They ought to have been prepared for it; and, if their schemes have gone wrong and have not turned out as they expected they would turn out, they have to thank not those who, they allege, were their rivals altogether, but they have to thank their own want of foresight, their own want of judgment, their inordinate greed, which forced them to go far outside the bounds of their contract, which induced them to go away beyond the bounds of the legitimate contract they entered into with this Parliament, and to indulge in speculation, which might have turned out well, but of which, having turned out badly, they have a right to take the results without coming

here whining about it. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman made a statement which I think he ought not to have made. He made the statement that the Opposition in this House had done what they could to prevent the sale of the stock. I venture the assertion that the hon. member cannot lay his finger upon one sentence used by any responsible leader of the party to which I belong in this House, from which the most violent opponent of the party could draw a deduction that this party had any desire or intention, or that it was their wish, to decry the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Was it by proclaiming in this House, as the party did proclaim, was it by re-echoing it in their press and proclaiming on every platform throughout the length and breadth of this country, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had made the grandest and most lucrative bargain that any company which ever existed in the world had ever made, that they decried their stock? Was it by telling the world that the contract was so grand, so magnificent, so wealth-producing, that, if carried out prudently, it would leave millions to the good in the exchequer of the Canadian Pacific Railway? If that was the way to decry their stock, I acknowledge the charge. I think any sensible man will say that the language used by the leader of the Opposition, by his supporters in this House, and by the press out of it, was language calculated to advance the monetary interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to send their stock up higher on the market, to lead foreigners to place confidence in the Company, and to breed hope and a belief in those who were going to invest their money that they would have a handsome return for that investment. If, as I said before, their stock has not gone up as they expected, if their schemes have not turned out as they thought they would, they have but themselves to thank, and their own greed. But more than that. When they introduced their scheme into this House it was pointed out to them—not by one hon. member, but by several—it was put on record by resolution emanating from this side of the House, that the very monopolies they were seeking would be the means of retarding the advancement and the prosperity of the great North-West, in which they were going to build their railway, and on whose prosperity their own was dependent. Sir, if they had come forward and given up the monopolies which they had claimed at the hands of this Parliament, and which they unfortunately received; if they had said that, having the richest country in the world, as it has been termed, and as I have no reason to disbelieve—the richest grain growing country in the world, that they were going to build their road into it, that that country was going to be opened for settlement on fair and reasonable terms, that the farmers who settled there would have a reasonable ground for believing that after growing their grain they could carry it to a fair market at reasonable rates—then, I say, they would have done much to build up the North-West, to put money in their own pockets, and to raise the value of their own stock. But they have chosen another course. They chose to hold on to their monopolies; and, Sir, because the result has not been as they expected, they have themselves to blame and not the Opposition in this House. If they had taken the advice tendered them by the leader of the Opposition, from time to time—and I am not going to state it in my own words, because it was put into much better language by that hon. gentleman sometime ago—if they had taken his advice one short year ago, and refrained from launching out into those enormous speculations which have been almost their ruin—I will not say their ruin because I have no right to say so, but their great loss—they would not have found themselves in their present position. If they had taken his advice, and confined themselves to the legitimate operations of the contract they made with this country, then, Sir, they would be in a position where their stock would command a better price in the market; they

would be in a position to go on with the contract without having to come to this Parliament and ask for more help. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) stated that the Opposition in this House have been magnifying the exodus from this country for the purpose of hurting the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not know why he made that statement. There is no occasion, I regret to say, for the Opposition to magnify the exodus from this county; it is too well known to every hon. member, whether he comes from the Maritime Provinces or from Quebec. That exodus is to be deplored, and, I think, Sir, that nobody can say that the Opposition have ever attempted to magnify it. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says—speaking, I presume, with authority—that three dire results would follow if this House did not vote in support of the Resolutions which the Minister of Railways has tabled. These results were: First, that the Company would stop their works for five years; secondly, that some 9,000 men would be thrown out of employment; thirdly, and what seemed uppermost in the hon. gentleman's mind, and which he desired to press most strongly upon the minds of his colleagues, that the Conservative party would lose prestige. Now, Sir, let us examine these three propositions which he has laid down somewhat in detail. He said the Company would stop work for five years. What authority had the hon. gentleman to make that statement? Sir, it was not in the contract. The hon. gentleman has put forward a statement opposed to that which was made by the hon. Minister of Railways, when he moved his Resolutions here. He told us, if I understood him aright, that the Company were quite prepared to go on with the contract and carry it out to the letter—quite prepared to carry it out within the time they agreed upon a year ago—quite prepared to do everything that they had contracted to do, but that they wanted simply to do it a little more hurriedly. And now the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe comes in as the mouth-piece of the Company, with a very different story, saying: If you do not give us the money we are going to stop work entirely for five years. Is that a statement calculated to advance the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the stock markets of the world—that they have no money to go on with it? Why, Sir, he could not have made a more damaging statement. No more damaging statement could have been made than the one he has made, that unless they get so many millions more the works are going to be stopped and 9,000 men thrown out of employment. That was not the language of the hon. Minister. What did he say? You will pardon me for reading a short extract:

"I wish the House to understand, at the very outset, that no change is proposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in regard to their contract. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, taking into account the property they own, the lands they possess, putting a more moderate estimate of value upon them than that of the hon. gentleman opposite, and one which I think the House will be prepared to concur in—putting the most moderate estimate on the value of their lands, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company feel that they are able to carry through the contract to completion without the alteration of a single letter."

That is the declaration made by the hon. Minister of Railways; and in the face of that declaration, Sir, his supporter comes in and tells us that so far from their being able to carry out their contract, these 9,000 men will strike employment to-morrow, and work will cease for five years, because the Company have no money to go on with it. How do they reconcile these statements, and which one are hon. members to believe, when they are called upon to vote for or against these Resolutions? But, Sir, I do not think the argument he used, that 9,000 men would be thrown out of employment, ought to have any weight in this House. Is this House to vote \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 to any cor-

Mr. DAVIES.

poration whatever, for fear that certain men might be thrown out of employment? If the vote cannot be justified on proper, on reasonable, on just grounds, in heaven's name do not justify it on this ground! Do not hold the threat over this House by telling us: If you do not vote the \$30,000,000 we will throw 9,000 men out of employment in the middle of the winter. It is an argument unbecoming those who speak in this House on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is an argument unworthy of them, I say, and one which ought not to have weight for a moment in the minds of those who have charge of the people's money. But, Sir, in his innocent guilelessness the hon. gentleman let out the true secret; the real reason why we are asked to vote this money is because the Conservative party will lose prestige if you do not vote it. Their pet contractors will fail; their contract will not be carried out; the magnificent promises the hon. Minister of Railways made us last year will not be realized; the predictions he made will be falsified; the Conservative party will be placed in the position of having told the people that certain things were going to come to pass which have not come to pass, and, therefore, they will lose prestige; and that is the reason why this House is asked to vote \$30,000,000 of the people's money in order to maintain the prestige of the Conservative party. Sir, that is not a very good reason for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, at any rate; and I fancy there are those on that side of the House, too, who have sufficient manliness and fidelity to the interests of their constituents, to require some more substantial reason for voting this money than that advanced by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. Now, Sir, when that hon. member made his statement and read from his brief, he was supposed to be replying to the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman has stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had, from time to time, made estimates of the cost of constructing this great work, so different was the one from the other that he felt it difficult to place reliance upon the estimate which they now submitted; and the hon. member turned round and denied that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had made different estimates. He said no estimates of the cost were ever made before by that Company; and he denied the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, the amusing statement, of an interview which took place between Mr. Van Horne, manager of the road, and a newspaper reporter in Montreal. While he denied it in one breath, he admitted it in the next. Mr. Van Horne, he said, never made the statement; and if he did make it, all he meant was that they had not time to make accurate estimates. You will observe, Sir, that he did not deny Mr. Van Horne's statement that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had no time to be bothered with estimates, they had a big job on hand, and were going to carry it through and get the money somehow. Oh, says the hon. gentleman, it is true that Mr. Van Horne said they had not time to make accurate estimates. We will take his own version: \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000, he says, do not amount to anything. Such a sum may not amount to anything to a company which deals in such vast sums as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company deals in, but \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 mean a good deal to my constituents, and I think they mean a good deal to the constituents of every hon. member. But I contend that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made estimates. I find in the Sessional Papers brought down last year, in the official memorandum to which I referred a short time ago, made on December 12th, 1882, and signed by George Stephen, President, that estimates were made by that Company of the cost of constructing the road. Those estimates were not carelessly made, but were made under the gravest responsibility under which they could be prepared; they were made to be scattered

broadcast over the world, so that those who examined them and had money to invest might obtain an accurate idea of the position and prospects of the Company. If ever there was a time when a gentleman issuing estimates should be careful and accurate, it was when he stood in the position which the President of that great corporation occupied when he issued his official manifesto inviting capitalists to invest money in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The President, in that document, went on to show what a good contract the Company had obtained, and the document I may say is ably drawn up. He shows there are millions in it for the Company—vast sums of money which the mind can hardly grasp. It goes on to say:

"The proceeds of the \$20,000,000 of land grant bonds, as sold, are deposited with the Government, which pays interest on such deposits at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum. These proceeds are paid to the Company in agreed mileage proportions (in the same manner as the Government cash subsidy) as construction progresses; and the balance of these proceeds and of the cash subsidy coming to the Company amounts to about \$31,500,000. It is believed that this sum, with the proceeds of the capital stock now remaining unissued (exclusive of \$10,000,000 of the stock which is to be reserved) will be amply sufficient for the complete construction and efficient equipment of the railway, and that 1,800,000 acres of land will be more than sufficient to extinguish the outstanding \$2,700,000 of land grant bonds."

Here is the President of the Company after presumably—for any other presumption would be an insult to him—consulting with his engineers, his managers and all those who had information upon the subject, proclaiming to the world that the sum of \$31,000,000 was sufficient, with the Government subsidy and the lands, to build the road and leave the Company 17,000,000 acres of land beside. I want to ask the hon. gentleman whether that was an estimate, or whether it was not, and whether he will withdraw the statement that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not put forward from time to time estimates differing so vastly from each other that an ordinary man, not acquainted with railway construction, is utterly incapable of reconciling them. I am for one, and I find there are many others in the same position. What is the President's estimate in that document? His estimate of the cost of the road, made as late as the 12th December, 1882, was that it was going to cost \$90,000,000. In the letter which the same gentleman addressed to the Grand Trunk, in May last, he refers to the same statement, and makes the same estimate, that the road can be built for \$90,000,000; and now he comes before this House and the people of the country and tells us that it can be built for \$22,000,000 less. I want to know if there is an independent member, one who really and honestly desires to vote on the question, after forming a correct and honest opinion as to whether the sum we are now called upon to vote will complete the work upon the road, who can come to this conclusion with the estimates differing to the extent of \$23,000,000, until he has the matter explained? I do not think he can. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) was said by a very high authority to have answered all the charges made by the leader of the Opposition. I hold that, in the hon. gentleman's speech from beginning to end, in the brief from which he read, every strong point made by the leader of the Opposition was passed by; no attempt was made to answer them. Trifling and incidental points were taken up, and the time was occupied in dealing with minor matters; the grave charges made by the leader of the Opposition remaining unanswered then, and remaining unanswered now. What answer was given to the charge made, that a telegram was sent by the President of the Company to England, the language of which, to say the least, was disingenuous and misleading. This House is entitled to know something about that telegram—is entitled to the fullest and most complete information with respect to the dealing of the Company when they come here asking further aid. No explanation of any kind was offered, and the charge, unless it is answered or explained, will seriously injure the Company in the

minds of those who look for straightforward, honest dealing in matters of this kind. I want to know why no explanation was made of the further charge that they had illegally paid out of capital, and in defiance of the Statute, 11 per cent. interest upon the money invested. That charge was made by an hon. gentleman who knew what he was talking about. He made it deliberately, with all the responsibility attaching to his position as leader of one of the two great parties. The charge, however, remains unanswered, and was not explained by the hon. member who followed the hon. leader of the Opposition. It remains unanswered now, and I suppose no answer will be vouchsafed. I merely mention it to call attention to the fact that a charge was made in the most direct language which the hon. gentleman is capable of using, and no attempt of any kind has been made to deny the charge, or give any explanation regarding it. I do not intend to say anything more with respect to the speeches of hon. members, nor do I intend to indulge in any historical review of the question; but I propose to call the attention of the House for a few moments to what strikes my mind, at all events, as strong and cogent reasons why the House should not commit itself to the proposition submitted without a fuller and more explicit explanation than we have had. Sir, what are we asked to do? We are asked to supplement the already princely dowry we have given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by an additional sum of \$30,000,000. To hear hon. gentlemen talk about millions, one would imagine that a million of dollars was nothing at all; they talk about millions as flipantly and toss them about as freely as a juggler tosses balls. One would suppose that this country was a mine of wealth, that its resources were practically inexhaustible, that there are no such things as taxes in this country, and that we can go on supplementing and subsidizing, year after year, to the extent of millions upon millions, without the people of this country suffering at all. But on what ground are we asked to listen to these new demands—what is the argument advanced? The only proposition put forward is that if you give them \$30,000,000, they will finish the road within the next two years. Well, Sir, if they do, they will only be doing what they have proclaimed to the world for the last two years it was their intention to do! When the President of that road issued his official memorandum, in 1882, to the stockholders, inviting them to take up the stock, what did he tell them? He told them that it was the intention to finish the road by the end of 1886, that they could do it, that they had made their calculations carefully, and that they were going to do it. We were told in the House that such was the great wealth, the great energy, and the pluck of these men that when they said this, when they took hold of a matter of this kind, they were sure to carry it out. The hon. member when he brought down his proposition, which at the time was received with applause by nearly all those who sit behind him, had not a line in which he could point to a guarantee that the road would be completed one day sooner than was mentioned in the original contract. Now, he gets up in reply to the hon. member for Cardwell—who made a mild suggestion, who hoped that some guarantee would be taken, or that something would be done, who wished no offence—the hon. Minister gets up and says that he is going to have some security. I would ask him what his security is? The House would like to be informed on that point. As I understand, the road itself and everything the Company own from Port Moody down to Montreal, is to be mortgaged, including the branch line to Portland. What additional security is he going to get? I say there is no security you can take, because if they go on for another two years and spend that \$30,000,000 on the road—as I have no doubt they will do, I do not wish to charge them with anything to the contrary—but if they go on, and if at

the end of that time the road is not finished you will be in this position: you cannot exact anything more from them beyond the mortgage, and the road is yours. You will have to come forward with a further supplement and further subsidies, or else take the road in your own hands. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that this subsidy has been asked, not in the interest of the Company. The hon. Minister of Railways says, I do not ask this in the interest of the Company. In whose interests then? He says in the interests of the country. Was there a demand made by any part of this country that this Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be subsidized still further? Has Parliament ever made that demand? Has any Province of this Dominion ever asked it? Have the newspapers voiced the opinions of any portion of the people of this country in favour of it? Has there been a public meeting held in Canada asking that this money should be voted? Not one. Where did the demand come from? It came from those who wanted the money, and not from the people of this country who pay the money, and it is not in the interests of the people that it should be given. The demand has been made in the interests of the Company and the Company alone. Why, Sir, should the people of this country burden themselves with this additional \$30,000,000 of money? Is it such a great advantage to have that road built, or to have the promise that it shall be built, within two years? I think not. We have already the road built so as to give us access into the prairie land, and reaching to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. Immigrants can now come from the old country, take the cars at Montreal go on—I was going to say to Algoma Mills, but I believe that route is to be abandoned, and they are to be carried around to Owen Sound, south of Georgian Bay, thence through to Thunder Bay where they will tap the railway, and go in and spread through the prairie country. I say we have that great highway now opening up the prairie lands of the North-West to be peopled; and while building it across the Rocky Mountains and north of Lake Superior may be a good thing in itself, it is not such a good thing, and is not so absolutely essential and desirable, that the people of this country should run in debt to the extent of \$30,000,000 at this time, in order to secure that boon within two years. The advantages of opening up the prairie country I can appreciate. I can understand what a great boon it will be to this country to be able to carry in thousands of immigrants to settle those lands and become taxpayers, and grow the large quantities of grain which that country is capable of producing; but I cannot understand that there is any vital importance in building the road through the Rocky Mountains, when it is a very doubtful question whether we will take any large share of the eastern trade over that line. It is a fine thing to talk about this transcontinental railway from ocean to ocean, but when you pay \$30,000,000 extra for the promise of having it done two or three years previous to the time in which the Company are bound to do it, then it becomes a very serious question. The hon. Minister says that this contract is to stand without any alteration. He emphasises that point. He repeated the statement in very eloquent language, not once or twice, but at least five or six times, that no alteration is to be made in the contract, but that it is to remain just as it was signed. For what does the hon. gentleman take us? There is hardly a term in the contract which he has not altered. The very manner in which the payments for the work are to be made, has been entirely altered by him. But the hon. gentleman says that is nothing at all; here is his language:

"It is proposed to postpone the payment of that guarantee for five years, and to loan the Company \$21,500,000, to be repaid on the first day of May, 1891. The conditions of that advance may briefly be stated as follows:—In the first place, it is proposed that in future the payment for work done shall be placed upon a different basis from that which

Mr. DAVIES.

was contained in the contract. That is not a real, but simply a nominal change in the terms of the contract."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. We will see directly how nominal it is. He goes on to explain the contract:

"When the contract was made, it was provided that, upon the completion of every 20 miles, the Company should receive payment, according to the terms of the contract, on the 20 miles completed; but it is now found that, owing to the character of the work which remains to be done, it would be impossible, with any justice to the Company or to the Government, to carry on that mode of payment. Take the country north of Lake Superior, the whole distance, until you come to the 95 miles of enormously heavy work, and if you paid them *pro rata* according to the contract for the number of miles done, you would not have left the money that would be required to perform the work on the 95 miles where it is inordinately heavy. So, in the Rocky Mountains, the 30 miles that is comparatively easy would not bear any proportion to the other work that remained to be done; and it is only proposed to make a change that is based upon the principle upon which payments are made by the Government. In relation to almost all the other contracts—I think I may say to all the other contracts, on the canals, on railways, and on everything of the kind—the principle is to pay for the amount of work done."

Now, Sir, there are two reasons given by the hon. Minister for the change. One is, that it is the method adopted in relation to all other contracts, and should be adopted here; and the other is that if the Company were paid *pro rata* for the number of miles done, they would not have enough money left to do the balance of the work on the ninety-five miles. These are the two reasons—let us examine them both. If that was the provision in all other contracts, why did the hon. gentleman not put it into the original contract before the Company commenced the work on the prairie section? The hon. gentleman knows why—it was not in the interest of the Company that it should be put in. But when the prairie work is completed, and the Company has entered on the hard work, it becomes in their interest that the method should be changed, and he changes it. The second reason the hon. gentleman answers himself. He says that the Company have commenced the ninety-five miles, and unless we change the mode of payment, we have no guarantee that that work will be done. What! no guarantee from these wealthy men who have taken hold of this great enterprise—no guarantee that they will carry it out? I thought we had the guarantee of their names, of their respectability, and of their great wealth; the guarantee of the \$1,000,000 which they deposited in the hands of the Government, and which the hon. Minister says is going to be given up—had we not that guarantee? But apart from that, the hon. gentleman answers his own argument; because, in the same speech, almost in the same breath, he says that the only reason for changing the mode of payment is that unless we change it we have no guarantee that the ninety-five miles will be finished. He states that 9,000 men are engaged in this part of the work, and that the Company are concentrating their efforts upon it. Why, Sir, they are at work now, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, and we want no more guarantee that they will do it. They have already performed, as I read the hon. gentleman's statement, 121 miles of the lighter work on the Lake Superior section, and they have been paid for that. At what rate have they been paid? They have been paid for the light work first, and paid in advance for the heavy work; and now, having paid them in advance, the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt the new mode just as they come to the 95 miles of heavy work, so that they may be paid in full for every mile of the 95 miles, after having been partially paid for it in advance. Then the hon. gentleman said: Oh, we intend to give up the \$1,000,000 deposit—that is a mere nominal thing, too. What does that mean? It means that this country is giving the Company \$31,000,000 instead of \$30,000,000. I remember, Sir, when the contract for the construction of this road was entered into, what an amount of talk there was about the \$1,000,000 deposit in the Government exchequer, as a guarantee for the completion

of the road. Now, that deposit is to be given up, in addition to the \$22,500,000. And while we give the Company all these concessions, what do the Company give the country? What are they asked to give? Nothing. Are they asked to surrender one of the monopolies, one of the privileges, one of the exemptions granted to them by their charter? Does the hon. gentleman ask them to surrender one of them? Not one, Sir—catch him! The Company and he are too good friends for that; he gives up everything to them that they ask, while they are to give nothing in return. The pledge comes from the hon. gentleman that, forsooth, they will alter their policy of monopoly after the road is completed, and permit other roads to be built in Manitoba. That is all that we get, and that could be obtained in a much speedier way by hon. gentlemen on this side being put in the place of hon. gentlemen opposite, for that is the policy they would adopt at once. This was a grand opportunity for the hon. gentleman to retrieve the gross blunders his Government committed when they invested that Company with all the marvellous monopolies and exemptions which have proved to be a curse in every country where they have existed heretofore, and I am quite sure will not prove to be an exception in the North-West. Now, Sir, there was a portion of the speech made by the hon. Minister of Railways which disappointed me, as a Maritime Province representative, very much indeed—a passage which I had not expected to come from that hon. gentleman. I had listened to him years ago, when he was declaring to the people of the Maritime Provinces what a glorious thing this contract was to be—how Halifax was to be the *entrepot* for all the trade of the west, and the winter port for all the grain and the other products grown on those western prairies—how the wharves were to be lined with shipping, and thousands of masts were to fill the harbour—oh, what an era of prosperity was to come when the road was once finished! He told them that the Government were not constructing this road on narrow commercial principles alone, but that higher principles actuated them—it was to be a national road; not an inch of it was to touch the detested Yankee soil—they would have all the benefits which were to flow from its construction—and some seaport in Canada was to be the outport for shipping the products of all that great country. What does the hon. gentleman say to-day? Does he tell the people of the Maritime Provinces that they are to have a Maritime Province port? No, Sir; but the hon. gentleman, forgetting all he has said about a Canadian seaport, not only justifies but approves of the policy of carrying the trade of the North-West to an American port, and of building up Portland at our expense. I do not want to misrepresent the hon. gentleman on this important point, and I will repeat his eloquent language—for it was eloquent, as nearly all his language is, dealt in superlatives as nearly all his speeches do, was very pleasant to listen to, as all his speeches are, but very inconsistent, as many of his speeches are. The hon. gentleman said:

“It (the contract) provides for the extension to the seaboard” —

I pricked up my ears at this. I wanted to know which what was to be the favoured port now, St. John or Halifax. I knew that the Government must fix upon one or the other; and this is what I heard:

“It provides for an extension to the seaboard, and the expenditure in connection with the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, the South-Eastern and the Atlantic and North-Western are for purchase of the bonds of those roads, and are, of course, a good asset held by them for the purpose of reaching the Atlantic seaboard from Montreal. The acquisition of the Atlantic and North-Western charter, and the expenditure under that charter of a considerable sum of money in connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Grand Trunk Railway by a line around the mountain at Montreal, is, of course, embraced within their charter. The expenditure to secure a controlling interest in the South-Eastern Railway was, of course, for the purpose of enabling them to place themselves in a position to draw traffic to the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the Atlantic seaboard, whether at New York, or Boston, or Portland.”

The hon. gentleman did not say anything about the other side of the question, that it was for the purpose of enabling them by the speediest and shortest route to reach the seaboard and make an American port the *entrepot* of the western trade, to carry along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to ship from an American port the products of that great western country which he is opening up, although he promised so frequently this trade should go through British territory, and through a British port. He continued:

“We, looking at it from the Maritime Provinces, are extremely anxious that they should go to a Canadian port.”

Why did not the hon. member give expression to his anxiety in some tangible shape? What do we value it at when it is merely a lip assurance in this House, when he does not put it in the contract, now that he has power to do so? If the hon. gentleman had taken the ground that this was a commercial road which should be built on commercial principles alone, that the Company had the right, and it was our interest to carry the produce by the speediest route to market, he then could have justified his policy—for that is his policy now—of having the seaport for the exportation of the produce of the west in the United States. But he did not do so. He built the line around the north of Lake Superior, not because, from a commercial point of view, it was the shortest or the best and the speediest, but because he wanted a line on British territory. He made it much longer than it need have been, on the ground that it must be a through Canadian line. Why does he not apply this principle when he comes down to the Maritime Provinces? If commercial principles are to be abandoned, as far as the west is concerned, why are they not abandoned when the east is concerned? If the line is to be built on national, as antagonistic to commercial, principles, I ask that the same principle be applied to the eastern section of the country, as well as the western. Now that the Company are on their knees asking the tax-payers of this county for \$30,000,000 more, let the Government say to them: Yes, if you are to have it, you must give up your monopolies, your other privileges which you obtained in the first instance, and which are found to be oppressive, and you must put your winter outport, not in American but in British territory; give us the advantages to be reaped from your trade, and do not carry your trade to a foreign country! If the hon. Minister would do that, he might expect the support, not only of his own side of the House, but of a large number of people in this country, who, I am satisfied, would be opposed to the scheme as it at present stands. I was sorry to see him treat almost with ridicule—for that is practically what he did—the claim of the Maritime seaports to be the winter port of the Dominion. He talked about St. John, Halifax, St. Andrews, Louisburg, I think it was, and Quebec. But the hon. gentleman knows well he cannot have four or five winter ports. He knows very well that there can be only one winter port, and that the real terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway is Liverpool. No man knows better than he that it is as important to have cheap rates to Liverpool from our winter port, wherever it may be, as it is to have cheap rates from the west to the winter port; and he knows well he can have only cheap rates by concentrating the shipping in one place. If you diffuse the shipping over half a dozen ports, the result will be high rates, while concentrated in one port the contrary will result; as in New York, for instance, where, at times, there is a great plethora of shipping, grain will be carried for almost nothing. It is the duty of the hon. gentleman, as a responsible Minister of the Crown, to fix on a port, to declare it in his contract, and to tell this House what port he has selected. His decision, it is true, might not satisfy every section of the country, but with that we have nothing to do. It would satisfy the people, as a whole, that he had chosen the best port, and by so doing he will have carried out some of his

promises, whereas now he has not carried out any. The result will be that we will be the sufferers, and the American people will be the gainers. I wish to say one word more before I conclude with respect to a question which I consider of very great importance to this House and the country, that is the question whether or not this is a final proposition. When the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was entered into, some years ago, it was argued strongly by hon. gentlemen opposite, as a good reason for entering into it, that the proposition was one which would rid us once and for all of all responsibility. I will read but one statement which came officially from a member of the Government in answer to a complaint of the leader of the Opposition that he feared very much, from reading that contract, that the \$25,000,000 was not the last money we would be called on to vote. I fear, said in substance, the leader of the Opposition, that this country and Parliament will be called on at no distant day to supplement that \$25,000,000 by further grants. He was ridiculed by hon. members opposite, and the hon. Minister of Public Works rose in his place to reply on that very point. He told the House there was no ground for the complaint of the leader of the Opposition, but that, on the contrary, if there was one thing that recommended this scheme to his mind, and ought to recommend it to the minds of the people, it was that it was a final scheme. Once for all, he said, the people will get rid of the constantly recurring demands which are being made upon them for money to build this great enterprise. I had better read the hon. gentleman's own language. On the 17th of December, 1880, he said, in reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition, who was complaining of this 'want of finality :

"What does the hon. gentleman want? Does he want to drive a hard bargain with those hon. gentlemen? (Those gentlemen were the Syndicate.) What reason would there be in attempting to cut them down to as small a figure as possible, in order to make the Company a poor Company? It is to our interest, and the interest of the Company, that the Company should be able to construct the railway, and to work it afterwards, so that they should not come back to us year after year and ask us for new terms."

There was the reason given by the hon. gentleman speaking officially in 1880. I grant you, he says, we are giving them enormous subsidies; I grant you we are giving them a princely dowry, but we are doing it so that it shall be final, and they shall not come back and ask for more. Where are we now? Two or three short years have gone by, and the same gentlemen are coming back and knocking at our exchequer doors and asking for thirty millions more. Where is the Minister of Public Works? What position is he going to take on this new demand? He is going to back it up. As a member of the Government he is going to support it, and to vote for it, and to ask his friends to vote for it, and to use all the power he possesses in this House to induce hon. members to vote for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very likely.

Mr. DAVIES. I should think it was a certainty, or he would not remain a member of the Government that brought down the proposition. But the position he takes to-day is very strange in view of the position he took three short years ago, when he sought to make the people of this country swallow these enormous subsidies. I will read on:

"We want, once for all, to settle the whole question, so as to say to the Company: 'This is the settlement, you build that railway for that amount of money and land, and work it, and we must have a guarantee for the working of it for the first ten years.'"

The Minister of Railways says that guarantee is a mere nominal thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He does not hear you.

Mr. DAVIES. If he does not hear me, I hope other hon. members will hear me.

Mr. DAVIES.

"a guarantee for the working of it for the first ten years, after the building of the road, because, if you work that road for ten years, we may be sure that you will work it afterwards, as there will, by that time, be population enough in the country to secure a profitable trade for the road. More than that, I say that Parliament and the Government must show the Company that they are not our enemies, but that they are the friends of the country; and that we must treat them in the best way possible, taking into consideration the interest of the country at large. If we starve them now by giving them a small subsidy in land and money, and then tax them after they have built their road, the result will be that they will come back to us afterwards and say: 'We cannot go on. We do not want that; we want a strong company that will be a credit to the country, and be competent to carry forward that great national work, the Pacific Railway.'"

Further on he says, in the same speech, about twenty lines further on:

"We expect that our country, which is great in many ways, will be as great in certain respects as the United States; and we want a great and good railway, and also to put it on a proper footing, so as to prevent its owners coming back to us and saying: 'You starve us to death, and we want more money.'"

Here is the refrain running through all his speech: I grant you we are giving them immense amounts of money, but we are doing it on the principle that it is final, once and for all, and they must never come back. And I fancy, if the hon. gentleman had been asked then, what will you do if they come back, how indignantly he would have exclaimed: "I would not give them another cent; I would not listen to any further demands." The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) said, in answer to that, "We have the guarantee," and the Minister of Public Works said; "We have the guarantee, no doubt; but, perhaps, the hon. gentleman would prefer to see them come to ask for better terms. I am not of that opinion, nor is the Government." He was not of that opinion then; what is he now? where is he now, Sir?

Mr. BÉCHARD. He has changed his mind.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, he has changed his mind; and so have all the members of the Government changed their minds, and they ask the country and they ask their supporters to change their minds, and to make another raid upon the Treasury of this country to the tune of \$31,000,000. Well, Sir, let us see whether we have any guarantee whatever that this is to be final. I say we have no guarantee, and I argue it in this way: I see by the statement I read from the Company's official document, put forth in December, 1882, that they there stated that the road could be built from Montreal to Port Moody for the subsidy of \$25,000,000, the land grant bonds of \$20,000,000, and the proceeds of \$90,000,000 of Canadian Pacific Railway bonds at 60 per cent., or \$54,000,000, making in all \$99,000,000. In April, 1883, Mr. Stephen writes to the Grand Trunk Railway directors: "In other words, taking the \$90,000,000 of share capital at the issue price of 60 per cent., the actual cash cost of the 3,544 miles of railway and 17,000,000 of acres of land to the shareholders will be \$54,000,000,"—the result of the sale of the bonds at 60 per cent., \$25,000,000 of subsidy, and \$20,000,000 of land grant bonds. So we have there two distinct statements made by him at distinct times, one to his own shareholders, when asking them to invest, one to the Grand Trunk Railway, in both of which he declares that the cost of the road would be \$99,000,000, and now we have a statement which he made public the other day, I think it is dated February the 5th, laid upon the Table of the House here in the Returns, in which he makes the following estimate:—Instead of costing \$99,000,000, they have already expended, he says, \$58,695,000, and the cost of completion will not exceed \$27,000,000, making altogether \$85,000,000 odd. Now, there is a discrepancy of \$13,000,000 between the estimate made by Mr. Stephen, in December, 1882, and repeated by him, in April, 1883, and his estimate made now, when he considers it desirable to ask us for more money. Which statement are we to accept? Which is

correct? The hon. the Minister of Railways stated that he had an additional guarantee of the accuracy of this statement from the report of his subordinate, Mr. Schreiber; but, when he was pressed upon the point, he was compelled to acknowledge that Mr. Schreiber's report was not based upon any data, that there had been no actual survey made of the line, that it was a mere acceptance by Mr. Schreiber of the statement made by the Canadian Pacific Railway gentlemen themselves, to which no weight can be attached. But that \$13,000,000 does not represent the discrepancy between the two estimates. Why? Because, in that last estimate of \$85,000,000, which is \$13,000,000 less than the first estimate, there are two items contained which are not in his estimate of \$90,000,000 at all—one of \$3,500,000 spent in acquiring the line to the seaboard at Portland, and the other of \$6,000,000 out of the \$8,710,240 which they have deposited with the Government as security for the interest on the bonds. Neither of these two items, making together \$9,500,000, was embraced in their first estimate at all. So the House stands to-day in this position, that Mr. Stephen now, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company now, estimate the cost of the construction of that road, when they are applying to us for relief and for money, at \$77,000,000 of money, whereas a year ago they estimated the cost of the same road at \$99,000,000. There is a discrepancy of \$22,000,000. I can never satisfy my mind that there can be any finality in this measure with that discrepancy existing. I have no doubt in my own mind—I may be wrong, but I form my conclusions from what I have stated to the House, and it seems to me the argument is a good one—I have not the shadow of a doubt that, before two years roll over the head of the people of this country, an application will be made here to advance that \$22,000,000 additional. What position will you be in then? You will have to grant it. Every argument that can be used now in favour of this proposal will be used with ten-fold effect then. Talk about 10,000 men out of employment. They can put 19,000 men on for a time, while the proposition is being made, and threaten to turn them out, threaten that the work cannot go on. The grand speech the Minister of Railways made, the appeal to our patriotism and so on, can be made then. Those who opposed it will be denounced in the very same language—as decrying their country, as having no patriotism, simply because, Sir, on reasonable and fair grounds, they refuse to vote away \$30,000,000 of the people's money until they have some better reasons advanced for it than those put forward during this debate. Now, Sir, there is one other statement of the hon. Minister of Railways which I would like to deal with. That hon. gentleman stated, and he made it a very strong ground of appeal to this House, that the Company had already expended out of their own funds over \$23,000,000 on the contracted line. The statement, Sir, if true, is a very strong argument in favour of the position which the hon. gentleman assumes—that they had expended \$23,000,000 of their own money. I have the hon. gentleman's language here, and I would like to read a few words. He says:

“On the main line between Callander and Port Moody—on the eastern and central sections—with improvements made on the Government line west of Cross Lake, the expenditures have been as follows—

And he gives the items, making in all a total expenditure on the main line of the contract of \$45,539,304. And he goes on to say:

“Now, Sir, of cash received from Government sources there was—  
And he gives the items, making in all \$21,795,999.

“showing an excess of expenditure on the main line made by the Company over all they have received from Government sources, of no less than \$23,743,305. Under these circumstances it will hardly be said again by any intelligent man that they have taken the money that they have received from the Government under their contract, and put it into outside operations.”

31

I wish to tell the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, that “these circumstances” do not exist; that the statement is not a fair statement of the facts; and, I think, I will be able to show it in one moment. Now, Sir, let us analyse for one moment the statement made by the hon. Minister showing a total expenditure of \$58,000,000, and showing the startling figures that they had expended on their main line out of their own pockets, \$23,743,000. I say that statement is not a correct one when you come to analyse the figures. I say it is not correct, Sir, because that statement includes the following payments, which have nothing whatever to do, directly, with the contract they made with this country. It includes, in the first place, the Credit Valley Railway bonds, \$485,000. The hon. gentlemen will not contend that that is part of the original contract, or that it has anything to do with the original contract, or that it is part of the main line, as I hear an hon. gentleman suggest on the other side. Then there was \$600,000 embraced in it which they have advanced to the Canada and North-West Land Company, or spent in sustaining the stock of the Canada North-West Land Company. I say that is no part of the bargain we made with this Company. Then there was the South-Eastern Railway, \$1,582,000; the Atlantic and North-Western Railway Company, \$157,000; the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company, \$70,000; and the steamers, \$552,000 making a total on that western branch of the line, of money spent by them outside their contract with us, and which the hon. Minister has embraced as within the contract, of \$3,446,000. Now, Sir, come down further eastward. On the line from Montreal Callander and Brockville they spent \$3,270,000. That was not in the original contract. The rolling stock, shops, materials, &c., for this line between Montreal and Brockville and Callander, \$2,140,000; on the Algoma branch and the Western Division branch, \$3,760,000, making a total of \$9,170,000 on that part of the road. Not one of these sums was within the contract they made with us, and still the hon. Minister embraces them in his calculation. Then, Sir, there is the advance which they made to secure the guarantee by the Government for the payment of interest on their bonds, for the next ten years, \$8,710,000. Then there is an item of \$460,000 for fuel, which surely ought to be charged to running expenses and not to capital expenditure. There is a general stores item of \$844,000; advances to carriers, \$473,000, making a total of \$10,487,000. Then there is the floating debt which we provide and pay, and which the hon. Minister included in the sum which they had expended, provided for by them. Why, Sir, we are asked to take it out of the Treasury and pay it now, ourselves. They did not provide it, except in the most limited and technical sense; substantially we provide it for the railway to pay. The hon. Minister has also included the advance to the contracting company of \$600,000. Now, Sir, is there an item I have read to this House which can be properly charged as expenditure, which should be included on the expenditure of the line they contracted to build? Not one dollar. That makes a total of \$31,203,000. Deduct that from the \$58,700,000 which they say they spent—and I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of their figures in that respect—and the actual expenditure on the line they contracted with this company to build is only \$27,597,000, including the interest—as my hon. friend reminds me they have paid it on their stock. Now, Sir, of that \$27,500,000 how much have they received from us? They have received, in subsidies, \$12,300,000; they have received in land grant bonds, \$9,200,000, although I see that it is about \$100,000 more than they give credit for, which \$100,000 are in the hands of the Government. For bonuses, \$250,000; for town sites, \$480,000; so, Sir, of the \$27,500,000 which they have spent on the

line they have contracted to build, they have received \$22,230,000 from this Government, and from this country—leaving what, as put in by themselves—leaving the sum of only \$5,000,000, the original amount of their stock put into this great enterprise by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, so far as it relates to the line they contracted with this country to build. So, Sir, I say that, instead of having put in \$23,000,000 of their own money, as the hon. Minister stated, they have put in but the \$5,000,000 of stock they have subscribed, and not a dollar more. I say that the argument upon which he based his statement, that because they had put in so much of their own money, no further charge should ever be made that they had applied Government moneys to outside projects, and that, therefore, no further opposition should be made to the scheme, I say, so far as that argument was based upon these figures, it is a fallacious one, without any foundation whatever. But my strongest argument against the proposition is, that it is not a finality. It was said that the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the interest of the country were so bound up together that the two were like man and wife. Sir, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not Canada's bride yet. The bans were published once, and when they were published we gave her a dowry greater than any princess ever received from mortal man. The bans are being published now a second time, and we supplement the magnificent dowry with \$30,000,000 more. When are the bans going to be published the third time? I wonder when they are so published, if any further demand will be made. Will they ask, in the historical terms, send me another \$10,000; or will it be, send me another \$10,000,000? This Company does not deal in thousands, it does not think in thousands; as their manager says, one or two millions more or less is nothing to them in an estimate. A demand will come, "Give me another \$10,000,000;" and when it comes, I will venture to predict that it will come with greater, more irresistible force and supported by stronger arguments than those which have been advanced in favour of this proposal. I oppose this present scheme, therefore, because of the want of information justifying the House in voting \$30,000,000. I oppose it because, to my mind, it has been proved demonstratively by my leader that a prudent expenditure of the means within their grasp would have enabled them to carry out this contract without asking Canada to expend another dollar. I oppose it because, to my mind, it presents no element of finality, and because, I believe, that before another two years have passed over our heads, we will be asked to add to our present endowment another \$30,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the House will fully appreciate the difficult circumstances which surround me in attempting to speak upon this question. I think I feel as deeply as any hon. member opposite feels the importance of this question, the importance of the issues which are involved, and of the consequences which will result from our decision. I also feel that the subject presented to us is, in its main points, exceedingly simple; its salient points are but few, and these have been so thoroughly discussed by the strongest minds in this House, on both sides of it—and that is a compliment to the hon. member who has just sat down, which I am glad to make—that it leaves me very little chance with the exception of going over most of the ground which has been travelled before. We had, in the first place, the very lucid and very strong statement by the Minister of Railways dealing with this whole matter. Following him, we had an equally strong and equally long statement by the hon. leader of the Opposition, placing his side of the question before the House. Then, Sir, he was followed by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who in a temperate, well digested and lengthy speech, in which

Mr. DAVIES.

I thought I detected something of a malicious spirit as if he intended to dig into all sides of this question and thoroughly exhaust every possible calculation so as to try the ingenuity of those who might be so unfortunate as to come after him. When that hon. gentleman concluded the House was treated to a speech on this question by another hon. member who, in his clever, striking and rollicking way, finding there was not much to hit in the question itself, struck right and left as each idea seemed to come out of the experience or incidents of the past. Then we had a comparatively short but remarkably able and patriotic speech by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who dealt with the question not only to the amusement and interest of the House, but also to the edification of the country. I must not omit to state that the hon. gentleman was followed by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), who with his massive figures and logical presentation of facts made that same remarkable impression upon the House which he almost always makes upon it when he addresses it, and contributed his quota to the elucidation of this great subject. Then the House was treated to an hour or two hours disquisition by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), not King's, New Brunswick, but King's, Nova Scotia, for whom I have somewhat of a fellow feeling, because we represent constituencies of the same name if not exactly of the same character. That hon. member laid the heavy hand of contribution upon all history, modern and profane, upon philosophy, moral and otherwise, and exhausted the poets, both sacred, ancient and modern. And now, Sir, we have listened to the elaborate and vigorous and strongly put, if not altogether argumentative and pertinent arguments of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). Sir, I was a little amused, I am still a little amused; he began by complaining very much that other hon. members had not the remarkable power of concentration which he always exhibits, of omitting all outside issues and centralising his great power and strong reasoning upon the only issue before the House and the country. He complained very much that some other hon. members had taken up the time of the House in speaking a long time on topics outside of the point at issue; and yet by the clock which faces me he spent one hour and five minutes before he came to the point at all, when he announced that he was going to give strong and cogent reasons why this proposal should not be looked upon with favour by the House. Sir, the hon. gentleman had fault to find with the hon. member for King's, N.S., because he commenced at Jerusalem and ended at Longfellow's "Ship of State." I could not help feeling, before the hon. gentlemen had spent an hour or an hour and a quarter in getting to the point, that it was better to begin at Jerusalem and end at the "Ship of State," than to begin nowhere and end at the same place. The hon. gentleman started out with a very vigorous attack upon the malignity displayed by this side of the House, and then with remarkable truthfulness he turned round to his own side of the House and administered to it a full slap on the forehead when he pronounced that malignity a reciprocal malignity. We do not talk of reciprocity between members of the same family; we talk of reciprocity as a means of communication between members of different families and different nations; consequently, if this malignity which he declares has been shown by hon. members on this side of the House is reciprocal malignity, his own side, by his own admission, must have as large a share as we have. The hon. gentleman talked a little while about Conservative want of patriotism, and then in a very dark and mysterious but remarkably knowing way he hinted that if the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) only wished he could give the House very interesting information as to some very dark and tricky ways of which he had had experience while a member of the Conservative

party. Well, that is characteristic, we know. You will always find when a man has not facts at hand and arguments which he can produce, he will always say that if he desired he could produce them, and if they were necessary they could be brought forth. Why did not the hon. gentleman in that long review of all pic-nics which had taken place from the western coast of British Columbia to the furthest point of Cape Breton, give a single quotation from these speeches of my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) in which were uttered those damaging and damning statements with respect to this country, thereby displaying a terrible lack of patriotism? It is all very well to say, in general terms, that such and such a thing could have been done, or has been done. I have often had a man come to me and make a great, big, large, general assertion; but the only thing which was necessary to quiet and cow such a man was to take him by the button hole and say: "Sir, I want the bill of particulars," and you had him quite cowed when you made that demand. It is easy to deal in general assertions; any person can do that, but it is a difficult thing to bring things specifically to a point. There are not many men, comparatively, who can do it, and I am inclined to think my hon. friend from Queen's, P. M. I. (Mr. Davies) falls amongst the latter category. The hon. gentleman begged the indulgence of the House for reading from *Hansard*. I was glad that he did read from *Hansard*, and I do not think he had any reason for begging pardon from members of this House for doing so; in fact I came to the conclusion that if the larger portion of his speech had consisted of quotations from *Hansard*, it would have contributed quite as much to the edification of this House and very much more to his own reputation than it did. The hon. gentleman delighted in representing the Syndicate, or the Railway Company, as being on their knees before this House and before the country. Sir, that is not an honest way of putting the matter; it is not an ingenuous way of placing it. I do not know of any set of men who are on their knees abjectly begging before this Parliament. Let us take a parallel case. Let us suppose that the hon. gentleman who sits in his seat before me, smiling so complacently, should engage a contractor to build his house, that the contractor had started upon the house, that he had made his plans and calculations for raising the money, but found when the house was three-fourths completed, that his plans had, somehow or other, not turned out as he anticipated. Suppose he came to the hon. gentleman and said: "Sir, you see the amount of material I have; the amount of property I possess; I want an advance of money from you, as a loan, of so many thousand dollars. I have property good and realizable to the extent of five times the amount, and, if you will give me that loan I will finish the contract in two months instead of eight, and I will pay you a percentage on your money as large as you can get elsewhere." Would the hon. gentleman be justified in stating to his neighbour that this contractor was down on his knees, before him, asking for money? I think not, and I take it that this is an exactly similar or nearly similar case in point. The hon. gentleman delights in representing this amount as a drain upon the Treasury, and not having the fate of many hon. gentlemen on his side of the House in his eyes, he indulges in precise prophecies. Sir, the preciseness of Vennor's prophecies amounts to nothing beside his; Wiggins snow storm fame has no chance to light a candle beside the hon. member for Queen's, comparing the preciseness, the earnestness and the certainty with which they respectively predict. And he is equally precise as to the time; he does not leave himself much of a margin. He does not say, at some future time, or in a number of years, but in two years. In two years he says the Company will be, where? They will be here; they will not be importuning the Government somewhere else, but

before this House, this Parliament, and for what? Asking them for a sum of money. And with what delightful precision the hon. gentleman states that sum of money; it will be exactly twenty-two and a half millions, not a dollar less or a dollar more. Now, Sir, let me hold up before the eyes of the gentlemen present, this prophecy. Let me ask my hon. friend from Queen's, especially, to jot it down in his note book, for fear he may forget, and if he and I live just two years from this 12th day of February, 1884, we will meet some place, and compare notes with reference to this prophecy. If I am not greatly mistaken, if I had a reputation to lose, I would not care to risk it in such a reckless way as the hon. gentleman has risked his reputation to-day. The hon. gentleman, like two or three others before me, attacked my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), on a point on which my hon. friend's words probably led him to be misunderstood as conveying an idea which he did not wish to convey. It was this: that the Conservative party would lose their prestige, or, in other words, that it would be bad for the Conservative party if these Resolutions were not carried, and that, therefore, the Conservative party must vote for them, not because it was good and necessary for the country, but because it was good and necessary for the Conservative party, and thus party considerations were placed above patriotic considerations. Sir, that, I apprehend, was not the intention of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. What he meant to say was this: that the Conservative party in this railway policy had a record which had gone before the country, and that record should not be falsified by their not carrying out, to the very letter, the idea with which they started, and with which they went before the people. What was that policy? The policy of the Liberal Conservative party has been: a railway, a railway on Canadian territory, a railway completed just as quickly as it possibly can be completed. In pursuance of that policy, in 1880 and 1881, they made a contract with the Syndicate which bound them to build the road by 1891. Sir, the Conservative party went to the country largely on that question, they relied on these terms and conditions, and the country took them at their word, and sent them back here with a majority of seventy to carry out that idea. I say that we have an honourable and honest right to state, that the Conservative party has a policy and a record in this respect—a policy in favour of building this trans-continental line of railway as soon as it possibly can be built; and that the Conservative party, by the vast majority by which it was returned, in 1882, has been sent here, commissioned to carry out that idea, and that they would fail in their record, fail in their duty to this House and to the people who sent them here by such a majority, if they did not carry out that idea with all the speed and promptness compatible with safety and security. That is what the hon. member from Richmond and Wolfe meant; that is what hon. members knew he meant, and that is something which should not be misunderstood or misrepresented. The hon. gentleman has asked a question and asked it with a great deal of earnestness. He asks: "Has a single meeting been held in this country, in favour of this loan?" The hon. gentleman knows that that is just the reverse of the way in which it should be put. When the people make no sign, what is the inference therefrom? That they acquiesce; that they are in agreement with, and favour the plan which is proposed. Ever since this House sat, and it sat early, it has been before the country that additional legislation would be had with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the idea has been mooted and sent abroad that that additional legislation would either make a provision for an increased out-and-out gift or a subsidy, or would take the form of a loan. That information has been before the country for a month or more. For nearly two months that idea has been

before the country; and yet I challenge the hon. gentleman to point to the record of a single public meeting which has been called to protest against the proposed action of this Government. I say that is proof conclusive that the public mind has settled down to acquiescence in these proposals. Before his argument can have a feather's weight with the country or this House, the hon. gentleman will have to get up an agitation outside the party press, and show a spontaneous uprising of the people here and there throughout the country in protest against these terms.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. In the remarks I was addressing to the House, I was dealing with the new or salient points of objection that had been raised by the hon. member for Queen's. I did not exhaust all the points which were made, and which were merely iterations or repetitions of those that had been made and largely answered in speeches which preceded. In the remarks which I shall now address to the House, I wish to speak first, Sir, of three broad, general facts, upon which is based a necessity, as I think, for the position which we take with reference to this whole railroad question. I wish, then, to speak for a few moments of the question as it is presented to us in the Resolutions which are before the House; and afterwards I propose, with the kind indulgence of the House, to take some notice of the points which have been raised and put forth as arguments why these Resolutions should not pass. In the first place, then, with regard to the three broad or general facts upon which, as I think, is based the railroad policy of this party, as embodied in its latest phase in the Resolutions before the House, we often hear the remark, Sir, that a country does not amount to much without a people. That is very true; but I think it is equally true that a people never amounts to much without a country. I believe, Sir, that the material is not by any means the most important factor in the development of national greatness, and the upbuilding of national permanency. I believe, Sir, that there is a sentiment, indefinable, but very strong and very creative, which is sometimes known by the name of patriotism, which is written as one of the broadest facts upon the history of the past, which is no less a fact in the development of the present, and which no statesman and no deliberative assembly can afford to ignore. It is that feeling, Sir, which makes us proud and confident of our own country, which creates within us a desire, an overmastering desire, to make it rival, and if possible excel, any other country, which calls forth the best energies of a people to embody and realize that desire, which joins together dismembered parts and diversities of opinion and of interest in order to attain the object desired, which throws its halo, Sir, of hope and confidence over the darkest period of a nation's development, and which crowns seeming impossibilities with triumphant success. This feeling, Sir, I believe to be a factor which is indispensable in the development of any people, dowered even with the richest material resources, and a factor which has been proved over and over again in the history of the world, to have brought forth wonderful transformations, to have built up splendid and enduring nationalities out of elements which have been disjointed, disunited and surrounded with difficulties. If you, Sir, and the House will pardon me for a moment, I may be allowed to remark that years ago, when seated, as a school boy, on the school form and making my first explorations into that wonderful field of geography and history, following out, with all a boy's eager enthusiasm, the birth, the progress, the growth and the splendid outflowing of national greatness, I was interested in every step, I participated in every struggle, I felt sad at every reverse,

Mr. FOSTER.

and I rejoiced at every victory; and I remember perfectly well the feeling that often and often came foremost in my mind, that I wished I, too, were a citizen of a country which was large and great—which either had in its storied past a grandeur to fall back upon, or which had a future out of which it could carve that grandeur for itself. I felt the lack of that, I felt a spirit stirring within me, a desire that that void might be filled. As I have grown, I have felt more and more the yearning for a country of which I might be proud, of which the future possibilities were grand, and might be said to be almost illimitable. There were many other boys in similar forms, in similar schools, all over this Dominion, that were feeling the very same lack and had the very same desire stirring within them. There had been boys of generations previous who had felt the same lack, and had been stirred with a similar desire. These boys, of generations past, have grown up to be men, but they have not lost their desire. Those of my own generation are growing up to be men, but they have lost none of the ardor and strength of that desire, and out of that desire, born generations back and nurtured through the generations that intervened, there sprang the idea of Confederation, which, in 1867, became a fixed fact. I welcomed the idea of Confederation. I welcomed it at the outset, outside of all the difficulties and conditions which surrounded it. I left the arrangement of these difficulties to older heads. It was sufficient to me that the idea which had been born within me, which had been nurtured and was strong within me, had at last come to its embodiment and had been engrafted in the country. Our four Provinces became a country. The provincial life which had been bounded by narrow limits flowed out afresh in a wider sweep and came back again to the different parts of the confederated Provinces fraught with a new life and a new impulse. But that was not all that was needed. These four Provinces of Canada that became merged in one Dominion were old; their names were familiar; they had been known from the seventeenth century. The names of Upper and Lower Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, were old familiar names, the mention of which excited no fresh enthusiasm, awakened no new interest, had no new attractive power. Outside of the impulse which the confederation of those four Provinces gave to the life of the people of those Provinces, the Confederation of 1867 stopped short of that which was needed. There was needed after that the electric shock of a new idea; the new idea that there was a background of illimitable resources, that there was a country with a great prospect and a wonderful fertility which should stand as the background of the old picture to attract to us the attention, not only of people nearly related to us in blood and friendship, but the attention and the gaze of the civilized world. The very same thing should occur here that was necessary when the life of Europe had become stagnant in its veins. Its people, looking out across the Atlantic Ocean, descried the far distant shores of a new country, opened up to themselves a new world and were filled with an impulse to which they had been strangers for centuries past. New enterprises were set on foot, and out of the older world streamed into the newer many immigrants; out of it flowed many a department of progress which found not only its development in the new world, but brought back that width of movement, that breadth of idea, that strong spirit of liberty, which, returning upon the motherland and fatherland, have done more to bring about liberty of Government and liberty of social development than any one influence with which we are acquainted. The very same was necessary when the New England States had grown to be old. All at once the great west was opened; a wonderful background of widest promise for the development of the richest resources, and this attracted the gaze of Europe and brought its stream of emigrants and made its enterprise and spirit and impulse

of life, wide and broad and deep. That same thing was necessary for our Confederation of 1867, and it came in 1870-71 and 1872. The new North-West was opened to the gaze of the world, was annexed to the older Provinces, and we possessed a Dominion which extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific and which then had its wide resources, great fertility, and wonderful power, first opened to the gaze and attracting the attention of the world. In 1867 we gained a country. In 1870 and 1872 we extended that country to wide bounds and made it more a country to be proud of, with greater resources and greater possibilities than we had hoped for at the period of the first amalgamation of the Provinces. But something was necessary besides this. The elements that made up this new country of 1871-72, were widely diversified and widely scattered. British Columbians had hardly heard of Nova Scotians and New Brunswickers. The Province of Quebec with a different language, different blood, and a different mode of expressing its religious aspirations lay very largely unknown to people of the Maritime Provinces and the people of even the western and newer Provinces. It was necessary, in order that we should have a great country of which we could be proud, that we should have a united country. The very same spirit which drove us into Confederation in 1867, which drove us to the extension of our territory in 1870, stopped not, would not stop, will never stop until the country is amalgamated and united in the best possible way. What are the different methods of growing people together and uniting them? If we go back and take a slight look at the history of the world what do we find these things to be? They are first race and language. The people of the same race, the people of the same language, separated from others of a different race and a different language, and necessarily thrown in upon themselves, are amalgamated, are united, are forced to make a community in themselves and grow up with mutual interests and mutual objects. These, Sir, were the two chief things that united the nationality of the Greeks, which, with a different language and a different blood, sprung up from the old world, which, with a language that was not spoken by those who bordered upon them, made of the outside world barbarians, and united them together in the strong and permanent bonds of a national life. Sir, there is another influence which may unite countries together—it is the influence of government. One country grows up with a republican form of government, another with a monarchical form of government. The very fact that these two exist side by side—different forms of government—has a tendency to throw together all who live under the one form of government, and to throw together all who live under the other form of government, and so to make the two nationalities cling closer together in their interests and in their mutual relations. There is also, I think, Sir, another influence which binds nationalities together. It is this, Sir: it is the influence of similarity or oneness of institution—institution in its broadest sense, taking in the benevolent and charitable institutions, taking in the religious institutions, the educational institutions, all that we may group under this broad name of the institutions of a people. These, I think, are the three chief influences which, in the past, and, to a certain extent, in the present, tend to unite groups of people in the oneness of a national life, in a unity of aim and of interest. Now, Sir, the point of my remarks, in travelling thus far, as it may seem to some hon. gentlemen, outside of the record, is this: to show that, in this new country, neither of these three can be considered a factor in making a complete and united nationality of the Dominion of Canada. It cannot, Sir, be race and language, for the country to the south of us has the same blood in its veins, speaks the same language, and it forms no dividing line between the two; and, consequently, it throws neither the one nor the other back to

seek a unity and oneness amongst itself. Neither is there a sufficient difference in government between ourselves and the country to the south of us. There is, when we come to dig down to the essence of these two forms of government, a fundamental difference which is of the greatest importance, and which I hope, standing here with my present thought and my present feeling, to see perpetuated instead of to see obliterated; but, for the general mass of the people of these two countries, there is no very perceptible difference of government which should keep the two apart. Neither is there any perceptible difference of institutions. Our forms of education, our religious establishments, all those which are grouped under the name of institutions are very much the same. What is it, then, that, in this day and on this continent, with respect to these two peoples of which I am speaking, the Canadian people and the people of the United States, can tend to bring us, draw us, and hold us together in bonds of national unity, with a oneness of aim and a oneness of interest. I think I will speak within the knowledge of all when I say that there is only one thing to do it, that is, a continuous, a speedy, and an uninterrupted bond of communication between all parts of the country, making every distinct member and section of this country easy of access to every other member and section of the country. That is the element that is to bind us together. Our merchants are to know each other from British Columbia to Cape Breton; our people are to become acquainted with each other from the Provinces by the sea to the Provinces in the far North-West, as long as and wherever they may be formed; we are to draw together as the members of one family; Ontario is to cease sitting down here by the broad lake, thinking that she is sufficient to herself, and caring nothing for those who are about her, especially the smaller Provinces away by the sea; the smaller Provinces down by the sea are to forget their prejudices against these upper Provinces, and are to become better acquainted with them in interest and in social relations; the Province of Quebec is to come and join hands with the people of the other Provinces, and we of the other Provinces are to become better acquainted with our *confrères* of the Province of Quebec, and, learning to know them better, are to learn to like them better. So, in all ways, whatever can take place to bind together the trade interest, the social interest, all the interests of the different parts of this great Confederation, is the thing which shall draw us together, keep us together, and make of us a living and progressive unity, in a national or country point of view. Now, one step farther. What is the kind of communication which we can have which shall join these Provinces together? Can we have a water communication which would be sufficient? No, Sir; that is impossible. Outside of the difficulty of having a water communication at any season of the year for more than one half the width of this great continent of ours, there is another half of the year when the ice king lays his hand upon that form of communication, and makes it impassable to us. The only form of communication which is adequate, which is continuous, which is uninterrupted and uniform is that communication which comes from the construction and opening and completion of a trans-continental line of railway, which shall gather, Sir, in one hand the outlying Provinces of the far east, and in the other the outlying Provinces of the far west, and shall unite in bonds of intercourse and trade and social communication all the different parts of this country with every other part. Now, the whole point of this latter train of thought, in connection with the other two, is this: I honestly believe that, if all the politicians of 1867 and all the newspapers of 1867 had joined themselves to battle down this idea of the confederation of the Provinces, they might have retarded it, but a generation or two would have raised up a new set of politicians

and planted a new set of newspaper presses which would have brought to its development and embodiment that longed-for, wished-for idea of a union of these Provinces. I believe in the same way that, if all these different influences had chosen to pit themselves against the attainment, against the opening up and joining to these Provinces of the North-West Territory and the more remote Provinces, they might have hindered and retarded it for a time; but it was in the hearts of the people, and could only be hindered for a time, it must reach its fruition and have its embodiment. In the same way, I earnestly and honestly believe that this same idea is as warm and deep and earnest in the hearts of the people, that the confederation of the four Provinces is not complete, that the confederation and joining together of every part of this Dominion is not complete, that it will not be held to be complete, until the iron bands of a railway, trans-continental and Canadian, shall join every part of this great Dominion together in the bonds of commercial and of social intercourse. Therefore, I was in favour of Confederation because it gave us a country, I was in favour of this expansion to the bounds we now have, because it gave us a great and illimitable country, I am in favour, and cannot but be in favour, of the speedy and quick and certain construction of that which is essentially necessary to make us a united, and so a permanent, a successful, and a progressive people. So much then for these thoughts, these three broad facts which lead up inevitably to the policy which has been adopted by this party, and which is propounded by the Government which this party has formed, which has been initiated by them, and in furtherance of which the Resolutions which we at present have before us are being discussed. Now, Sir, when we come to this solid foundation, that a railroad, a trans-continental railroad, is necessary for us in order to complete the idea of the unity and oneness of this country, three great plans are presented, or have been presented, to the people of this country. There was, Sir, the plan of 1872, which offered to grant 54,700,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000 to a company for the building of the road. There was a second plan of 1874 by which it was proposed to grant \$10,000 cash as a subsidy per mile, 10,000 acres of land as a subsidy per mile, and 4 per cent. on any balance which was considered necessary to complete the different contracts, for the period of twenty-five years. In 1881 there was a third plan, which we are now discussing—to a certain extent—by which a company was to be given \$25,000,000, 25,000,000 acres of land, and completed railway to the amount of \$28,000,000. I may state, Sir, that very early in the consideration of this great question it came to be a settled fact that this road should be constructed, if possible, not by a Government but by a company. Well, Sir, of these three plans, which can we assent to, and which do we consider to be the best in the interests of the country? The two plans that I mentioned at first are out of the calculation. Why? Because no one could be found to avail themselves of the terms which were offered. The third one became feasible because a company was found who was willing to take hold of it under those terms and to push the railway to completion. Therefore I say that those who believed in the necessity of a trans-continental railway believed that it should be built as quickly as possible, and there was no plan to take hold of, but the plan of 1880-81, which was taken up by a Company and which thereafter looked as if it might be carried through. And so, Sir, the discussions of 1880-81 took place. Parliament came to a certain conclusion; it ratified the contract; it made the conditions firm, and it looked then to a completion of this road by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the amounts which I have mentioned. Now, Sir, there were there considerations why the country and why this Parliament took hold of and ratified that contract. First, because it gave a prospect of a complete road within a

Mr. FOSTER.

definite time, which was never held out to the people before. It held out the prospect of the completion of the road in 1891. A definite period was fixed and we had something sure to look forward to. There was another reason for which Parliament and the country, I believe, were disposed to ratify that contract, and that was that there was what the hon. gentlemen opposite have talked so much of, an element of finality about it. The cost was fixed; there was a certain number of acres of land and a certain amount of money. It measured the liabilities of the country, and the people were glad that they knew at last what the cost of this Canadian Pacific Railway would probably be to the country. There was also a third reason, which was this: That the line had better not be built by a Government. Now, Sir, I am free to say that I have no objection whatever to a Government running a railway. In fact, Sir, as I grow older, and look a little deeper into things, I am of the opinion that it would not be a bad thing for the Government to own and run all the railways of a country. I am not disposed, therefore, to be against the running of a road by a Government. But I appreciated the danger which other hon. gentlemen appreciated, and which, I am sure, this country appreciated—the danger of the risk involved in a Government attempting to build a railway of such dimensions, and of such enormous expenditure. Sir, the patronage, and the vindictiveness of party which is involved in the letting, and making, and criticism of contracts are almost insuperable objections to a company undertaking to build a road of such dimensions and involving such cost. So, Sir, I say the country was willing to ratify that contract for three especial reasons: First, because it fixed a time at which the road should be finished; secondly, because it made a finality, as far as expenditure was concerned; and thirdly, because it had the road built by a company, and avoided the risk and the danger incident to the building of such an immense road by a Government organized on a party basis. So much, then, with reference to the contract. Now, Sir, in 1881, that Company went to work. It has, I am bound to say, displayed an immense amount of push and energy—a fact that is not questioned by the country at large, or by any section of the people. It has kept good faith with reference to its contract, and has built a *bona fide* road much better than the road which was laid down to guide it as a model. It has put force and energy and power into the enterprise, so much so that at the end of 1883 it stands before us with 1,131 miles of completed road on the main line west, with 269 miles of completed, equipped, and running branches on that same line west, and with 470 odd miles east of Callander, taking in the branches and the main line from Montreal and Brockville, and as far West as Callander and running up to Algoma Mills. That is what has been done by the Company, and more than that has been done. Such has been the energy and push they have displayed, such has been the rapidity with which they have constructed the work, that they have raised the belief of the people that the road would be finished in 1886, and not in 1891. So that they stand before the country and before the world in the latter part of the year 1883 as having accomplished all that work of which I have spoken, and as holding out to Canada and to all countries interested in Canada, the hope that this road would be built entirely by 1886. Now, Sir, a new phase of the question is presented to us—a phase of the question, I am bound to say, as unwelcome as it was unexpected, a phase of the question which is equally painful to gentlemen on this side of the House as it was to gentlemen on the other side of the House; a phase of the question which we and the country had hoped would never be presented, and which we are sorry has ever been presented. What is that phase? Sir, they come to Parliament in the Session of 1884, through the Government, and they say: we have raised the hopes of Canada and of the world that this road would be

finished in 1886. We based those hopes upon calculations that we thought were good and would hold. We have to come to you to-day and say that we must fall back on our original contract and finish that road by 1891; or else, in order to finish it by the end of 1885, we must ask you for a loan. That is the question that is presented to Parliament and the country—1891 on the one hand, and 1885 and a loan on the other hand. Now, Sir, I, as an Independent member of this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I supposed, Sir, that we should have a general chorus of hear, hear, from the opposite side of the House. I say to the hon. gentlemen opposite who are so prodigal just now with their hear, hear, that though it may be a most unheard of, and unthought of thing to them, for a man to sit on one side of the House, and whilst he supports with all his power, and with all his earnestness, the party of his choice on broad lines of policy, it is still quite possible for him to make up his mind, as an independent thinker and investigator, upon every subject which does not come within party lines. I am supported in this opinion by what has taken place in this House this Session. There has been more independent and scattering voting on this side of the House by members supporting the Conservative party, than there has been on the other side. And so I say, as a man who supports a party and yet who does and will think independently, and conclude independently, I am bound to take this matter into my consideration and find out whether or not it is reasonable. Now, Sir, what reasons did the Company give when they came to this Government and Parliament. They said this: owing to hostility and hostile combinations at home and abroad; owing to shrinkage in values and a decline in the price of stocks; owing to the difficulty of realizing such large sums as are necessary to carry on this gigantic work, from lands which are, to a certain extent, locked up from a speedy realization, and which, if thrown upon the market would bring but ruinous prices, we come and say: we have resources sufficient; we want a loan; we will pay you a fair interest; we will finish the road by the end of 1885; we ask your consideration as to whether or not our proposal is a reasonable one. Sir, the Company does not come on bended knees before this House. This Company comes as a man would come walking straight on his feet, looking up straight with his eyes and saying to this Government and Parliament: we have a fair proposal to make to you; we ask you for a loan; we will give you as high a rate of interest as you can get elsewhere and even better; we will place within your hands sufficient security; that is your part of the bargain—will you do it? We will be helped in certain particulars; you will be helped in certain other particulars; if you will accept our proposition, well and good; if you will not, well and good; and we fall back on the terms of the original contract. What I have to conclude in my own mind is whether these are reasonable grounds or not. As to the first one. Has there been hostility manifested, and have hostile combinations been entered into with respect to this Company? I think that no hon. member will deny it; I do not think hon. members opposite will deny it. I call to mind that the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Davies), acknowledged that such was the case but he did not see any reason why, if such were the case, the Company should go whining around, as he elegantly and classically expressed it. Then there was a hostile spirit. It was expressed in what way? It was exhibited by hostile combinations of rival roads in the great stock markets of the world. It was shown in hostile articles which were written from this country to American papers, and in telegrams sent from this country to American papers, and in cablegrams sent to the Old Country. In these and a hundred different ways, the fact is as clear as the sun at noon-day

that there were hostile combinations, that there was hostility both at home and abroad, and that this hostility must have had and did have an effect on the securities and assets of the Company. Sir, is the second contention a reasonable one—that there was a shrinkage of values generally throughout the country and a demoralization and fall in the value of stocks. We have only to read the stock list, to take the most cursory glance at the commercial records of the world for the last eight, six or four months, to establish the fact. Looking at these points I say, it is a reasonable contention on the part of the Company that they were prevented from realizing many of their assets by the demoralization of the stock market and shrinkage in values. As to the third contention, it is an eminently reasonable one. To meet the expenditure necessary, to raise the amount necessary to meet that expenditure, and to raise the amount within a period of two years upon lands which are slow sales comparatively, and on stock for which there was no market at that particular time on account of the demoralized condition of the market—it is a reasonable contention they urge that in these respects they have encountered difficulties which they had not reckoned upon when they made their calculations and estimates years and months ago. As an independent member, making up my mind from data presented before me, I cannot refuse to admit the contention that these are reasonable reasons, and that I am bound, as one considering the issues involved, to give them my fairest and most impartial consideration. Apart from these considerations, the question narrows itself down to this: Is there any great or important reason which commends itself to my mind, and which leads me to believe that it is better for the country's welfare to have the road finished in 1885, rather than have the completion postponed until 1891. That is the first question I have to settle with myself. Mind you, I am in favour of the road as a means towards national unity and national progress. Mind you, I believe this Company have done exceedingly well in the progress of the work so far. Remember that I take into consideration, as I must do, their contention that owing to the circumstances to which I have referred they have been thrown out in their calculations. The question for me to decide is this: is there any counterbalancing advantage in having the road opened in 1885, sufficient to make us take upon ourselves to do what is embodied as reasonable and necessary in the resolutions before the House. I think I have settled that question, so far as to make me, at least, act in a certain way. One reason that it is better to have the road finished by the end of 1885, is because it is in the interests of Canada abroad that such should be done. I know that what I am going to urge as a reason will be called by hon. gentlemen opposite a sentimental reason. I do not therefore refrain from urging it. By the push and energy exhibited by this country, with its 4,500,000 of people, determining to do what, on the part of the country to the south, with its 38,000,000, was considered a bold and daring enterprise, Canada has obtained a certain name and prestige among the people of Europe, and even the people of the civilized world. If a person advertised himself to perform some great athletic feat, and when it came near the time of performance, and when the spectators had gathered and the thought of the community was centered upon him, and if his previous performances had led to the conviction that he was able to do that which he had set himself to perform, and he failed at the last moment, his reputation would be lost. Just so in a similar, but in a larger and more important way, would the prestige and fame of Canada be diminished if we were to fail now in the prosecution of this work. In hundreds and thousands of homes in England, Ireland, and Scotland they are sitting round their firesides to-night talking about that plucky Canadian Dominion, which, with

its 4,500,000 of people, has undertaken to weld all its parts together by building a railway 3,000 miles in length. They are reading documents which have been scattered by this Government, and by means of this very same railway organization, and their thought and feelings and sympathies, are being drawn out to this country of Canada as a field for immigration, and as a country whose people are full of energy, full of enterprise, as shown by the very fact that they have undertaken, and promised to perform, this gigantic work, and have it finished by 1886. Now, Sir, are these promises to be falsified? Once let this idea be overthrown, and they shall assemble again about their firesides and say, ah! there has been a failure over there in Canada; they undertook more than they could carry out; they promised well, but they failed in performance; and there goes down the prestige of Canada; there goes down at least a part of that attraction which this country has had, as a field for immigration, and there, I believe, the name and the fame and the interest of Canada will suffer in a very vital and important way. Therefore I conclude, in my own mind—hon. gentlemen may take it for what it is worth—that it is important that this scheme should be carried out; that it is the general sentiment that it should be carried out, and that it is all important that it should proceed because of the interest and the fame and the credit of Canada in countries abroad. But intimately connected with this is the great subject of immigration. No one doubts that this very building and construction and completion of this trans-continental railway has been one of the best things which this country has put forward as an attraction for immigration, in all parts of the world from which we draw our immigration. It is no doubt a fact that the opening up of such an immense country by an unbroken line of railway, so that these people might have communication with the Old Country, and have intercourse in different ways with the outside world, has been of the very greatest importance and utility in attracting immigrants into this country, and not only in attracting those who have already come over here, but in starting that spirit of desire, that spirit of looking forward, that spirit which says: there is the country to which, if we change we shall change to; a spirit which is as seed sown in a fertile soil, which will bring forth, as year passes on year, its increasing harvest of immigration to this country. I believe that if to-day the Parliament of Canada should decide that this great work should stop and not be carried to its promised completion, that it shall loiter along and hesitate till 1891, the immigration interests of this country would be sadly and importantly affected by that course of conduct. So, I am in favor of having this work pushed through by the end of 1885, for the sake of our immigration interests. There are reasons at home, too. One of the first is the North-West development. A gentleman speaking on the other side of the House said: cannot we get into the North-West now? True, but we have to cross a foreign country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen have not lived to the length of years to which they have lived, and felt the snows which have fallen on their heads, and seen the ice which has taken hold of river and harbour in all these years, without knowing that there is a large portion of the year in which it is impossible to carry on that speedy and safe and uninterrupted communication, which we need for the purposes for which this trans-continental railway is to be built. Sir, there is a sentimental reason which comes in, but it is a forcible one. What would you think of your family life, what would be your interest in your home, if, every time you got up from your breakfast table to go to your library, you had to pass through apartments which were owned and controlled by some other person? Would you feel that you had a home of your own? Would

Mr. FOSTER.

you feel the same love for its roof? Aside from the inconvenience which would be inevitable, there would be a taking away of the feeling that it was your own home, and that you were under your own roof. Hon. gentlemen opposite may think that this is a very pleasant thing, and they may smile about it, but it has force with me, and with the people of this country; it has force, and it will have force, in shaping our policy on this question. A person knows very little about railroading if he does not know that when a company has a line of railway 1,000 miles long away over there, and a line of railway 500 or 600 miles long on this side, and between them there is only a means of joining them by running their freights and passengers on a road which belongs to a different country, with hostile tariffs, and with another system, and all the possible inconveniences which may arise—I say a person knows little of railroading if he does not know, that the expense and inconvenience incident to that sort of thing, is one of the strongest arguments that can be used to those people to obtain an independent, self-controlled, and through line of communication open for themselves. I say, therefore, that we have not an open means of communication, such as is at all adequate, from these older Provinces to the heart of the North-West Territory. I say we need that line, that the development of the North-West depends on it, that the number of immigrants we get there, the amount of produce which is raised there, the amount of minerals which is taken out from their mines, and all the vast development of that country depend, more perhaps than we think, upon the speedy, continuous, and uninterrupted communication which shall take place between this part and that part of our country—this an older and stronger one, but that a newer one, and full of greater possibilities, and capable of the greatest amount of expansion. Our British Columbia development needs it. Sir, since our confederation with British Columbia, that Province has stayed away out by itself for all these years, with three-fourths, five-sixths, yes, nineteen-twentieths of her people strangers to us, commercially and socially, and is she to remain there until 1891, with all the disadvantages which result from that isolation? But if we carry out this idea, and complete the road by 1885, there are six years in which British Columbia and all of its resources are opened to free course for the stream of enterprise which will rush in, and the stream of trade and commerce which will rush out. Is that nothing for British Columbia—is it nothing to this Dominion? I hold that it is something to the Provinces by the sea, and that it is something very important to the rest of this great Dominion which lies east of it. But, Sir, our trade, our industries demand it. We are building a trans-continental line of railway, and do we not know that trade springs up in proportion to the facilities for trading? Sir I want to have it as thoroughly impressed upon my mind as I possibly can, that conditions differ now from what they were in the old time of pioneer settlement in this and other new countries. To-day people rush in where there are facilities for rushing out as well as facilities for going in. They follow the course of the railroad; and with reference to branch lines, I maintain that if the main line is thoroughly finished and equipped by 1885, instead of 1891, you will have a far larger number of branch lines built by the end of 1891 than you possibly could have if you carried the building of the main line through all those years until 1891. Some hon. gentlemen are very anxious to have branch lines built. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared that he believed it would have been better for the country and the North-West, if this railway had stopped at Winnipeg, and the people had been allowed to build branch lines west of Winnipeg. Branch lines where, pray? Why, each one of those branch lines would become a main line. What use is a line of railroad that does not run into a market centre? Those branch lines

would have to run into Winnipeg, at least, and make connection with the main line. So that the building of the main line must be antecedent to the successful, continuous and rapid building of branch lines. I believe the interest of our own country, the interest of our trade and industries in the eastern Provinces, demand that this line of communication should be opened up. Sir, what has been accomplished in the last five years? There has been developed and opened up a trade between our eastern industries and British Columbia and Manitoba; and to-day no inconsiderable feeder for the industries of the eastern Provinces is to be found in the population which is producing from the lands and from the mines of those western parts of our newly opened territory. Sir, if this line is put through by 1885, these industries will not be harmed. They will feel the impulse. They will then be able to send their wares through without any interruptions, in the shape of bonding or of hostile tariffs, through the whole heart of that country, and to send on to British Columbia what is necessary for the people of that Province. I believe that our own industries will not be injured, but, on the contrary, will be very much helped by the speedy construction of this road. These, Sir, are the reasons which, amongst others, induce me to favour the completion of this road by 1885, rather than have it set back until 1891—that is, provided we think we can reasonably do it. Now, Sir, I wish for a moment to look at the nature of this loan. What is it? The Company come and ask this Parliament for a loan of \$22,500,000. Recollect that we must argue upon the idea that this is a *bona fide* transaction. But someone asks, what about the \$7,380,000, part of which has been postponed until 1888, and the rest of which is due in 1888? What about it? It is no liability to this country until 1888, and if the Company fulfil their part of this agreement, which we believe they will, it will not then become a liability to this country, because it will then be paid. That is one of the conditions of this agreement. So that the loan is this—\$22,500,000 to be paid in 1891, and a contingent loan of \$7,380,000, which is only contingent upon the possibility or the probability, however you may choose to regard it, that in 1888 the Company will not be able to pay that amount. Now, Sir, for this loan the Company agree to pay 5 per cent. interest—a better rate of interest than we can get elsewhere—a rate which is greater than that at which we borrow. So that, if this is a *bona fide* transaction—and we must argue it upon that line—we are to loan \$22,500,000 at 5 per cent., and we are to have this percentage paid to us half-yearly. Now, then, the second great question which comes to my mind for conclusion is this: Granted that it is better to have this road built by the end of 1885; granted that we are able to provide the loan asked for, is the security sufficient? And until I can convince myself, with all certainty, so far as certainty is possible, that the security is sufficient, I, Sir, would not vote for these Resolutions. One moment, then, Mr. Speaker, while we take a glance at the nature of the security. In the first place, we have a railroad of some 1,131 miles of main line, the construction value of which is \$23,078,929; we have 269 miles of branches west of Callander, worth, at construction value, \$3,759,793; we have expended on improvement of the line west of Cross Lake, \$353,606; we have rolling stock, plant, lake steamers, and the like, \$6,870,045; and we have materials and supplies, less the advance of rails, \$4,025,604; making a total of \$38,087,977. This is the amount, in actual cost value of the line west of Callander, which is to be placed in our hands as part security. In addition to this, there is east of Callander 457 miles of extension main line and branches, \$3,270,351; rolling stock, worth \$900,000; shops and machinery, worth \$516,032; tools and machinery, \$352,230; real estate for termini, worth \$390,790; making a total of \$5,429,403, the value of security east of Callander.

If we add these together we get a total present railroad security of \$43,517,370. That is the actual value at present of the security placed into the hands of this Government for the loan asked. But I am not unaware of the fact, and I am alive to its importance as well, that this security is of such nature that it appreciates with every dollar the Government pays out to their call of the loan which has been stipulated for. That, with me, weighs as an important point, and I believe it weighs as an important point with this House. Of the loan of \$22,500,000 which this Government is asked for, \$7,500,000 go for floating liabilities and \$15,000,000 are to go into the road. There is besides the subsidy yet to be paid which the Company owns, which we have guaranteed the Company, by the contract of 1881, and which, if they carry out their contract is no more ours than a section of land in the moon is ours. That \$12,710,788 has also to be paid out and applied to the construction of the road, making a total of \$27,710,788 to go into its construction. Now, my point is this: The very moment we can float this contract and make them the loan of \$22,500,000, we have the present value of the railway worth \$43,517,370. The Government has to see that every dollar of the \$27,000,000 that they pay to the Company is represented by actual construction of the road, so that when the two years have past, and the end of 1885 has come, and all this loan and subsidy are paid to the Company, we will have an actual railway value of \$27,710,788 to add to the other \$43,517,370 as a gross security for the payment of the loan. That is we have a security in a railway which is not a diminishing but is an appreciative security, and which grows by the amount of every dollar which is paid over of that loan and that subsidy into the hands of the Company. That gives us, at the end of two years, a railway security worth, in construction value, \$71,228,158. But that is not the only security we have. We have also the security of the land, amounting to 21,240,600 acres. Against this 21,240,600 acres of land handed over to the Government as additional security, there is a loan of \$1,123,115, which leaves, if we can take the value of the lien at the price which has been already realized for what has been sold—\$2.36 an acre—we have a balance of some \$49,019,795 represented to us in worth of lands placed in the hands of this Government as additional security. That is, we have in Railways and landed security, at that rate of calculation, \$120,247,953. Is that sufficient security for a loan of \$22,500,000 and a contingent loan of \$7,380,000, which never will be called for if this agreement is carried out. Is a security of \$5 for every dollar that is loaned considered to be sufficient security? There is another point which adds greater force to this—will that railway property depreciate from this till 1891, supposing it runs so long? Will it depreciate in value between this and 1885? No, Sir; it is constantly appreciating in value. The railway property which is represented in the equipment and rolling stock of the road is kept and must be kept up to its level and can be kept up to its level, because it has a paying traffic. It is therefore a security that will not depreciate but appreciate in value. How is it with reference to the lands? I have calculated these lands at the rate of \$2.36 per acre. Does that calculation seem to be too high? I think not. I think we can test it very well by the amount which has been already received for what has been already sold, and that is at the rate of \$2.36 per acre. I think, however, we can take a little more in argument out of analogous roads. I go over to the Union Pacific road and I find that its lands sold, from 1880 to 1883, at from \$4.28 to \$4.82 an acre; I find that the Kansas Pacific lands sold at from \$4.03 to \$4.93 an acre; I find that the sales of the Central Pacific lands averaged, since 1870, \$4.85 per acre; I take the Northern Pacific, which is more analogous to our own road, because it has the element of newness to a certain extent, and their lands, in 1882, sold

for from \$2.60 to 3.60 per acre. Now, we have this fact that the lands already sold of the Canadian Pacific Railway have averaged \$2.36 per acre; that sales of lands on analogous roads averaged from \$2.60 to \$5 per acre in round numbers, and I think I have fair ground for the contention that the remainder of those lands of our road will be worth an average of \$2.36 per acre, at least. Will these lands depreciate or appreciate in value? They must appreciate in value every year, on account of the increased impetus which is being given to buying and selling them, so that the value of real estate will creep up, especially within a certain distance of the great line of railway, and these lie within that distance. To my mind, there is no question that the security offered for the loan asked is amply sufficient. If it comes to be a fact, if the possibility ever becomes a probability, and that probability ever merges into a fact, that the Company makes default and is not able to carry out its obligation, I, as a humble member of this Parliament, will not be sorry to see so valuable a property fall into the hands of the Government and the people, at so small a price. It would be a good thing for the country and a bad thing for the Company, after the expenditure of all the energy and capital they have put into this gigantic enterprise. There is one other consideration I will trouble the House with, in reference to this. Is the road, provided it falls into our hands, going to be a dead weight? or will it be a live and realizable security? That is, supposing this road were finished to-morrow, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the Company made default, and it came into our hands, would it be a bill of expense or a means of income to us? That is a very important point, because upon that rests in part the value of the security in the contingency that the Company shall make default and that the property shall come into our hands. What have we to say in reference to this? Will the road be a dead security or a living and paying security? We have but three things to go upon. We have experience in the first place. What is that experience? In 1882, the gross receipts of the Canadian Pacific Railway were \$2,449,824. In 1883 they were \$5,420,913; and the net of nine months' traffic comes to pretty nearly a million of dollars. I think that, so far as the road between the Rocky Mountains and Port Arthur, added on to the road between Algoma Mills and Sudbury Junction and Montreal, is concerned, it settles the fact conclusively that that portion of the road, at least, is a paying property and will give a net earning over and above all expenses. We have only to ask ourselves this question: whether, when that line of communication between Sudbury Junction and Port Arthur, around the north of Lake Superior, is filled in, and when the gap across the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops is filled in, and the whole trade of the country has a chance to extend and grow up on this line, we think, in the light of the past experience of the road, this will be a paying road, or will involve us in expense? I believe it will pay for its running and give a profit in net earnings every year. Have we anything to back up this contention? Yes, we have the analogy of the roads I have mentioned before. Take the Union Pacific, and its net earnings have risen from \$5,000,000 and odd in 1874, to \$7,000,000 and odd in 1879, and, after the consolidation, from \$7,000,000 and odd in 1879, to \$12,000,000 in 1882. Are the lands and the country and the capabilities of the country through which our road goes so infinitely inferior; is the extent of country that is to be traversed which gives nothing to feed the line with traffic so infinitely greater in our own country, that we can hope for this analogy to have no force and weight when applied to our own road? I believe the reverse is the case. I believe the capacities and capabilities of our own lands through which our road runs; I believe the lesser tract of barren and unproductive country which cannot feed the line of travel; I believe the shorter line following the meridian between

Mr. FOSTER.

the centres of traffic on the east and the centres of traffic upon the west, are immeasurably in favour of our own line, and I believe, Sir, that if that line shows such an increase in gross earning as it has, our own line may safely be asserted to be beyond the possibility of doubt, and reasoning by analogy, a line that will pay its way and leave something to the net. Take the analogy of the Central Pacific. In 1871, the net earnings were \$5,000,000 and odd; in 1882, they have risen to \$8,000,000 and odd. Take the Northern Pacific: in 1882 the gross earnings were \$5,000,000 and odd, and in 1883 they were \$9,000,000, and a little more. Taking all this into consideration, I say the conclusion of the argument from analogy will be that our road will not be a dead security, but a paying and constantly increasing paying investment. Then we are to take the element of probability in. I started to make a calculation just about the time the Speaker took his Chair. I am exceedingly sorry, looking at the country's advantage and the enlightenment of this House which would have been possible, that the Speaker took his Chair as early as he did, before I had an opportunity of completing that interesting calculation; but I will give you the germ of the calculation, and hon. gentlemen can work it out themselves. I said to myself, is it too much to ask, is it too much to think, that, during the next ten years, we shall have at least 50,000 people yearly thrown into our North-West? Does that appear reasonable to the members of this House, that, during the next ten years, an average of 50,000 people a year will enter that country? Does it appear reasonable to say that, of that 50,000, 40,000 will belong to the agricultural classes? I believe it is not unreasonable. Is it unreasonable to say that, of these 40,000, one out of four will hold a farm; that is, that, out of that number of people, there will be 8,000 farmers, and that each of these will bring under cultivation twenty acres of good grain lands each year? If you take that, and put it on the rate of progression, and count it up for ten years, you will be surprised at the vista it opens up of production, accelerating and increasing production, which will feed the line of traffic, and develop and make prosperous a trade of the dimensions of which we to-day can form no actual—can scarcely form a probable—estimate. So I believe in the probabilities. Facts showing that to-day the road is paying as far as it is built, probabilities leading us to believe that a large increase will take place in the productiveness of the soil which will form a basis for trade in the future, I think we are altogether within the mark when we conclude that that line of road, once built, will not be a loss to whoever may happen to own it, but will be a means of income and a source of profit. Therefore, when they come and ask for a loan of \$22,500,000, and offer us securities worth \$141,247,953—because I add the \$35,000,000 of stock, at the rate of 60 per cent., which will make \$21,000,000—I believe the security is ample. I believe they come in an honourable and manly way and say, we want a loan which you can give better than others; we offer securities which we would not like to give into the hands of any other; we make the bargain for mutual advantage, and we trust for mutual benefit to the two parties concerned. Now, Sir, that exhausts about the line of thought that I conducted with myself, and brings me to this result: that it is a foregone conclusion with the people, and a necessity of this country, that the line of trans-continental road shall be built, that the Company, having proceeded so far with unexampled push and energy towards the completion of that road, and having been involved in these temporary difficulties, if such you may call them, are reasonable in coming before us and in asking us for a loan which shall accrue to the mutual advantage of the Company and of the country; and I, for one, am prepared to vote for loaning the \$22,500,000 with the contingent loan which may possibly come upon us in 1888, taking the security which is offered us and the percentage they prom-

ise to pay; and I believe that the country outside, which, despite all that was said against that contract in 1880-81, approved of it and sent back those who framed and those who ratified it with such a large majority, looking upon that road in the light of a necessity now as then, will regard those who put this through in this Parliament, and vote for the speedy completion on such terms, as having only carried out their behests, as having done what was given them to do, and will approve of their action when they next come before the polls to ask the suffrages of the people. Now, I will ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments whilst I present a different thought. Not only were the propositions made by this Company, and the propositions entertained by the Government, brought before me as a subject for investigation and approval, but I thought that something else was necessary. I believed that wisdom did not reside solely in myself. I knew that human nature on this side of the House was fallible as is human on the other side of the House, or as human nature is generally; and I said to myself, it is possible that new light may be thrown upon this question, and I will wait and listen. I will carefully observe, I will weigh, as far as I possibly can, the arguments of those hon. gentlemen who are opposed to this measure, and if they give me good grounds for rejecting this proposal, I am willing to take the onus and responsibility of rejecting it. So, Sir, I listened earnestly and attentively to the Minister of Railways, who expounded this matter to us, and I listened with an equally earnest attention to the hon. leader of the Opposition who made out the opposite case, and who contended against the Resolutions which are placed before us. Now, Sir, what did I extract from the long and able speech of the hon. member for West Durham? I listened to it from first to last. I did not content myself with that, but I have read that hon. gentleman's speech over three consecutive times since I received it in the *Hansard*. I think no hon. gentleman on this side of the House, or on the other side, will be able to say that I have not given it an attention and an investigation equal to all that it deserves at my hands; and I did it with a desire of finding out what were the strong points—if there were any strong points—which might be urged against the resolutions before the House. Well, Sir, what do I find? I find this: that, with that facility for bringing up buried issues and points about questions that have been settled over and over again, the hon. gentleman occupied nearly the whole of his speech with debating issues and questions which had been settled by this Parliament, and settled by the country after they had been settled by this Parliament. That hon. gentleman did not like a great many things; he was curious to know a great many more things; and what he did not like, and what he was curious to know, in nine cases out of ten, were questions which, in my humble opinion, had no more to do with the settlement of the question which is now before us, than a magazine article upon Bacteria has to do with chemical notation. In the first place, the hon. gentleman did not like this Company coming back again to Parliament. Well, Sir, we would all much prefer that they should never have come back and asked for a re-arrangement, or a reconsideration of this question. We would have much preferred to see them go on with their contract, and complete the road in 1886. But the point to be observed is that they came back, and whether we liked it or not was not the question. That was the problem we had to solve, and it is no use for us to grumble because they came back when we did not want them to come back. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman satirized the able resources of the Syndicate. He seemed to make a good deal of merit over the fact that this Syndicate had been lauded in years gone by as composed of exceptionally able gentlemen, financially; and now that this Company has come back to us in the way it has, he supposed that he had good grounds

for turning back upon the Government, and the party who support the Government, because the great advantage we hoped to obtain through this Syndicate was not realized. Well, Sir, I do not think there was any man, in 1881, or since 1881, who for a moment supposed that any syndicate were going to take money enough out of their own pockets, or had pockets deep enough, out of which to take the requisite money, to complete the gigantic enterprise of building a line of railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. It was not that for which we looked for a set of able men, but we looked for a set of able men who, by their financial character and standing, should be able to put the Company in the shape of realizing from the assets which should be placed at its disposal, and supplementing the deficiencies by their credit. This, Sir, the Company has done, and having done that it is not open to the ridicule and satire which was heaped upon it by the hon. gentleman. He has declared that speed meant cost. Sir, that whole question was discussed in the debate on the Address. The hon. gentleman went into elaborate calculations then to prove to this House that speed meant cost. He proved it to his own satisfaction then; he did not any more than prove it to his own satisfaction this time. Possibly, speed does mean cost in some cases, but, to my mind, the construction of that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway that has been constructed is not one of those cases. When you take into account that you might just about as easily take in supplies for 10,000 people as for 7,000; when you take into account that railway building to-day is largely done by new and improved machinery; when you take into account that the speed with which it is carried out leaves less dead capital lying on their hands, and puts them into a position of realizing more quickly on the outlay—I believe when you put all these things together, you will come to the conclusion that in this case, and in many cases, it is not true that speed means cost. In this case there are two prior considerations. Speed means benefit to the Company, because it keeps dead capital from lying on its hands; and speed means benefit to this Dominion, because it opens our highway just so many years earlier than it otherwise would be opened. Sir, the hon. gentleman opposite dislikes the mode of building. He did not like the construction company and the directors which form part of that construction company; he took it for granted that the directors did form part of the construction company. Sir, that is a question that is not germane to the issue which is before the House. The construction company, the mode in which the road was built—those are matters which I think do not touch directly upon the question whether things being as they are to-day, it is proper for this Parliament to make the loan which is provided for in the Resolutions. He also complained of the change of route; but the change of route is also outside, in my judgment, of the question which is before us. He is also opposed to the issue of stock and the manner in which it was issued. I think the ground is tenable here, that if we make a contract with the Company and pay them so much to do the work, and provide that our rates upon the railway afterwards are dependent upon the actual amount of money that is used in the construction of the road—I say, in that case, it is not very germane to the subject as to how they issue, or how they dispose of, the stock which is their own, and which does not enter as a factor, therefore, into the cost with reference to the road. Again, the hon. gentleman was opposed to monopoly and disallowance. But this disallowance is apart altogether from the question at issue, and this monopoly was thoroughly discussed and settled when the contract was ratified, and the people have already passed upon it. He also ridiculed the opening up of a United States port; and my hon. friend from Queen's County, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), grew virtuously indignant because we were going to have connections of this road reaching

to some great city or cities in the United States. Sir, I yield to no one in this House in my desire to see a line of railway which shall pass through Canadian territory from the extreme east to the extreme west. I will go as far as any hon. member in putting forth the power of the country to have that idea thoroughly carried out; but at the same time I will never consent to build up a Chinese wall between us and the United States, with respect to the running of this road and the points from which it shall gather or to which it shall carry the traffic which comes to it. I will not go for that. But I hold that, for commercial and prudent reasons, and for national reasons too, if you like, it is within the competence and duty of this country to see that we plant our hands wherever we can draw in a single dollar of traffic or make our road more profitable than it would otherwise be. I think it will go without saying, before this House, that the point of shipment directs or controls the destination of the freight which is shipped. We have a trans-continental line of railway. A great deal that will be shipped across that line will be shipped from American ports in the west—will be shipped from Asia, China or Japan, with a destination in some of the eastern ports of the United States. It will be a detriment to our road, a detriment to the increase of trade and commerce upon that road, if we are not prepared to receive and forward freight by the cheapest and most rapid means within our power, over our road, as far as we can, and then forward it to the destination for which it is freighted. There is a large amount of traffic which we hope to draw over the road, which will not begin in Canada but outside of the Dominion; a large amount of traffic from the eastern seaboard of the United States, which we hope to carry over the road. Now, can we do so, with the best prospect of increasing the volume of our trade, unless we have connections so as to hold out inducements in the centres where the trade starts to take hold of the traffic and carry it right through to its destination. Therefore, I say that it is of the utmost importance that the road shall throw out its connections towards the great seaports of the United States, in order to gather traffic from them and bring up to the Company's main line. There are two divisions of trade. There is one which will start from the west in and out of Canada and end at an eastern port of embarkation for Europe, going through our own country. That is the kind which we must keep within our own control. That is the traffic which starts in the west and goes towards the east, bound for the old country markets, and that is the kind which I would be no patriot and not worthy of the trust reposed in me, if I did not declare should embark at Canadian ports. But although I believe in that doctrine, we should not place ourselves so as to be unable to gather traffic destined for the eastern cities of the country south of us, and carry freight at the lowest cost, and thereby increase our volume of trade. The traffic which starts west and is bound for the old country, let us keep for our Canadian ports; but, as regards all that we can profitably draw from outside sources—traffic which begins in countries outside, and is carried to countries outside our own, on this continent, let us have every facility for carrying that traffic. So much with respect to this matter of United States outlet. There is just one expression which particularly struck me in the hon. gentleman's speech, and which I will quote as he gave it. He said: "We may be exposed to the risks" (speaking about this partnership with the railway company) "but it is not likely we shall have any of the profits." In my opinion that is the cardinal defect in the criticisms given to these Resolutions by hon. gentlemen opposite. They have taken the ground that the Canadian Pacific Railway is an enemy to Canada, and must be watched; that it is of no national importance; that the Company have all the advantages and we have all the risk and none of the advantages. If by the power of my arms I could take up the whole Canadian

Mr. FOSTER.

Pacific Railway and throw the track into the deep sea, I want to know what would be the sensation with which Canadians would awaken to-morrow when they realized the fact that they had no Canadian Pacific Railway, no line running from Montreal, Brockville, and Callander across to the far west, 1,131 miles, with its steel rails through that great undeveloped, but rich and promising country? Would they think there were no advantages connected with the building of that road? We may give the Company all the money and subsidies we have given them, and even supplement those amounts with this additional aid in the form of a loan; and yet with all these risks and gifts, I undertake to say that the benefit which the Dominion realizes from the operation of that road, is far greater than the cost involved to the country. Sir, I will make another confession. I had the curiosity this morning to read the whole of the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, delivered in the House of 1880-81, upon the Canadian Pacific Railway contract; that was when the contract was being submitted and the House called on to decide as to whether it should be ratified or not. I read that speech from the beginning to the end; and what are my conclusions? Simply these: that the hon. gentleman, when he made his speech on the Resolutions now before the House, had the same set of models and patterns as he had in 1880-81. The only thing new is the little different material he has ran through them. It was "may be" and "may happen" from the beginning to the end of his speech in 1881; it is "may be" and "may happen" almost from the beginning to the end of his speech this Session. One of the hon. gentleman's "may be's" in 1881, was this: "may be the Company would never begin to construct the road." But they did begin it. Another was that "may be the members of the Company would abscond." They have not done so. Another was, that "may be the Company would never build the Lake Superior section." But they have shown their earnestness in commencing that work. Another was, that "may be the Company would lock up the lands and hold them until some future period when they could get higher prices for them." But they have not held the lands; they have sold all they possibly could sell. Another was, that "may be the scheme would ruin the country." But the country has not been much ruined by it. Another was, that "may be the scheme would ruin and submerge the party." But the party still stands intact. Sir, at the conclusion of all those "may be's," the hon. gentleman stood up straight and spoke to the hon. members on this side of the House in the following language:—

"I shall not venture to hope that this House will reject it but I do not doubt that an indignant country, although you will not give it time now to raise its voice, will take the earliest opportunity to inflict a summary penalty upon those persons, offenders for a second time, who having once betrayed, when entrusted with power, their country's honour, and having been forgiven, have now taken advantage of the opportunity which a too confiding people conferred upon them to betray, in the same transaction, her most vital and material interests."

That, Sir, was the concluding sentence which fell like a thunder clap of warning upon the House, and which showed that, as the hon. gentleman did not properly gauge the connecting circumstances which surrounded the question, he had equally failed in gauging, as every statesman, especially one who aspires to be the leader of a party, should be well able to gauge—he failed to gauge the temper of the Canadian people, with respect to this subject. Have we not, then, good grounds for believing that, as he failed then to rightly gauge the importance of the case and the sentiment of the country, he may as certainly fail again. Now, Sir, I shall take up some few points of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am sorry he is not in his place, but as he is not, it is not my fault. He commences with a warning. Will any hon. gentleman in

this House, who has watched him from his seat, year by year, say if he can recollect a single instance in which that hon. gentleman did not commence his speech with a warning? The hon. gentleman is in love and delighted with warnings. An old historical legend, which takes us away back into the times of Greece and the Trojans, tells us that there was once a prophetess by the name of Cassandra. She had the divine gift of prophecy, but it was fated that her prophecies should never be believed. She walked about the streets of Troy, and the burden of her prediction was, "Troy shall be destroyed; woe unto Troy; Troy shall be destroyed; woe unto the city of Troy." Year after year that plaintive cry of Cassandra went abroad in the streets of Troy, until the people became indignant, indifferent; and at last, when she passed by their way, they would simply say, one to the other: "It is only the mad Cassandra, let her rave." It may happen that the multiplied warnings—warnings made when the hon. gentleman was in power, and since—will become wearisome to the people, and to his party, and that when he raises his fruitful succession of warnings, the people may just jog each other as they pass by, and say: "It is only the mad—Cassandra." What are the warnings which the hon. gentleman has given us on the subject of the Resolutions? The first is this: I warn you that if you endorse that bill you will have to pay it. The second one is: I warn you if you pass the Resolutions, the Company is not bound to, and will not, complete this road by 1886. Well, Sir, that warning was effectually voided by the utterances of the Minister of Railways, who has, I hope, set that question at rest in this House. He then goes on to warn us that the road will not be built in four years; he warns the Finance Minister that he may find it hard to borrow money; he warns him that the surplus may give out—and that is a warning upon which, I am bound to say, he is particularly well able to talk. He warns him that the importations may diminish; he warns us—no, he does more, he confidently predicts—and the old Latin line comes to one's mind: *ab uno disce omnes*—confidently predicts, what? Here is what the hon. member for South Huron says:

"Then we see from declarations in this House—we see in the newspapers of a certain Province, we see in every direction, that one of the great Provinces of the Dominion is seriously dissatisfied with its financial position, and that it is not likely to consent to this \$30,000,000 being given, unless other and greater concessions are made, unless other and still greater liabilities are incurred."

That is a statement in cold blood, that if we advance this loan the demands of a certain Province will not be satisfied until another \$30,000,000 more are given to it. I give that as a specimen of the extravagant predictions of the hon. gentleman opposite; and as we know how close to probability that one is, we may take it as a fair sample of the probability of his other warnings being verified. Well, Sir, he warns us, first, that this is but the initial instalment, and again, that it may turn out to be simply a Grand Trunk affair. Sir, with reference to this Grand Trunk affair, I think the hon. member for Cardwell pretty well set it in sufficient light when he spoke on that question. I deny that they are parallel cases. I say they are as widely different as possible. In the first place, with reference to the Grand Trunk Railway, it was built by money subscribed by people abroad, which was sent to this country and used in building a road for developing and opening up this country. In the other case, all the assets and money which have been given to the Company for the building of this trans-continental line, is money which has been advanced and land subsidy which has been granted by this country—a magnificent, and I must say a sufficient subvention—one which we are not called upon to increase, and one which I do not think it is the temper of this Parliament or the country to increase, in the way of subvention or gift. Add this to the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Cardwell and the considerations which

he adduced, and I think it is patent to most hon. gentlemen that there is no fair parallel between the Grand Trunk Railway and this railway, with reference to the lien we may have upon them. The lien we have on the Grand Trunk was placed where it is because of considerations which cannot now enter into this question. It is still a liability, and the time will probably come when this liability will be met, and the country will get back what it paid into that road in the way of capital. Sir, the hon. gentleman has given these amongst other warnings. Now the only process by which we can arrive at any fair estimate of what importance we are to attach to these warnings, is to go back to the past warnings from the same hon. gentleman. If we have any doubts about the matter they can only be set at rest in that way. Let us go back to his record and collate a number of the warnings he has uttered, and if he has proved a fair and a true prophet in the past, it is possible he may do so in the present instance. But, on the other hand, if he has proved a false prophet in the past, it is quite possible that his prophecies will have the same outcome at the present time. I think if we take the budget speeches which were delivered by that hon. gentleman from 1874 to 1878, we will find prophecy and non-fulfilment running through from the very first to the very last. In 1874 he came down with his budget, and when placing his \$3,000,000 of extra taxation on the people, he concluded that he would thenceforward be able to dispense with any additional taxation, and that the prospects of the country for being able to sustain itself were fairly good. In 1875 he had reason to believe that there would be a reasonable surplus for the current year. In 1876 these confident forecasts of the hon. gentleman's are given a new turn, both by the mournful prologue with which he commenced his speech in 1876, and the still more mournful tones in which he alluded to the falling off of trade to the extent of \$20,000,000. In 1877, despite his hopeful forecasts, a deficit of \$2,000,000 stared him in the face, and he put a tax on tea to help him to meet it. But then he thinks that in that year the country is about coming to clear water, and it will be all right afterwards. But the next year comes, and there is another deficiency, and there is a foreshadowing of the hated income tax. As a man of forecast, the history of the hon. member for South Huron, from 1874 to 1878, will not make us feel that his authority in that regard is of any very great weight. But let us go from forecast to prophecy, and see how he has succeeded. Any man may make a mistake in forecast, but if a man has the divine afflatus breathed upon him, if he has the power of prophecy, there can be no difficulty in his case; if he can prophesy, and is a true prophet, his predictions will come true; if not, they will not come true. The hon. gentleman prophesied in 1878, and the subject of his prophecy was the hon. Finance Minister. He said:

"But when the people come to understand what is now being proposed, the chances of my hon. friend ever succeeding in regaining his place in this House is, if I know anything of the temper of his constituency, problematical in the last degree."

The hon. Finance Minister, however, did come back, and he is here to-day, and the fallacy of the prophecy is shown by the fact. In 1878, the hon. gentleman again lifted up his voice and prophesied—and this time he had two strings to his bow. The subject of this prophecy is the hon. Minister of Railways and the National Policy:

"The hon. member for Cumberland, when he comes back to power, if he ever does, of which I must fain express my doubt, at all events at the next election, will find himself so crippled and confined in every quarter, that if he did make some slight readjustment of the Tariff he will be obliged to settle down on the general Tariff, not affording manufactures one whit more assistance or protection than that which he now condemns on our part."

Sir, the hon. member for Cumberland did come back at the next elections, did help to introduce and to carry forward the very same Tariff policy which he propounded when he

was a member of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. In 1879 this hon. gentleman again lifts up his voice and prophesies, this time about the party. He says:

"The time is coming, and coming fast, when they will wake up from their short-lived delusion to find themselves wiser and poorer by many a million than they are to-night. I warn the hon. gentleman that then he will find that for the sake of obtaining a temporary party triumph, he and those who support him will, in the long result, prove to have utterly and hopelessly wrecked, not only their own fortunes, and the fortunes of their party, but I very much fear the fortunes of the country, that have been most unfortunately committed to their charge."

Sir, the events have spoken after the prophecy, and have shown upon what tenable grounds he prophesied. In 1880, again he lifted up his voice and prophesied, and this time he spoke about the party and the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, saying:

"They will rush upon the fate which awaits them so soon as the people have an opportunity of pronouncing their opinions at the polls."

The people had the opportunity of pronouncing their opinions at the polls. They did it in 1882, and their opinion is shown by the majority of seventy which came to back up and carry through the contract which was introduced by the Government; and, sad to relate, the prophet was left at home. In 1880, he again prophesied as follows:—

"I might recall the doom which, two years later, overtook the men who treated with scorn the warnings we had uttered. I think the country is likely to repeat its vengeance, and that, if these hon. gentlemen do not take care, the doom which overtook them in 1873 will be visited upon them in 1883."

Well, Sir, in this prophecy the hon. gentleman left himself an outlet—he said, "if they do not take care;" therefore, I suppose he will come to the conclusion that they did take care, and so avoided the trouble that he promised for them. So much for the hon. gentleman's prophecies. Now, I repeat what I said before—why should we be plagued with this continual iteration of warning and prophecy? Who can blame the people if they soon come to grow indignant and indifferent, and pass the hon. gentleman by with the words, "it is only the mad Cassandra—let her rave and prophesy." The hon. gentleman was pleased, in the plenitude of his power, the greatness of his mental strength, and the magnitude of his information, to turn to this side of the House, lift himself up in all his dignity, and ask this question: Sir, I wonder if hon. gentlemen ever look at the Public Accounts, or do they put implicit faith in their leaders? If that hon. gentleman were in his place, I would say that once in a while we do look into the Public Accounts. I remember looking at a page on which there were a great many figures, which ran from 1868 to 1883, and the only places where I found a minus sign were opposite the years in which the hon. member for South Huron happened to be Financial Minister. Yes, Sir, we do look at the Public Accounts; we learn a lesson from them, and the lesson bids us beware of trusting the finances of this country to the hon. member for South Huron again. Well, Sir, that hon. gentleman went a little further a short time afterwards and said: "Now, my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces may not be as well aware of the past history of Canada as I am, and my friends around me." The hon. gentleman credited the members from the Maritime Provinces with much of the effects of isolation—they had not read so much as the hon. gentleman, or informed themselves about the history of Canada. If that hon. gentleman were in his place to-night, I would venture to humbly suggest to him that the members from the Maritime Provinces and the people of the Maritime Provinces do now and then see a newspaper, do get a history of this country occasionally, and are not totally benighted, even with regard to the history of older Canada. I would remind that hon. gentleman that he came down on one occasion to enlighten the people of the Maritime Provinces, and with no very enlightening effect, if we may judge by the extent to which his visit increased the number of his followers there. I would ven-

Mr. FOSTER.

ture to suggest, as he was followed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Huntington, and as neither of these gentlemen seemed to have increased the number of their followers there, that it may only be a way of taking vengeance on the people of the Maritime Provinces, to imply here that they are not very well informed. Well, Sir, we are somewhat informed on the history of Canada. We know a few things, and amongst others we know this—we know that outside of the points I have mentioned, there are bits of history which cling around the hon. gentleman himself. We listen, Sir, to his strong assurances of his patriotism and his indignant denial that he is unpatriotic, and yet we are compelled, from what little information we have, to come to some pretty strange conclusions, in one or two instances. What are these instances? We remember, as we read the budget speeches, that, from 1874 to 1878, inclusive, that hon. gentleman in no single budget speech, refrained from hurling back upon the preceding Government accusations respecting the enormous and reckless and insane expenditures they had heaped upon the country, and the more reckless, enormous and insane obligations to which they had committed the country. But that hon. gentleman went over to Great Britain to ask a favour, and when he reached the Mother Land he had no other words, in presenting his case, to utter, than these:

"The entire debt has been incurred since for legitimate objects of public utility. The indirect advantages from these public works have been found in the remarkable rapidity with which the commerce and the material prosperity of the Dominion have been developed. The revenue has shown a continuous surplus each year since Confederation."

Either the hon. gentleman was wrong in his first statement or he was dishonest in his second, and our opinion of him is not raised when we find that, on his return he gave this reason for his contradictory statements, that it was necessary to show the silver side of the shield in the Mother Country when soliciting a favour, but he kept the brazen side, for his own people at home. The hon. gentleman speaks in indignant tones of his patriotism. On this point I have gathered some information, in a statement made by the hon. gentleman in 1882, when he occupied in this House his position of chief financial critic of the Government. He said:

"Why, Sir, I tell them to-day that Canada is a country in which no man is free to buy or to sell, to eat or to drink, to travel or to stand still, without paying toll to some extortioner or other."

If the eminently patriotic gentleman is to carry abroad statements of that kind, it becomes of the first necessity that a man with equally strong lungs should travel closely behind him, and, as these utterances go forth, cry out with a loud voice: "Nevertheless this is a Canadian patriot of the first water." I think I have taken up most of the objections which have been urged as reasons why these Resolutions should not be passed. But there are a few left out of the abundant surplus—I am glad that the hon. gentleman has a little portion of a surplus in some way—there are a few left from the salient remarks of the hon. member for Queen's which I did not quite overtake before recess and with reference to which I have a few remarks to make now. When the hon. gentleman spoke of the old landlord system of this country, and tried to make it appear that we were introducing into the North-West Territories a revived type and a perfect pattern of the old, exacting, and, in some respects, tyrannical landlord system of the old country, it is only necessary to make that statement where people can hear it to show its inaccuracy. It needs no refutation other than simply to state it. There is no analogy between colonization land companies and the land regulations in the North-West, and the old system of landlord tenure and the like which obtains in the old country. The hon. gentleman said, no doubt, that there

were bulls and bears outside who are manipulating the stock of this Company, and naughty men inside who are making capital out of it, and rival speculators who were found in every way plotting schemes in relation to this measure; but I tell the hon. gentleman that Canada has too large a stock in this road, too many of her interests are bound up in its successful completion, for us to sit idly by and see the bulls and bears tearing this to pieces, and naughty men doing their best to destroy the prospects of the Company, and rival speculators trying to obtain an advantage out of this thing in which we are deeply interested. In this question, the motto of Canada is *nemo me impune lacessit*. The hon. gentleman speaks of the enormous sums which have been expended by the Company in side enterprises. If he will make a calculation, he will see that the amount so expended does not exceed the sum of \$1,800,000, so that the sums are not very enormous compared with the expenditure and the estimated cost of the whole road. I protest against the way the hon. gentleman puts the terms of this Resolution. Any stranger sitting in the galleries and listening to the hon. gentleman will suppose that the proposition before the House was to give this Company \$30,000,000 in cash as a gift, which will never be repaid. The hon. gentleman begged the question entirely in so stating it. It is a loan which must be paid back to the uttermost farthing, or this Government will have its perfect forfeiture in the taking over of the securities given for the loan. It is not a gift but simply a square bargain. I thank hon. members very kindly for the attention they have given me. I know I have trespassed longer on your time than I should, but I trust you will pardon, in a comparatively new member, what you might not be disposed to pass over in the case of an older and more experienced member. I have never yet had an opportunity of expressing myself with reference to the railway policy of this country, and I thought it would not be amiss for me, at this stage of my political life, to give the reasons why I intend to support these Resolutions. It will not be more than a quarter of a century from this time when the next generation, looking at this completed work and at the multitude of enterprises clustering around it, will come to the conclusion that in the inception and carrying out and completion of this road, the fathers of this Canadian people acted wisely and well, and that they have raised a monument which is more imperishable than bronze, a monument which will stand to their credit and endure to their benefit so long as Canada shall be Canada, and countries shall look upon and honour public spirit.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Mr. Speaker, I shall offer no apology to the House for rising to speak upon this question. It is a question of so great importance that every representative is entitled to speak upon it. I, Sir, feel that I, too, have a duty to perform, and to the extent of my limited ability shall endeavour to do it. You can the better afford to listen to me for a short time, as to-day you have had the pleasure of listening to both Queen's and King's among the speakers, and can now afford to listen to one of the Commons. In the speech just closed by the hon. member for King's, we have seen the work of a master painter, one who has a great command of language, one who is a master in the business, and we have only to regret, Sir, that so great painting ability as he possesses should be used in whitewashing so bad a measure. Eloquence like his tends to soothe, and I presume that in the surgical operation which is to be performed, the deep incision which is to be made in Canadian credit, he will administer the chloroform, to make the cut felt as little as possible. He remarked to the member for Queen's that, at some future time, they would meet and compare notes. I presume he will follow the example of the Canadian Pacific Railway by asking the Government to endorse the notes. There is

very much of what the hon. gentleman said with which none of us will disagree. Indeed, for the first half hour of his speech, I understand that those who are more familiar with him than I, say that they always did like that portion of his speech. When he spoke of his late researches convincing him that it was possible and perhaps a proper thing for the Government to control the railways, he came very near sentiments expressed by myself during the last Session, and upon that point we should perhaps agree pretty closely, so far as to their owning and working them to an extent which would prevent the monopolies of which we stand in great danger. He spoke of the energy, the remarkable push of this Company, he referred to their push repeatedly. Sir, there is a legend on the opposite side of the House which gentlemen there are very fond of referring to, called a "big push," in connection with which it is alleged the words were used "come down handsomely." I think from the Resolutions laid before us, that this is a push of that kind on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a big push for us to come down handsomely. He lays out the plan of his argument, the field of his conflict, as between the completion of the railway in 1886 and 1891. I do not understand that to be the question before us. The railway company have not stated that they could not finish until 1891. They have said that with this great advance, they could finish in two years, but they have not stated, as put by the hon. gentleman, that it would not otherwise be finished until 1891. Yet, if that came really to be the test as between the advance and not the advance, I do not think we would change our position. The hon. gentleman alluded to himself as an independent member. Now, Sir, when I become Premier, which, I do not think, will be before 1891, unless I like the railway get a large advance, I hope I may have many such independent members, members who will confine their independence to speak against me but voting with me. Then, Sir, he took us across the ocean, to firesides in Ireland and other countries, and said many were there to-night talking about the pluck of the Dominion. Mr. Speaker, there are other firesides nearer home around which, to-night, they are talking, but it is about the plucking of the Dominion. He became very eloquent indeed upon the question of immigration, regretted that the hand of frost had closed up the rivers and the lakes so that immigrants could not reach their destination. We all know that the dead of winter is just the time for immigrants to go to the North-West—they always go on snow-shoes. He drew a feeling picture of the disadvantages a man would labour under in having to pass through other premises in going from his breakfast table to his library, comparing the North-West with old Canada, but he did not tell us which was the breakfast table and which the library. So far as that question is concerned, it is simply a question of cost. Distances are measured by the cost or passing from one to the other for either passengers or freight, and the time for talking largely about political railways is passed—I think it ended with the Intercolonial. He derives much consolation from the assurance that, of the twenty-two millions and a half to be advanced, fifteen millions is sure to go into the railway. Is it not surprising how easily hon. gentlemen become satisfied after considerable practice? He is quite contented now to know that two out of every three dollars that we vote will go into the railway. Of course, Sir, we never expect that any hon. member will rise from the opposite side of the House without attacking the hon. member from South Huron. That hon. gentleman does not require my defence. He is quite able to defend himself. He has been attacked, and will be attacked, and we know the reason. It is a very sure sign, Mr. Speaker, when you see a dozen boys pitching into one, that it is a pretty big boy they are after. Sir, we have heard much of a railway from ocean to ocean, from sea to sea. I do not understand that such a railway is before us. There is much,

indeed, about this railway that we do not see; there is a great deal that we are not allowed to see; there is considerable that is not considered good for us to see; but, the railway from sea to sea is not before the House. Mr. Speaker, I propose to direct my remarks to a railway that has a beginning and an end—not a kind of patent, double-acting, self-adjusting suction railway, that goes down to New York, Boston and Portland, sucks up business there, and discharges it on St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax. This is not the kind of railway I am going to speak about. I shall speak of a railway that is bounded by law, its sections defined by contract. That railway commences at Callander, and ends upon the Pacific Ocean, at a point fixed at Port Moody. Where is Callander? The hon. Minister said it was an unknown place, and he had to go back to Montreal to find a starting-point that would be known. Callander, Sir, is in the Province of Ontario, and is not in the disputed territory. It is a little north of latitude 46, and about longitude 79. It is 345 miles west, and a little north, of Montreal; 223 miles north of Toronto, and was the end of the Canada Central Railway, and is our starting-point. Port Moody is a few miles north of the west end of the northern boundary of the United States. It is on the waters of the Pacific, in longitude 122, and is 2,550 miles from Callander. Such is the railway, and such are its termini. The following is the manner in which it was to be constructed: from Callander to Port Arthur a distance of 650 miles, by the Canadian Pacific Railway; from Port Arthur to Red River 429 miles, by the Dominion Government; from Red River to Kamloops is 1,260 miles, by the Canadian Pacific Railway; from Kamloops to Port Moody 213 miles, by the Government; and the branch from Winnipeg to Pembina 69 miles, by the Government; in all 1,910 miles by the railway company, and 711 miles by the Government. For building this railway, or these two sections of this railway, the Company were to receive \$25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land; exemption from taxation of road forever; exemption of taxation on land, unless sold, for twenty years; freedom from duties; a monopoly in the North-West for twenty years, and the whole road their own forever. At the time this bargain was made, many considered it a hard bargain for Canada. Tradition says that opinions expressed in the lobby, and the votes given in the House differed. Tradition says that the party whip had to be administered with great vigour to keep members in line. Tradition says that when the contract was finally passed, an old supporter exclaimed: "We have saved the chief, but we have ruined the party." Previous to the contract this work had been carried on as a Government work. The Pembina Branch was built, the Thunder Bay section was being built, and the road reached westward into the prairie Province. The contract was signed, and construction was proceeded with by the Company and by the Government. (All other speakers have given a little history, and I suppose I may, too.) The Company wanted to sell stock, and the Government was applied to to guarantee dividends. The Minister of Finance has been good enough to bring down a paper showing us in what manner the Government may borrow money, namely, by the issue of debentures, by the issue of debenture stock, by direct terminable annuities, and by the issue of debenture bonds. It was the opinion of his deputy that in June last the Government were authorized to borrow to the extent of \$18,000,000. He gives this as his opinion:

"The principal in money mentioned in the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to represent \$975,000 half-yearly for ten years, was nearly \$16,000,000. So far as that amount goes, the Government of Canada was, it appears to me, within their borrowing powers."

It appears, Sir, that the Government were quite willing to borrow \$24,000,000, but the Company could not furnish the money, and therefore they only borrowed a portion—

Mr. FAIRBANK.

they took a portion of it in cash, and securities for the balance. In relation to taking security, the Finance Minister says:

"As regards the acceptance of securities from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for deferred payments, the Government made the arrangement, trusting to the support of Parliament, as the case was urgent."

The Government do not claim it was according to law. They admit it was contrary to law, but trusted to Parliament, "as the case was urgent." Now, Sir, it will be observed that all these powers were given for the express and only purpose of borrowing money. Was this power exercised for that purpose? Let us see. I will read a paragraph from the Speech from the Throne speaking of the arrangement with the Company:

"That arrangement was made on the belief that it would give steadiness and increased value to the shares on the market."

Borrowing had nothing to do with it; it was to advance the stock on the market. The thing was done—done by Ministers; Parliament was not consulted, although it was to meet in about two months. As I have remarked, the thing was done. The railway gun was charged with Government giant powder; loaded with a red hot shot, and the gun fired. But it failed to inflame the stock exchange. It missed the target. But in one sense it made a bull's eye; for it hit the "bulls" in the eye and knocked down the stock. Mr. Speaker, common people must not be blamed if they fail to comprehend how the Company could expect to benefit from this arrangement. And please mark the distinction between the Company and an individual stockholder. The arrangement was to deposit with the Government, within three months, 11½ millions of solid cash—8½ millions cash down, and the balance within three months. And what was this to do? It was to guarantee the dividends on \$65,000,000 of stock. But where was the stock? \$55,000,000 of it had been sold and had passed from the Company, as a Company, and was the Company's property no longer. The remaining \$10,000,000 was pledged for a loan. How could the Company be helped? There is something about this we cannot understand; perhaps it is

"One of those things which no fellow can understand."

What was the first result? Let me read from the Speech from the Throne:

"That arrangement was made in the belief that it would give steadiness and increased value to the shares on the market. A combination of unfavourable circumstances has prevented the fulfilment of these expectations, and the Company has not been able to obtain the required capital by the sale of its stock."

Of the first result the President said was this:

"I regret to say, however, that the arrangements so made has not attained its object in any degree."

What was the second result? The President of the Company says:

"The payment to the Government of \$8,710,240, in advance of the secured dividends, has deprived the Company of the means of continuing vigorously the construction of the road."

This result was disastrous—a result not uncommon with individuals or companies or governments, when they go out of their proper lines. As gunners on the stock exchange, the Government is not a success. In military matters, when people get dissatisfied with the artillery, they are allowed to exchange into the infantry, where the guns are not so large and not so dangerous. What is the proposition before the House? First, that no part of the \$7,500,000 for which security was taken from the Company instead of cash shall be paid until 1888. The second part is, that the Government shall loan the Company \$22,500,000; the two items—the one which we are not to receive and the one which we are to give, amount together to \$30,000,000. I will deal

only with the \$22,500,000, and for the purpose of doing so, I beg to enquire what the Company has done? The Company has, upon the section of the line from Callander to Port Arthur, constructed 160 miles, and partially constructed some fifty miles besides. It has constructed on the section from Winnipeg to Kamloops 960 miles out of 1,260 miles. What has the Company expended? The president says:

"It has expended on its main line, including the finishing of 1,130 miles, \$23,363,564"

—say \$23½ millions. What has the Company received? The president says:

"It has only received out of the entire cash subsidies and land subsidies, \$21,318,222"

—say 21½ millions. This would leave the amount of cash furnished by the Company, \$2,245,342, or say 2¼ millions. But what has the Company earned by the work now done? It has earned cash subsidy, \$12,289,211, say 12¼ millions; land subsidy earned and sold, 3,753,400 acres, sold at \$2.36 per acre, amounts to \$8,855,024, say 8¾ millions; land subsidy earned and not sold, 10,102,305 acres, which, valued at \$2 per acre, amounts to \$20,204,610, say 20 millions. It is almost unanimously conceded that it is proper to place the price at \$2 per acre. These items together amount to \$41,151,845, say 41 millions. Deduct from this the cost of the work, \$23,563,568, say 23½ millions, and \$17,588,291, say 17½ millions remain. Now, Mr. Speaker, you will remember that the hon. member for King's, in going over those properties constantly used the word "worth;" he said those properties were worth in every instance what they had cost. When he was pricing them as security he valued them at their cost; and as he seems to be appointed valuator for this Government loan society, I suppose we must take his valuation, and, therefore, no objection can be taken to my using these as values in lieu of cost. By these figures, I have shown that up to the present moment the Company have earned a profit on the work they have so far done of 17½ millions, a pretty good two year's work, and still they are knocking at the door of the Treasury for a loan. They are asking the hard-handed artisans of Canada, many of whom are living on four days' labour in the week, to borrow the money for them. Hon. gentlemen can place their own value on these lands, but the matter stands thus, under any circumstances; the Company have 10,000,000 acres of lands for an expenditure of 2½ millions on their own work. But, Sir, that is not all. You have given them the Pembina Branch of 69 miles, a branch which has paid handsomely ever since it was opened. You have given them the Thunder Bay and Winnipeg road, 429 miles, built and ironed. These two together make 497 miles, which cost \$19,000,000, and the "valuator" says it is worth it, so there is \$19,000,000 to be added to the 17½ millions. And the road they have built is their own. But that is not all. These roads, during the last ten months, have earned, according to their own reports, a net profit of \$873,000. The Company must be hard up. But, Sir, the Minister of Railways has informed us that there has been—

"An excess of expenditure on the main line by the Company over what they have received from Government sources, of not less than \$23,743,550."

The hon. gentleman has invited criticism. I accept the invitation. Let us examine the items constituting those 23½ millions. One of the items is materials and supplies, \$4,025,604, or say, 4 millions. Now, Sir, are these supplies chargeable to past work? When they are used and have gone into the railway do not they draw more money and more land? Should they not be charged where the earnings come from? When those materials are used, the Company will have a further cash subsidy, and a further land subsidy. The accountant may strike off \$4,000,000. The next item

is the dividend on stock. Has the dividend on stock gone into the construction of the railway? I may be answered that a fair charge is interest on the investment, but we are not given what the investment is, and there is but a small amount at best that is invested by the Company. It would be nothing in proportion to the net earnings. This item is \$2,128,000, and the accountant will please strike it off. The next item is the deposit with the Government, \$8,710,240, or say 8¾ millions. Has the deposit made to secure future dividends to the stock-holders gone into the construction of the road? No man can contend for a moment that it has, and the accountant will please strike off 8¾ millions. It seems to me that the Minister's 23½ millions is getting winter-killed; it is shrinking worse than frosted wheat. In the language of a celebrated railway man, in New York, it seems to be going

"Where the woodbine twineth."

There is an item for rolling stock. I may be told that a railway does not amount to much unless it has rolling stock. Sir, in paying these subsidies, does the Government take the rolling stock into account? But we are asked to be liberal—it is the people's money, let us be liberal, and the most recent translation of the word liberal, I believe, is "patriotic." I have sometimes wondered what the "liberal" portion of the Conservative name meant. We are getting light on that subject. For the present I will allow this item of \$6,130,792 for rolling stock. There is also an item for tools. Sir, I decline to discuss the question of tools. We were told that the *Globe* newspaper was part of the rolling stock of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I shall not deal with this question of tools until we have the items. These two items, the 2¼ millions of excess of expenditure by the Company over receipts, as stated by the Company, and the rolling stock, together amount to \$8,376,134 cash invested by the Company in building the railway, and in its rolling stock, which has earned \$20,000,000 worth of land, and \$19,000,000 worth of railway, which we have given them. The Company has invested in building the railway and in rolling stock, \$8,376,134. That will never do; and the Government seem to be alive to the fact that this Company must not have any money in the railway. The first 7½ millions of what we are asked to vote is to go to pay their debts. Take the \$7,500,000 from the amount they have invested, that is, \$8,376,134, and the balance is \$876,134. The net earnings for the last ten months only were \$976,426, leaving a balance of \$102,332 of moneys they will receive more than they have put into both rolling stock and railway. I repeat it, Sir, this does not leave a single dollar of money furnished by this Company, composed of men of such tremendous financial power, for the railway or the rolling stock, up to the date of that paper. And what of the future? The president, in his circular of December 29th, 1883, says:

"It has been ascertained that the cost of finishing the line will not exceed \$27,000,000."

What are the Company to receive? They are yet to receive, of cash subsidy, \$12,710,788; of land, 11,244,295 acres, equal, at \$2 per acre, to \$22,488,590; 313 miles of railway which we are building, and which is estimated to cost \$9,000,000; a total of \$44,199,378. Under the contract as it now stands, the Company would own, of finished railway, from Callander to Port Moody, including the Pembina Branch, 2,619 miles; and 21,246,600 acres of land, for an expenditure of \$16,534,555. Valuing the lands at \$2 an acre, they have the road for nothing and \$25,958,645 besides. Our present contract is very easily and very simply stated. Under that contract, it would cost us: \$5,000,000 for surveys, \$28,000,000 for road constructed, \$25,000,000 in cash bonus, and 25,000,000 acres of land equal, at \$2, to \$50,000,000, making a total of \$108,000,000. And this is the state of matters under which

we are asked to borrow money to lend to the Company, to the extent of \$22,500,000. Mr. Speaker, we have been forced to deal with millions. They have been tossed about as things of small account. One would suppose, indeed, that they had been toys of the hon. gentleman's childhood. I wish to come down for a time to figures within my comprehension, and for this purpose I propose to divide this \$22,500,000 amongst the various constituencies of the Dominion of Canada. We have, I believe, 211 members. Let us see what proportion of this amount rests upon each hon. member of this House, or rather upon the people he represents. I find it to be in round numbers one hundred and six thousand dollars (\$106,000). Now, were hon. gentlemen opposite, were any of us, sent here with directions to make this loan? Was it part of our marching orders to lend \$100,000 to this Company on behalf of our constituents. If the question were put squarely and plainly to them, divested of all clouds and cobwebs and obstructions: "Are you, a county or section of a county, as the case may be, prepared to lend your money on credit to the extent of \$100,000?"—what would be the answer? I think we know what it would be. And why is the loan asked? There is but one reason given for this loan. There are two, but there is one which, to most of our minds on this side of this House, at all events, would be a secondary one—I allude to the effect upon the Conservative party. The one question we have to deal with is the loan for the purpose of completing the railway in two years. Do we feel authorized to compel our people at home to make this loan for this purpose? For one, I do not. I do not find it to be part of my duty. There is another point that must be considered—what will the cool-headed money-lenders of England say? How is it going to affect our credit? We are at present large borrowers, our debt at present amounting, in round numbers, to \$200,000,000. This debt is from time to time maturing. Certainly we cannot pay it, and we must borrow again. The rate at which we can borrow depends upon our financial standing; the interest we shall have to pay depends upon our credit; and it requires but little knowledge of business to know that credit depends largely upon the extent to which it is used. We have been informed, time and again, that the progress of the North-West is to be credited to the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The progress of the North-West did not commence with the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. No sooner had the North-West ceased to be a muskrat preserve for the Hudson Bay Company, than it began to attract attention, and immigrants began to go in. They went by the Dawson route, by Lake Superior and the railway to Moorehead; thence by Kittson's steamer, and later on by the American railway to the Canadian frontier. The North-West had prospered considerably up to the time it was attacked by grasshoppers—may it never be attacked by anything worse. I think it was in 1875 that the grasshopper made its raid on the North-West destroying every green thing; but following out the principle of insect life, that when an insect becomes too numerous it breeds a parasite that destroys it—I do not know but this applies to governments as well—the parasite attacked the grasshopper and the grasshopper had to go. It took a few years to recover confidence, but confidence was restored, and the North-West prospered. Perhaps the rapid construction had something to do with the boom which, amongst the North-West misfortunes, is not second to the grasshopper. Fever in business is not any better for business than fever is for man. It does not give it any strength. Rapid construction is said to advance the value of labour, to advance the rate of wages. Very likely it did. I do not know what the wages paid were. But to whom were the wages paid? It is a notorious fact that nine out of every ten men at least, of those who worked upon this rapid construction, were from the

Mr. FAIRBANK,

United States. They were not our people, but railway men from the United States. Did these men remain when they had done the work? No, Sir; they obliged the railway to take them back. At first the railway company objected, but in the end they did send them back. The men stopped in Winnipeg, and the reports are that they took sundry drinks there and then went home. The supplies, to a very large extent, came from the same source, as the North-West was too young to furnish the supplies for the new line. Had the building gone on less rapidly, a much larger portion of the money expended would have remained in the North-West. I was speaking of the wages and who got the wages. But there is another point—who paid the wages? I have shown you it was not the Canadian labouring man who got the wages, but it is the Canadian labouring man who pays the wages. Every man in Canada who consumes a dollar's worth of goods, paying either duty or excise, contributes to those high wages. There was another result of rapid construction. Rapid construction caused a rapid payment of the subsidy, and rapid payment of the subsidy caused a rapid drawing upon our banks last season. That rapid drawing was the cause, to a considerable extent, of the contraction which many a man in Canada will remember to the day of his death. There is, Mr. Speaker, such a thing inhuman affairs as going too fast. Much time has been spent in proving the good security that is offered; and, if we take the valuation of the "Government valuator," the security ought to be considered ample. But the man or the company that has good security to offer can always get money at money's value. Let those having this unquestionable security go into the money markets of the world and borrow their money. We are not money lenders. But, notwithstanding the good security, hon. gentlemen opposite have taken a great deal of trouble to show us what condition we will be in, in case of the Company's default. The hon. Minister states sundry expenditures, in which he includes the lands that the Company has sold and got paid for, amounting to some \$7,500,000, but he says nothing about the land the Company did not sell among the debit items. He includes the cash subsidy, the money we are now to vote—indeed, we can find no fault with what he includes in money—and he sums up \$97,000,000. Then, he asks what shall we do with the lands?—the land that was not sold. Do exactly that which you do with other lands when you sell them. Credit them to wild lands and not to the railway to which you have not charged them. But at the conclusion he says: I credit the railway with the 21,246,600 acres at \$2 an acre, making \$42,493,200. He credits this to the railway, but he did not charge it to the railway. That is a kind of single entry that will not do. Why did the hon. gentleman stop here in his calculations? Why did he not go on and sell 27,000,000 more acres of public lands and credit them to the railway. Then the railway would have cost nothing. If land business continued good, he might have sold more and made a railway dividend. The hon. gentleman's calculations are wrong—wrong—to the extent of 42½ millions, as the hon. member for West Durham has stated. But, defeated in this direction, he may attempt a masterly retreat by claiming that the lands would be of no value without the rapid construction. The railway adds to the value of the lands, and the lands add to the value of the railway, and settlers add to the value of both. But were the lands of no value before this rapid construction? Providence, in its wisdom, created but one St. Lawrence, with its enlargement of the great lakes, and in its goodness gave it to Canada. The difficulties in its navigation, owing to its rapids and the great falls of Niagara, have been overcome by an expenditure, on the part of Canada, of over \$40,000,000. The obstruction at the Sault Ste. Marie has been overcome by the American canal. Through it we pass to Lake Superior and arrive at Thunder Bay, the uppermost port within Canadian territory. At that point we are 1,000 miles west

of Montreal, and, calculating from the nearest Canadian winter seaport, St. Andrews, we are two-fifths of the way across the continent. From this point the Government, at our expense, had constructed a railway to Winnipeg, and were constructing a railway into the Prairie Province. Had that key to the North-West been maintained, had we continued to hold the line from Lake Superior, our inland seaport to the Red River, and pressed our railways on into the Prairie Province, throwing out branches by the way, would the land have been of value? I believe it would have been of double the value it is to-day. Permit me to quote what the railway company itself says in relation to the present facilities for reaching the North West:

"The Canadian Pacific, through rail and water route, to the west by Algoma, and Lakes Huron and Superior.

"On the opening of navigation in the spring of 1884, the new rail and water route from Montreal to all parts of the North-West will be opened. In comparison with the all-rail route by Chicago and St. Paul, passengers will be saved the fatigue and expense of 300 miles of travel, and, apart from this, and from the fact that their journey to Winnipeg will occupy much less time than by the railroad, it will be robbed of its monotony by a trip through the world-renowned inland sea."

I have very little sympathy, Mr. Speaker,—I have no sympathy with that sentiment which speaks of the enormous obligations of the North-West to the old Provinces. The old Provinces had debts which the inhabitants of the new Provinces will share with us in paying. Money expended in these rail-roads and other expenditure has been largely borrowed. The settlers of the North-West will bear their share of the payment. The expenditure was by no means made exclusively for their benefit, and I do not think the so-called great sacrifice that the old Provinces have made can justify an export duty being placed upon the wheat produced in the North-West. I know it is not called by that name, but it is the same in effect. I do not think we are justified in denying them their rights to build their own highways; railways are the highways of to-day. I do not think that we are justified in denying them their natural geographical advantages. They have not too many of them. Give the people of the North-West a low freight to Thunder Bay, where they can command and fetch into competition all the carriers of the continent; give them fair railway accommodation upon the prairies, which is easily and cheaply built; remove from them the monopoly, and you will make them contented and happy. I think our true policy in relation to their business is to draw it and not to force it. We are told that one of the reasons for this application for money is that the Company cannot sell its land. Why not? I will tell you, Sir. It is because they retain a mortgage upon it. They retain a mortgage that runs for twenty years, and the terms of that mortgage are that everything that the man who occupies their lands buys or sells shall be carried by them, practically at their own rate. Those are the terms of the mortgage, and it applies not only to the railway lands, but to all the lands owned by individuals or by Government—it applies to the entire North-West. Shall I be told that the railway company is restricted; that it can only charge a profit of 10 per cent.? Does any man acquainted with railway history place one figs worth of value upon that restriction? If I am not wrong in my information, I believe there is just such a restriction upon the most wealthy railway company in the United States, the balance was to go the State. Yet the State has never received a cent, and never expected to, and never will. Ten per cent.! When the railway company shall have received the \$7,500,000 which is proposed to be given them, they will not have a dollar in the railway; and during the last nine months, they have received a net earning of \$900,000. Will some ready reckoner please tell me what that percentage is upon something less than nothing? They have less than nothing invested in it, and they receive an earning of

\$900,000. It has got beyond my arithmetic. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) told us that they did not object to the Mackenzie Administration building a railway, but they objected to its building two ends and leaving the centre unbuilt. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no great "political exigency" at the present moment, I believe. I am well aware that this argument was used some five or six years ago, about building the two ends and leaving the middle unconstructed, but really I think it is time for sensible men to drop that argument. There is not money enough in British North America to have built the centre of the railway, until the two or one of the ends were built. What have they been trying to do for the last five or six years? What is their press now reechoing through the country? Talk about building the middle of the railway. Talk about building a railway 200 miles inland from Thunder Bay, taking in your supplies on the backs of Indians and in birch canoes. I should like to see one of these Howe truss bridges taken in that way. The hon. member for Cardwell also gave us an illustration from an editor in Dakota, who, by a freset, was driven to the upper story of his building, and sitting upon a high stool, with his feet upon a chair, wrote: "Magnificent overflow." The hon. gentleman commended that sentiment; he would have us imitate it. I infer from this, that when the flood of Dominion expenditure rises to our arm pits, we are to exclaim "magnificent!" When it rises so that we have to stand on tip-toe, to prevent it from getting into our mouth, we are to shout "glorious!" I suppose, Sir, we may take this as a key to what we may expect from the hon. gentleman himself. When he shouts loudest the floods will be getting highest, and from the manner he shouts now I judge it is getting rather damp where he stands. Mr. Speaker, I like pluck—in fact, I admire it—but when we are acting as trustees for the people we should exercise a little caution and discretion. The hon. gentlemen opposite are exceedingly fond, recently, of lecturing us upon patriotism. It has been my observation that when a man is inclined, constantly, to boast of his piety, the church needs to look after him. When a man is constantly boasting of his honesty you don't want to take that man's note unless it is well endorsed. And when an hon. member is continually shouting patriotism, it is an indication that he has either got his hand pretty near the public chest, or wants to. Whether it is more patriotic to point out and try to avoid a danger or to conceal it? And about this lecturing us upon patriotism. Do the hon. gentlemen opposite own this country? Are we on this side of the House tenants in arrears and liable to eviction? If so, may "our flight not be in the winter." What is the result of these figures? It has been shown that the Company, by its own figures and its own way of putting them, has expended upon construction up to this time, \$23,563,564, say 23½ millions. It will cost to finish it 27 millions more, or a total of 50½ millions. Government has paid, and is to pay, 25 millions; cash receipts from land sold, 8½ millions; proposed grant, 2½ millions, making a total of 56½ millions. Take from that the 50½ millions, and \$5,000,000 remains. So, at the conclusion, the Company will have a finished road and over 21,000,000 acres of land, not a dollar of money having been furnished by them, and with \$5,000,000 in spending money. Mr. Speaker, if we are to furnish all the money, what is the good of the Company? Will this money come back to us? Experience says, no. By entering into this agreement, I fear the Government are forming a dangerous alliance; I fear that we are drifting into the position of having the hon. Minister, king, and the Railway Company viceroy over him. Mr. Speaker, I must thank the House for the attention with which it has listened to my remarks.

Mr. CURRAN moved the adjournment of the Debate.  
Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 11.45 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 13th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adoption of the First Report of the Committee appointed to supervise the Report of the Debates.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. WHITE. The recommendations cover the appointment of a French proof reader and a translator from French into English.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to enquire from the hon. gentleman whether any arrangement has been made for improving the proof reading of the original, the first English edition. He must recognize the fact that the proof reading is abominable—I will not say this Session because I have not looked at the *Debates*, but it has been abominable in the past. It is apparently done by a person who has a very limited vocabulary. I observe that words which are in the slightest degree out of the ordinary run are turned, irrespective altogether of the sense and application of them, into some other words which the proof reader fancies they must mean, because he does not know what the words are; and really that which we get in the first instance, or rather did get up to the commencement of this Session, is entirely discreditable.

Mr. WHITE. I think if the hon. gentleman examines the reports this year, he will find a very great improvement has taken place in that respect. I quite concur in his condemnation of the proof reading during past Sessions, but the adoption of type-writing has secured better copy for the printers, and they are able to set up the matter a great deal better than last year. So far as I have examined the reports this year, I have found a very great improvement; and I am inclined to think the improvement will go on, and we shall have less cause of complaint than in the past.

Motion agreed to.

### REPORT.

The following Report was laid upon the Table:—

Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. —(Mr. McLelan.)

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 85) respecting the Huron and Erie Railway.—(Mr. Smyth.)

Bill (No. 86) further to amend the Patent Act, 1872.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Mr. FAIRBANK.

### THE INDIAN ACT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in introducing Bill (No. 87) further to amend the Indian Act, 1880, said: I will not trouble the House with details of the amendments proposed in the working of the Act; they are a series of amendments which experience has shown to be required.

Bill read the first time.

### INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY EXHIBITION.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint a representative of Canada at the next International Forestry Exhibition, to be held next summer in Edinburgh (Scotland)?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the several Provincial Governments have been asked to attend the Forestry Exhibition, and as they own the forests, it is presumed that any representatives to this Forestry Exhibition will be appointed by them, and not by the Dominion.

### UNION STATION AT THE TRAVERSE.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, Whether the Government has come to any understanding with the Grand Trunk Railway Company and with the Quebec Central Railway Company, respecting the joint construction, at the place called the Traverse, of a station which will serve for the three companies, and what is the understanding in question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The matter has not yet been finally determined.

### ST. CHARLES RAILWAY.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, What is the date, as nearly as possible, on which the Government intends to deliver up the St. Charles Branch line of railway to traffic, and to throw it open to the travelling public?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The date at which I expect the road will be opened will be the 1st of July of this year.

### TARIFF OF THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, Whether the Government has ever bound itself to arrange the tariff of the Intercolonial Railway, between St. Charles and Quebec, in such a way that the distance between these two places should be computed as if the St. Charles Branch was completed? If it has so bound itself, whether the tariff has been amended to accord?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the tariff was lowered in such a way as to carry out that object at the time, and it will probably not be necessary to make a further change during the brief interval which will elapse until the opening of the road.

### THE CLAIM OF CHARLES JOSEPH LISLOIS.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) enquired, Whether the Government have in their possession any report whatsoever made by one of the Dominion arbitrators, in relation to the claim presented by Mr. Joseph Charles Lislois, asking for an amount sufficient to cover losses sustained by him from the burning of one of his buildings in September, 1879? Does the said report declare that the said fire was caused by one of the Government locomotives on the Intercolonial Railway? Is it stated in the said report that, in equity, the Government is bound to pay to Mr. Joseph Charles Lislois the amount claimed? Does the report fur-

ther state that the sum claimed is not excessive? Is it the intention of the Government, if the report is of such purport, to reimburse Mr. Joseph Charles Lislois for the amount of his losses on the occasion aforesaid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that the Government have a report from one of the Dominion arbitrators on the subject. My answer to the second paragraph of the hon. gentleman's question is, yes. My answer to the next paragraph, is also in the affirmative. In answer to the next, I would say that the report does state that the sum claimed is not excessive. To the last question my answer is, no. The Department is advised by the Department of Justice that they can only pay legal claims.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE WINDSOR CUSTOMS OFFICE.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether W. Bushell, D. Brassard, and J. Lang, or either of them, have received appointments in the Customs office at Windsor; and if so, at what rates?

Mr. BOWELL. None of these were permanent appointments. Mr. Bushell was placed on the temporary list on the 15th of January, 1883; Mr. Brassard on the 15th of January, 1883, and Mr. Lang on the same list on the 1st of December, 1883. They are there still, and each receives \$1.50 per day.

H. H. SMITH.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) enquired, Whether a person named H. H. Smith is at present in the employment of the Militia Department at Toronto; if so, when did his employment commence, what is the nature of the service performed, and what is his salary? Did he occupy any other position in the service of the Government; and if so, for what length of time, and at what salary?

Mr. CARON. I beg to state that Mr. H. H. Smith is not at present in the employ of the Militia Department at Toronto.

#### STATION ON THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. McINTYRE enquired, What steps have been taken for the erection of a booking station at Peake's, on the line of the Prince Edward Island Railway, in accordance with the prayer of three petitions forwarded to the Department of Railways and Canals at various periods? If no steps have been taken, when may such be expected?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No steps have been taken towards the erection of a station at the point named, as it is considered that the present traffic will not warrant it.

#### ADVANCE TO THE EXCHANGE BANK OF CANADA.

Mr. HOLTON enquired, When the hon. A. W. Ogilvie and Mr. Alexander Buntin offered their personal security to the Government for the last advance of \$100,000 to the Exchange Bank of Canada, did the hon. Finance Minister require them, or either of them, to exhibit a statement of their affairs, in order to enable him to determine as to the sufficiency of the proposed security?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. My answer to the hon. gentleman's question is, certainly not.

#### BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. REID enquired, Whether the Government has received any communication from the Government of British Columbia in reference to the better defining the boundary

line between that Province and the North-West Territory? Is it the intention of the Government to better define the boundary line between British Columbia and the North-West Territory on that portion which follows the general course of the Rocky Mountains; and if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has not received any communication from the Government of British Columbia in reference to this subject. There is, indeed, no necessity for any such better definition, as the statute provides clearly what the boundary is. There has been no communication as to the marking of the line on the ground. I may say, in answer to the last part of the hon. gentleman's question, that it is not the present intention of the Government to better define the boundary, because it is a very expensive work, and there is no immediate necessity for it.

#### WHARVES AND PIERS OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES enquired, Whether the engineers sent to inspect and report upon the wharves and piers of Prince Edward Island last summer, have made their report yet? If so, whether the Government intend to take over any and which of the piers in the said Island, and what sums are to be allowed the Province therefor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the engineers who have been employed under the Chief Engineer of my own Department, to inspect and report upon the wharves and piers of Prince Edward Island, have made reports to the Department, and that the Chief Engineer is now preparing a report to me on the subject.

#### GRANTS TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. DUPONT (Translation) in moving for a statement of all sums paid by the Government of Canada on account, or in full payment, of the subsidies voted to the several railway companies mentioned in chapter 25 of the Act 46th Victoria, 1883, said: Mr. Speaker, last year when the hon. Minister of Railways caused the Federal Act of Dominion railways to be amended, one of these amendments was to the effect that the different lines of railways connected with the great trunk lines under the control of the Government, should thereafter be considered as enterprises for the general welfare and benefit of the Dominion of Canada. This amendment was received with favour by this House and by the people. The consequence of this amendment is that these railways being enterprises for the general benefit of the Dominion, it has become necessary to subsidize them, and it became the duty, not of the Provincial Governments but of the Federal Government to furnish the subsidies. This consequence is altogether rational, and flows out of the Act of Confederation itself, because, Mr. Speaker, the Provinces would be in quite an abnormal position if they were obliged to subsidize the building of railways which after all would only be the means of giving greater trading facilities, of opening out the country to colonization, of increasing the resources of the Federal Government and of diminishing, at the same time, the resources of the Provincial Governments. An increase in the population means an increase of the revenue of the Dominion Government, and on the other hand, an increase of the population and the settlement of our unsettled territories, signifies a decrease of the revenue of the Provincial Governments. Now if we wish to act in good faith and to give our constitution its real meaning, we cannot help admitting that those enterprises which are calculated to develop trade and to increase the revenue of the Dominion Government, must also be fostered by that same Government, and not by the

Local Governments whose revenues must be diminished by the increase of population and by the lessening of forests in the territories within their jurisdiction. No other construction can be put on the Constitution, otherwise you would arrive at a nonsense. Public works—that is the principle—must be paid by those who are to reap the benefits thereof. On the other hand, this amendment to the Railway Act was followed a few days afterwards by resolutions introduced by the hon. Minister of Railways, whose resolutions were to form the basis of a measure for the relief of certain railways mentioned in chapter 25 of 46th Victoria. These railways were colonization roads, roads built for the purpose of opening to civilization the yet unsettled parts of the different Provinces, and of opening up by this means, to our surplus of population, very rich and very fertile territories in which to send our settlers who, each year, are leaving us in great numbers either to settle in the plains of the western part of the United States of America, or to go and ingulf themselves in the manufactures of the New England States. The Federal Government and the hon. Minister of Railways have on that occasion obtained, for the adoption of that measure, the support, not only of the whole Conservative party in this House and in the country, but also that of a great number of the hon. members of the Opposition who supported that measure, which also received the general approbation of the people of the Dominion of Canada and of the Province of Quebec in particular. By this measure the Government showed to the people of the Dominion what use they intended to do with the large surpluses which the National Policy has been the means of accumulating in the public Treasury. These surpluses, Mr. Speaker, had necessarily to be employed in a profitable manner for the benefit of those who were called upon to furnish the revenue of the Federal Government. Now this surplus could not possibly be employed in a manner more profitable to the people of the Dominion than by aiding the construction of railways calculated to promote and increase our trade. Moreover, by this means the various parts of the Provinces of the Dominion, which were not yet settled although they had a fertile soil, capable of giving a livelihood to thousands and even millions of people, were opened to colonization. In fact, it must not be forgotten that colonization is hardly commenced even in what is called the old Provinces of the Confederation. If we glance over the extent of the Province of Quebec, we find that it comprises 120,000,000 acres of land. Out of this number of acres, what was the extent of improved land at the time of the census of 1871? We find that there was then in round numbers 11,000,000 acres of land owned by people now residing in the Province, and out of this number of 11,000,000, only 5,703,944 acres could be considered as being cleared and fit for farming, or hardly one-eighth or one-ninth of the settling lands of the Province of Quebec. Well, Mr. Speaker, am I not justified in saying that what we are agreed to call the territory of the old Provinces of the Confederation is really a new and virgin territory, since hardly one-eighth or one-ninth of that of the Province of Quebec is actually used for agricultural purposes. As I said a moment ago, there are in all the Provinces of the Dominion immense areas of land which are not yet used for agricultural purposes, and in the Province of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives, I must say that the uncleared lands lie mostly in the valleys containing the best settling lands. Those which appear to offer the greatest advantages to colonization are the valleys of Lake St. John, of St. Maurice, of Gatineau, Gaspesia and the surrounding territory. The valley of Lake St. John is an immense territory situated at a distance of over a hundred miles from the city of Québec, inaccessible to trade, surrounded by a range of mountains, but still excessively rich for agricultural purposes. Thanks to the subsidies generously granted by the Provincial Govern-

Mr. DUPONT.

ment, and by the Federal Parliament at their last Session, a railway is now being built in those parts. This territory of Lake St. John is inferior to none of the settled parts of the Province of Quebec, not inferior to the valley of the St. Lawrence, nor to the fertile valley of the Richelieu, nor to that of Yamaska, nor to the Eastern Townships. There is in that region, I repeat it, immense territories, and the unsettled part of it, is as large as all the area now settled in the Province of Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we should have a railway so as to be able to send settlers in that direction. If it was necessary to quote statistics to demonstrate the fertility of this vast territory, I would have only to refer to what has been written by men who have visited it with reference to its fertility and the advantages it offers to colonization. If we were to make comparisons, it would be found that, as far back as 1871, the agricultural products of the valley of Lake St. John were in no way inferior to those of other parts of the Dominion of Canada, either in wheat, barley, or any other cereals. In fact we find that in 1871, the county of Chicoutimi, with a population of 17,423 inhabitants, produced 136,099 bushels of wheat, or 7,780 bushels per thousand inhabitants. The county of Simcoe, in the Province of Ontario, which is considered as having the most fertile soil in the country, with a population of 57,389 inhabitants, has given, of wheat, in 1871, 509,965 bushels, or 8,886 bushels of wheat per thousand inhabitants. The celebrated Muskoka District, in the Province of Ontario, towards which flows the tide of immigration and where there is a multitude of lines of railway, one of which receives a large subsidy from Toronto, with a population of 3,470 inhabitants, has produced 44,631 bushels of wheat, or 8,836 bushels per 1,000 inhabitants. Now, Mr. Speaker, as will be seen by this statement, the soil of the valley of Lake St. John is inferior to that of no part of the Dominion, even the most celebrated wheat districts. The comparison I have just made is taken from the figures found in the census of 1881, and for all of that, it must be said in favour of Lake St. John that the culture of wheat and other cereals is not pushed there with as much energy as it might be if there were facilities of communication to enable the farmers of this rich country to transport their produce to market. What has been said of the fertility of the valley of Lake St. John may also be said of the celebrated valleys of the Gatineau, the Lièvre and the Rouge, in the counties of Ottawa, Argenteuil and Pontiac. In that region also, there is an immense territory interspersed with lakes, traversed by rivers, and offering immense advantages to colonization, richly covered with timber and fit to receive hundreds of thousands of inhabitants, millions of souls, I may say, if there were only roads to reach these rich valleys and these fertile lands. And what has been said of the Gatineau Valley may also apply to Gaspesia, if not for farming, at least for another kind of production, for that country is also very large, offers immense advantages to colonization, and is, besides, a country where fisheries of various kinds might be carried on with advantage if there was, during all seasons of the year, communication through which the produce could be sent to market. It is true that navigation on the coast of Gaspesia enables the fishermen to transport their produce to the various markets of the Dominion, and even to the American markets, but their commercial transactions are interrupted during the winter months. For five or six months in the year, they are doomed to a seclusion which is very disadvantageous to this numerous class of citizens. Mr. Speaker, if I was called upon to inform the House by means of statistics, of the richness of the fisheries of Gaspesia, I could not quote a better authority than that of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin), who has always taken so much trouble and who, for a number of years, has given so much attention to the development of the fisheries of Gaspesia. I find a statement of the production of those fisheries in one

of his speeches, made in 1871, at the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, when they were discussing the question of subsidizing the Bay of Chaleurs road. This is one of the patriotic speeches pronounced by the hon. member for Gaspé, who has always taken great interest in the development of the resources of that country, and who has succeeded in a great measure. The hon. member showed that, as far back as 1871, there was from the coast of Gaspeia an exportation of fish amounting to over 26,000,000 lbs.; this would go far to furnish the necessary traffic for a railway. But it may be objected that before building railways through those vast territories, the territories themselves must be colonized. Where would we be now, Mr. Speaker, if we had always followed this kind of reasoning? Where would the North-West be? What would be the condition of a great part of Upper Canada? How would it be with the Eastern Townships if, before constructing railways and giving to these settlers the required facilities of communication, we had waited for the population to cross the mountains and go hundreds of miles away from commercial centres? If we had followed such a line of conduct, the result would have been that none of the parts of these regions through which no navigable river flows, would be settled to the present day. But this objection does not hold, for in reality there is already a colonization in those fertile valleys, because to-day the county of Gaspé whose population was only 18,000 souls in 1871, has now a population of 25,000, in spite of all the difficulties of communication and in spite of all the obstacles that stand in the way of colonization in that vast territory. The surplus of population which goes to the United States each year comes out of the counties which are fully colonized. The county of Rimouski, which lies in that direction, had a population of 27,000 souls in 1871; to-day its population amounts to 33,000. The counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, which, in 1871, had only a population of 22,000 souls, now have 32,000. In 1871, the county of Ottawa had a population of 36,000 souls, which has now increased to 49,000 souls, or a population equal to that of British Columbia, for whose benefit we are building the Canadian Pacific Railway. The county of Pontiac, which lies in the Ottawa Valley, had, in 1871, a population of 16,000, which now amounts to 19,000 souls. The population of the county of Argenteuil, which in 1871 amounted to 12,000, now amounts to 16,000 souls. So that, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the immense difficulties with which we had to contend in developing this part of the country, there has been found among our fellow-citizens zealous and enterprising men who took a deep interest in the welfare of the country, and who organized colonization societies. These men, by dint of sacrifices and energetic efforts, succeeded in developing those fertile territories and in grouping together those centres of population which now deserve to attract the attention of the Government. These groups of population have even now a right to claim that the Government who are to profit by the large trade that will hereafter take place in these counties, should open out ways of communications. Perhaps it may be asked how it is that such very fertile valleys are not to this day fully colonized. To this objection, I may answer that, if colonization is not more advanced in those parts, it is because it has been almost impossible for settlers to get there; because settlers are constantly drawn to the western plains by the high-sounding puff of the American agents; because others are drawn to the New England States, which are furrowed in every direction by railways which give easier and more rapid communication; finally, because it is impossible to find an outlet for the produce which may be raised by the settlers, and which is the result of their labours in those valleys, so remote from all commercial centres and devoid of communication. Such are, Mr. Speaker, the reasons for which these vast territories have not been colonized sooner. But it cannot be held to-day that the obstacles in the way of the colonization of

these territories are serious. Surely a young people like ours, who have constructed the Victoria Bridge in order that the St. Lawrence should cease to be an obstacle in the way of communication by rail; who have undertaken such a gigantic work as the construction of the Pacific across the Rocky Mountains, and the mountains of Lake Superior, cannot be daunted by such obstacles as are offered by the Laurentians to the opening of communications. A certain amount of courage, a certain amount of energy, and of patriotism will enable us to scale those mountains and to cut railways through them. It is high time for the Government to push energetically the policy they inaugurated last year, and the hon. Minister of Railways himself, when he introduced his resolutions during last Session, declared himself fairly frightened with the position taken by that formidable conqueror of civilization, the Rev. Mr. Labelle, who had already got in rear of the mountains, in the county represented by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright.) Labelle, the conqueror, with his valiant army, who last year numbered 10,000 combatants, and which he has probably by this time increased to 15,000, invades the county of the hon. member for Ottawa, who, instead of sending his force to repel the invaders, seems to be trying to establish communications with him. For these two men are working in common in the interest of civilization, and by opening this immense territory to civilization they will ensure the happiness of hundreds of thousands of inhabitants who will come and settle there, where they will find ease, comfort and prosperity. The hon. member for Ottawa, instead of representing, as he does to-day, a vast territory with 50,000 inhabitants only, may perhaps, when communications shall have been opened, come before this House and speak on behalf of 250,000 inhabitants. But let us leave aside all these arguments, which may be invoked by a people who wish to become great, and to prosper by taking possession of the immense domain which Providence has put at our disposal for the settling of their children; let us leave all that aside, and let us see if the imperious necessity has not dictated to the Government this policy of railway and colonization. I perfectly understand, Mr. Speaker, that a debating assembly may sometimes hesitate to make heavy sacrifices to attract to the country a large tide of immigration, because as the character of the immigrants is unknown, we do not know whether they will be satisfied with the position which we are in a position to offer them. I understand that under such circumstances, a Government may sometimes hesitate before making heavy sacrifices to attract immigration. But what I fail to understand, is that a Government should make no effort to keep in the country settlers who are, without the least doubt, most well fitted to develop our country, settlers to whom no other class in the world could compare—settlers of indomitable energy, who were the first to open out the country and who could easily—if they had facilities for communication—complete the glorious work which they had begun. Mr. Speaker, if we examine the increase of population, in the Province of Quebec, we find that there are a great number of counties whose population has ceased to increase, and that in some of the electoral divisions represented by certain hon. members of this House, the population has decreased since the last decade. And why this astounding result, Mr. Speaker? It is because every part of those counties are now settled, and the surplus of their population—which has no other outlet, but to go on the unsettled land of the Provincial Government, no ways of communication by which they could, when once arrived there, transport their produce to the commercial centers—go off. And the consequence of all this is, that the surplus of the population of these counties, now fully colonized, direct their steps towards the western part of the United States or the New England States, where our countrymen go and settle, never more to return. Thus we learn by the last census that the

population of the county of Iberville has decreased by an amount of 954 souls; that of the county of Verchères by 325; of the county of Laprairie by 400, Napierville, 1 100; Chateauguay, 2,000; Huntingdon, 900; and there are various other counties in the Province of Quebec where the population has not increased. However, Mr. Speaker, the county which I have the honour to represent, and whose population increases but slowly, because all the land is cleared, has, nevertheless, each year a large excess of population; the excess of births on deaths is from 500 to 800, which, during a decade, for a county having a population of 21,000 inhabitants, as the county of Bagot, would give a surplus of from 5,000 to 8,000 inhabitants, and by applying the same proportion to all the counties in the Province, we would have a surplus of 350,000 inhabitants per decade, taking only into account the farming population. Still, the population of the Province of Quebec has not increased by 200,000 inhabitants during the last decade; and why? It is because the population goes off towards the western plains of the United States, where there are now important groups of populations, important localities formed by Canadians, who have emigrated from the Province of Quebec. There are also in the New England States, cities which are completely under the control of people who have emigrated from our Province, and American statistics show that the French population emigrated from the Province of Quebec to the United States amounts to 600,000 or 700,000 souls. What an advantage it would be for the Province of Quebec, and for the Dominion revenue, if our Province had 700,000 or 800,000 more inhabitants than it has to-day. Mr. Speaker, if it has been a fault in the past not to have constructed colonization railways, there was at least an excuse for such an omission: there was no precedent; the direct consequence of such a course was not yet known, but to day it is impossible to conceal to ourselves the fact that there must not be any more delay, and that each one must bear his share of responsibility, and a very heavy responsibility it is, if we allow such good settlers to leave the Province of Quebec to bring in strangers in their stead. The way to check emigration, the way to diminish its proportion is, as I was saying a while ago, to construct colonization railways. Now, we must of all necessity, and the Government ought—if they were in earnest when, last year, they adopted this colonization railway policy—I say they ought to push vigorously the development of our unsettled regions. They must of all necessity give to that policy a real effect; let it not be a policy on paper; let these grants not be merely in the statutes, but let them be sufficient to enable the railway companies thus subsidized to attain the end for which they were formed—that of furnishing communications to the regions through which the railways are to pass and of opening to colonization territories which are now shut to it although they are endowed with great fertility. Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Government, received with applause last year by the House and by the country, and received with applause even by several of the hon. gentlemen opposite, for what concerned their own respective counties or Provinces, was certainly a wise one, since it received such an unanimous support. It was entirely calculated to meet the wants of the country, to meet a pressing necessity, and I hope the Government will do all in their power, so far as the resources of the Dominion will admit, and I might say, by all the means at their disposal, to render possible the rapid execution and completion of the colonization railways now subsidized.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend from Bagot. As a good deal of irritation exists in Nova Scotia because \$256,000 voted by this Parliament last year was not expended on a railway between the Strait of Canso and Sydney or Louisburg, I deem it my duty to explain the reason

Mr. DUPONT.

why. I shall do so as briefly as possible; but, in order to place our grievance intelligently before this House, it is necessary to give an outline of the railway policy which has existed in Nova Scotia, particularly since Confederation. Before Confederation, the Legislature of Nova Scotia undertook to build a railway from Pictou to Annapolis, at a cost of between \$7,000,000 and \$8,000,000. After Confederation, the Legislature of Nova Scotia found that, on account of the limited revenue at their disposal, it was utterly impossible to pay for the extension of railways east and west, and particularly east. After the agitation in Nova Scotia, between 1867 and 1869, secured better terms for Nova Scotia, the Local Legislature assumed a little more courage, and proposed to aid railways east and west. In order that I may state the policy as it actually existed, in as concise a manner as possible, I shall quote from the leaders of the different Governments in Nova Scotia relative to that policy. The first attempt to subsidize railways in Nova Scotia, east and west, after Confederation, was in 1872. The resolutions, embodying the policy adopted by the Government of the day, were presented to the House on the 5th of April, 1872, by the Provincial Secretary, and were as follows:—

"Whereas, the time has arrived when it has become expedient and necessary that an effort, alike creditable to the public spirit of the Legislature and people of the Province, should be made to extend our railway system—west from Annapolis to Yarmouth, eastwardly from New Glasgow, to Louisburg, in the Island of Cape Breton, and to encourage the construction of additional lines of railway required to develop the mineral traffic and other resources of the country; therefore it is resolved:

"1st. That with the view of aiding in the construction of a railway from Annapolis to Digby, Weymouth and Yarmouth, an allotment of Crown lands not exceeding 150,000 acres, and an annual subsidy of \$20,000 a year for twenty years, be granted to the Western Railway Company, or to any other company that may hereafter be incorporated, that will engage to construct said road under such conditions as may be necessary to ensure the completion thereof within three years after this date.

"2nd. That 150,000 acres of Crown land be granted to the New Glasgow and Louisburg Railway Company, or to any company that may hereafter be incorporated, that will construct, within five years from this date, a railway from New Glasgow to Louisburg, in the Island of Cape Breton, together with an annual subsidy equal to one-half the royalty (5 cents) yearly, payable, under the existing law, into the Treasury of Nova Scotia, for all coal raised in the Island of Cape Breton, the said annual subsidy to be paid to such Company for forty years, commencing from the time of the completion of said railway: Provided always, that the subsidy shall cease and determine whenever it shall appear that the said railway pays 6 per cent. on the capital employed in its construction.

"3rd. That with the view of attracting capital to develop the valuable and apparently exhaustless coal mines of Spring Hill district, in the county of Cumberland, a grant of land not exceeding 10,000 acres be given to the Parraboro' and Spring Hill Coal and Railway Company, or to any other company that may hereafter be incorporated, that will engage to construct a railway from Spring Hill to Parraboro', with suitable appliances at that port adapted to a large mineral traffic, together with a subsidy to such company equal to one-half the royalty chargeable, under the existing law, on all coal carried over said railway for fifteen years from the completion of the road.

"4th. That in view of the great importance of extending branch and lines of railway as soon as the means at the disposal of the Government and Legislature of this Province are adequate for that purpose, this House will grant subsidies to such branch and other lines of railway as may recommend themselves to their judgment and approval."

This was the policy adopted in Nova Scotia in 1872, and approved by a majority of the representatives of the people from the Island of Cape Breton. However, it was found that this policy was not sufficient to induce any company to undertake the work on the Island of Cape Breton; so, on the 9th of April, 1874, owing to circumstances which had arisen in the meantime, there was a change of policy in the Province. Besides the additional amount placed at our credit at Ottawa on the granting of better terms in 1869, a further sum was granted us in 1873-4, when the question of the debt between Ontario and Quebec was adjusted, the Dominion Government having assumed the debt and placed an equivalent to the credit of the various Provinces. Under this arrangement, \$1,500,000 was placed to our credit in addition to the sum already credited us. On account of that fact, the Local

Government of Nova Scotia assented to the policy, and, in reference to this point, I would quote the language of the Provincial Secretary, which is more concise than any I can possibly use :

"It would be remembered that when the Act of 1872 was introduced, the Province was expending from year to year, about the full amount that it could afford upon the public services of the country, leaving a very small balance, even by curtailing the expenditure as much as possible, in the hands of the Government to devolve to the extension of public works, such as railways. And as had been explained when the Act of 1872 was passed in order that the Eastern and Western Extension should be provided for, the Government had introduced an Act giving to the Western Counties Railway Company, \$30,000 a year for twenty years, and to the Eastern Extension from New Glasgow to Louisburg, one-half the amount of the royalty on all coal raised in the Island of Cape Breton. The Government had been obliged to adopt that policy in consequence of the fact that the \$30,000 devoted to the Western Counties Railway absorbed all the surplus revenue that the Government could then expect to save from the income. The Act in relation to the Western Counties Railway authorized the Government to enter into contract for the completion of the road from Annapolis to Yarmouth within two years; and the company had come forward last year, and entered into a contract with the Government for the performance of the work. They had made very fair progress, and had been working out some ten miles from the town of Yarmouth, and that had been done altogether from the funds subscribed by the town and by private individuals."

The town of Yarmouth deserved greater credit for the enterprise it showed in assisting railway extension west. At the close of the same year, the Commissioner of Crown Lands, who represented Cape Breton in the Government of Nova Scotia, spoke as follows :—

"A Bill had been passed last year to give a subsidy equal to one-half the royalties on coal, together with an allotment of Crown lands, to any company that would come in within two years, and give satisfactory security to construct the road from New Glasgow to Louisburg within five years. The two years had now expired, and therefore that Act was virtually a dead letter. The persons interested in that Bill had made no efforts, so far as he was aware, to carry out the provision of the Act. He had himself taken some trouble to induce those persons to give the security required, or, if not in a position to give the security, to at least offer some encouragement that if the Government bill should be re-enacted, they would do so. His efforts in this direction had been utterly fruitless, and had failed to extract even an assurance that within a reasonable time they would give the security to build the road. Under these circumstances, being desirous to secure construction of the road, and feeling that the object could not be accomplished under the Bill passed two years ago, he had come to the conclusion to support this measure, as he believed that it afforded the only means by which a road could be extended to Cape Breton. The company already chartered, Messrs. Schreiber and Burpee, had offered to build the road to Canseau, provided that the Dominion would give them the use of the line from Truro to Pictou, that the Local Government would give \$5,000 a mile, and a certain quantity of Crown lands, and he believed that in three years the work would be accomplished under this Bill. He believed that the members of the House, on both sides, would give the Bill the support that it deserved."

It was about this time that this Government and the Dominion Parliament adopted a new policy and proposed to give the Pictou Branch to aid railway extension east of New Glasgow and, the Windsor Branch to aid railways west of Annapolis. Owing to this additional subsidy granted by the Dominion Parliament to aid railway extension in Nova Scotia, it was found necessary by the Local Government to again change its policy, and on the 20th April, 1875, the then Provincial Secretary introduced a Bill, which he thus explained :

"He explained that the Bill proposed to give \$4,000 per mile to the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway, and a like sum to the Broad Cove road, and also to add \$2,000 per mile to the subsidy already granted to the Western Counties Railway, as it appeared that the work was in some places difficult to carry on, and the Company required increased aid. In considering the question whether the Province was warranted in granting the sums mentioned in the Bill, he stated the subvention already granted to the Yarmouth road was at \$6,000 for 90 miles, equal to \$540,000; that of the Spring Hill and Parrsboro' road at \$5,000 a mile for 28 miles, equal to \$140,000; the New Glasgow and Canso road \$5,000 a mile for 80 miles, equal to \$400,000; and the Canseau and Louisburg road \$5,000 a mile for 80 miles, equal to \$400,000, making in all \$1,480,000 for 278 miles of road already provided for. The present Bill proposed to subdivide the Nictaux and Atlantic road, 70 miles, with \$4,000 a mile, equal to \$280,000, the Broad Cove road, say 50 miles, with \$4,000 a mile, equal to \$200,000, and the Yarmouth road, of 90 miles, with additional subsidy of \$2,000 a mile, equal to \$180,000. These sums added to the sums already provided for as subventions, gave a total of \$2,140,000."

31

Out of this sum voted in 1875, there was a portion allowed for the Island of Cape Breton as apart from Nova Scotia. It was then considered that of the \$2,140,000 voted by Parliament \$560,000 was a fair proportion for Cape Breton. This included \$5,000 per mile from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, and \$4,000 a mile from the Strait of Canso to Sydney. This was the policy adopted in 1875, but owing to circumstances difficult to explain, it was found necessary, in 1876, to again change it, and the change did not prove more beneficial than any of its predecessors. The Bill providing for the change in 1876, was explained by the Attorney General as follows :—

"At the end of last year the Province had to its credit at Ottawa \$1,789,213, which, deducted from the total just stated would leave a balance of \$350,786 deficiency, supposing that the whole amount payable as subventions to railroads had to be expended at once, which was not the case, as the Acts in relation to the payments of these subsidies all provided for the payment as the various sums in instalments of the various works progressed. But supposing that the whole amount of the subsidies provided for had to be paid out at once there would still have to be deducted from the amount stated the sum of \$164,000 paid to the Yarmouth road previous to December 31, 1874, which would leave a deficiency of only \$186,786."

This was the policy adopted in 1876, and the policy which failed in securing any railway extension in Cape Breton. In 1882, the Local Government of Nova Scotia adopted a somewhat different policy. The Government of that day proposed to consolidate all the railways in Nova Scotia, from the Gut of Canso to Yarmouth; and in that consolidation it was contemplated to ensure the completion of a railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg. On the terms of the proposal of that Company, an allotment of \$45,000 of a guarantee was made for the Island of Cape Breton, equal to a vote of \$900,000, at 5 per cent., given as a subsidy for the railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg. At that time, the hope of the people of Cape Breton was more elevated than at any previous time, because the proposal made had allotted to Cape Breton a larger amount for the purpose of extending a railway to Louisburg than any other policy adopted by any previous Local Government. However, owing to circumstances to which I need not here refer, that policy failed. In 1883, owing to a change of Government, a different policy was pursued; and we find that, on the 11th April, 1883, resolutions were introduced to the following effect :— "First, to raise a loan not exceeding \$1,500,000 to pay and discharge the liability of the Province to the Halifax and Cape Breton Railway and Coal Company, under the provisions of the Act of the present Session, providing for the taking over of the Eastern Extension, and to repair and equip the railways mentioned in the said Act; second, to raise a sum not to exceed \$350,000 to pay the subsidy to which the Nova Scotia, Nictaux and Atlantic Central Railway Company may or shall become entitled, under the provisions of chapter 22 of the Acts of 1882; third, that a sum not to exceed \$50,000 be raised to make the necessary repairs to the Western Counties Railway between Digby and Yarmouth, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Government and the Western Counties Railway Company; and, fourth, that \$500,000 be raised for the purpose of building permanent bridges in the Province of Nova Scotia." This was the policy which the Local Government of Nova Scotia in 1883 adopted, assuming a liability, in round numbers, of \$2,400,000 for general purposes, and of \$1,900,000 for railway purposes. The obligation of paying this \$1,900,000, with the additional expenditure of \$2,000,000 on railways in Nova Scotia proper, would give the Island of Cape Breton, if that Island received a fair share of the amount proposed to be expended for railways in Nova Scotia, not \$560,000 as in 1875, but double \$560,000; in other words, over a million. During the last Session I had occasion to visit Nova Scotia, and, while there, I was informed that the railway company was negotiating with

the Local Government with a view of obtaining the Pictou Branch and Eastern Extension on terms that would ensure the construction of a railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg; and, owing to reports made to me at the time, I moved in reference to that matter in this House, and I called the attention of the House to the necessity of pursuing a policy somewhat similar to that which had been adopted by this Parliament in 1874; that is, the policy of assisting Nova Scotia as much as possible to extend the railway system east of Halifax. And I was led to believe at that time, and I had reason to believe—on account of interviews between the president and the vice-president of the Short Line Railway Company and the manager of the Company in Nova Scotia, who were then in communication with me—that an arrangement could be made with the Government of Nova Scotia, while they visited Halifax during last March, which would enable that Company to extend their railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, with some additional subsidy from this House. I was not the only one, Sir, who was led to believe that such would be the case. I find, by reference to the *Hansard*, while the subject of these subsidies was under discussion, that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in this House asked the following question:—

"I would like the hon. gentleman to make a brief statement with reference to the great American and European Short Line Railway Company's system. I observe, in looking at the papers which have been brought down, that the Company's statement is, that considerably the larger portion is already built—some 417 miles. I also observe, on looking at the map which the Company have appended to their proposal, that the eighty miles owned by the Halifax Extension Company, from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, is among the parts which they expect to acquire. I would like the hon. gentleman to state in what position that line now stands, and whether he is aware with whom the negotiations have taken place, and in what state the negotiations are which the Company referred to as having made such progress as to justify them with going on with the links.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Committee are aware that, under the legislation which has already taken place, the Government of Canada agreed to hand over the branch from Truro to Pictou for the purpose of securing the construction of the line eastward. The Government of Nova Scotia, with an additional subsidy, secured the construction of the line of railway to the Strait of Canso. Under the existing legislation, the whole of that property is, therefore, the property of the Eastern Extension Company; but the Government of Nova Scotia made a contract with that Company, which bound the Company—in case the Government, by a certain time, paid them their actual expenditure, irrespective of the subsidy which had been given to them to hand over to the Government of Nova Scotia the whole property. The arbitration provided for in that contract between the Company and the Government of Nova Scotia is now taking place. It is expected that in a few days that road from Truro to the Strait of Canso will be in the possession of the Government of Nova Scotia, and the Government of Nova Scotia are anxious to utilize that for the purpose of securing the extension of the railway system to Sydney or Louisburg, in Cape Breton. I understand that negotiations are pending between the Company and the Government of Nova Scotia for the acquisition of that line, upon terms that would secure, in connection with the subsidy provided for in this Bill, the prompt execution and completion of the line to Sydney or Louisburg. That is the position. The charter of the Great American and European Short Line Railway provides for running powers over that portion from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, independent of its acquisition in another way.

"Mr. BLAKE. The Pictou and Truro Branch cost about \$2,300,000, irrespective of rolling stock, and the Halifax extension subsidy from the Nova Scotia Government amounts to \$600,000; so that the Eastern Extension Company have received generally in money and cost \$2,900,000. Do these negotiations on the Great American and European Short Line Railway embrace the surrender of the Pictou Branch as well as the eighty miles, or simply the eighty miles?

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it covers the whole.

"Mr. BLAKE. The idea is, that thus, by the machinery through the acquisition by the Nova Scotia of the Pictou and Truro Branch and the eighty miles, we will be able to accomplish that for which we formerly agreed to give up the Truro Branch, a line through the Island."

In this way we were led to believe, last year, that the Truro Branch and Eastern Extension would be given to the Short Line Railway Company, on terms that would insure the building of the road from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg. In order to show this House, and the country, that negotiations did take place between the Short Line Railway Company and the Local Government of Nova Scotia, I have only to quote from the speech of the Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, who is a representative of the County of Cape Breton in the Local Legislature. On the 12th April, 1883, he spoke as follows:—

"The hon. leader of the Opposition has made reference to the subject of railway construction in Cape Breton, and has stated that the Bill does not provide one dollar for building a railway into Cape Breton."

That is the Bill to which I referred, in reference to subsidies aggregating \$1,900,000, for railway purposes:—

"It is true it does not, but it is equally true that by its provisions the Government are empowered to negotiate with any company or companies respecting the building of a line in Cape Breton, and though I may not hope to see it accomplished immediately, I do hope that before very long—I trust within a year—a fair and reasonable proposition will be laid before the House, and will secure the assent of the House, for the purpose of extending the line into the county of Cape Breton. I feel that any person occupying, as I do, the position of a representative of that county, might naturally desire to say to his constituents that he has provided something so distinct and positive that there was no peradventure to prevent the bringing of a railway into the borders of that county; but I may say frankly that I do not hope for that this year.

Now, Sir, he says here that he did not entertain hopes that, owing to some negotiations which took place between the Government of Nova Scotia and that Company, within a year the road would be undertaken between the Strait of Canso and Louisburg. Under these circumstances, I do not think it is very unreasonable that the people of Cape Breton particularly, should feel not a little irritated, because, from causes over which they had no control, no step has been taken for the extension into Cape Breton. There are many people in Cape Breton, and I am among the number, who believe that if the Local Government of Nova Scotia, last year, had transferred the Pictou Branch and the Eastern Extension to the Short Line Railway Company, on terms which we and that Company were led to believe they would do, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the railway on the Island of Cape Breton would have been taken before this day. I say more, Sir, that after the passage of the vote in this House last year, no company—not even the Canadian Pacific excepted—ever moved more vigorously in the construction and completion of the line from Montreal to Louisburg than did that Short Line Railway Company after the passage of the votes of last Session. But unfortunately it was not long after the surveys and actual railway operations were so vigorously commenced, that we were informed that they could not obtain the Pictou Branch and the Eastern Extension on any terms whatever. On that account, Sir, it is not unreasonable to ask why the Short Line Railway Company was in difficulty; and it is easy to understand that every reasonable person in Eastern Nova Scotia will fully realize the reasons why that project continued to be a failure up to the present time. We find, by the correspondence which has been laid before the House, that although we were deluded into believing, as late as the 21st of May last, that the Pictou Branch and Eastern Extension would be given to the Short Line Railway Company on terms that would ensure railway construction to Cape Breton—I say we find by correspondence that the Local Government of Nova Scotia, instead of intending to do what they had unquestionably promised, were negotiating the sale of the Pictou Branch and the Eastern Extension to the Dominion Government; we find by correspondence which is now in the hands of the public, dated 28th May last, that the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia telegraphed to the hon. Minister of Railways as follows:—

"In the event of delay in London and possible loss of our right, will your Government take both lines, pay Company's outlay, and return our subsidy on Canso line; if not, on what terms will you relieve us?"

This very telegram of the 28th May, even if it could only reach our hands at that particular date, would assure us that our hopes of railway extension into Cape Breton on the terms specified in the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, would be delusive. The offer was

not accepted by the hon. Minister of Railways; so that two days later the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia again telegraphed to the Minister as follows:—

“Halifax, 30th May, 1883.—If we can offer you the Pictou Branch and Extension on payment of Company's outlay and expenses of arbitration, would your Government entertain the proposal?”

Well, the proposal, after a long agitation, has been accepted. We think at present that we have nothing to do. We shall watch the proceedings; but, in the meantime, I feel myself obliged to refer to an agitation which is intended to mislead the people of Cape Breton particularly. Notwithstanding the fact that since Confederation the Government of Nova Scotia have assumed obligations for railway purposes, aggregating in round numbers \$4,000,000, we now find that that Government does not propose to expend one dollar, or contribute one dollar, to railway extension in Cape Breton. But that is not all. We find that our political opponents, in Nova Scotia particularly, twitted us for not doing more in securing railway aid from the Dominion Government. They now ignore, notwithstanding the immense obligations undertaken for railway purposes in Nova Scotia, the claim of Cape Breton to a dollar for railway purposes. And what do they say? I find that an hon. member for the city of Halifax, occupying a position in another place, to which I dare not, under the Rules of the House, refer, spoke as follows:—

“The hon. gentleman who now occupies the Chair of this House has on former occasions spoken of the Island of Cape Breton. He is not perhaps now in a position to do so, and I shall try to say a few words on that question. Of course, I have not the eloquence and ability, or the energy, that he has; but I wish to say a few words in relation to the claims of that Island. The white population of British Columbia is about 20,000; the population of Vancouver Island is about 12,000. The population of Cape Breton is 84,000. The Island of Cape Breton was settled before Vancouver Island was discovered. The 84,000 people of Cape Breton have been paying largely into the Dominion Treasury for the last sixteen years, and there has not been expended by the Department of Railways and Canals in that Island up to the present time any sum beyond some \$300,000 spent on the St. Peter's Canal, while the amount expended in British Columbia is counted by millions. Now, the Island of Cape Breton is quite as wealthy in mineral and agricultural resources, and in fisheries, as the Island of Vancouver, or any portion of British Columbia; and I cannot understand why so great a difference should exist between the treatment of the East and that of the West. It may be because the claims of Cape Breton have not been put before the Government in the same pertinacious and vigorous manner in the other Chamber that has been used in pushing forward the claims of British Columbia. I propose, a little later on, to show a way in which I think, at the present time, the Government have it in their power to assist the just claims of that section of the country. The people of Cape Breton are more reasonable in their demands and expectations than the people of British Columbia, probably because they have been so badly treated in the past. The Government will not have to spend a great many millions there to make them satisfied.”

Notwithstanding the fact that the Local Government of Nova Scotia assumed large expenditures for railway purposes, they failed to appropriate a dollar for Cape Breton. And there is another significant fact, that the hon. gentleman who spoke thus in the other House is either the agent of the present Local Government or its leader; it is impossible for me to say which, but I can prove out of his own mouth that he was acting in either the one capacity or the other. He refers to a proposition which he would make that would ensure the building of railways in Cape Breton. At the conclusion of the speech from which I have quoted, the hon. gentleman makes a suggestion as follows:—

“If the Dominion Government did not care to hand over the Pictou Branch and to make what I look upon as being a fair and reasonable arrangement with the Local Government of Nova Scotia, and decided to own the roads themselves, it would have been only fair to have repaid the Government of Nova Scotia the sum of \$800,000, or thereabouts, which that Government had expended on the extension. If they had dealt with them in that way, they would have treated the Nova Scotia Government somewhat as they are treating British Columbia in connection with the Graving Dock, the Government having agreed to pay British Columbia \$250,000, which the Local Government had expended on the Graving Dock; and I think they should have treated the Government of Nova Scotia in the same way, and repaid them the \$800,000 which had been expended by them on that road. The House will see the position in which things would have been then. If the Local Government had got that \$800,000, they would have been

in a position, and it was their intention I understand, to have aided in extending the railway through the Island of Cape Breton; but they cannot do that now, not having the money. If, on the other hand, the Dominion Government had dealt liberally with the Local Government, and that Government had been able to retain the Pictou Branch Railway, and the Eastern Extension, they would in all probability have been able to make arrangements with some company by which they could have secured the extension of the road into Cape Breton, but the Dominion Government had a giant's strength, and they used it like a giant; the Local Government are now powerless to do anything in the way of aiding in the extension of the railway into the Island of Cape Breton, and the responsibility rests with the Dominion Government.”

The hon. gentleman has published some very significant facts. The first fact made public is this: He complains that \$600,000 expended on the Eastern Extension should not have been handed by the Dominion Government to the Local Government. For what purpose? I have reason to believe that it was not for railway extension in Cape Breton. At a later stage of the Session I shall be in a position to prove it; at the present stage it is not necessary. There is another significant fact, it is that he endeavoured to create the impression all over the Province, and especially in the Island of Cape Breton, that he has taken that large and important island under his wing; and as an opponent of the present Federal Government and a supporter of the Nova Scotia Government, he would lead the people of Cape Breton to believe that he is their great friend, notwithstanding the fact that he is in perfect accord with the Local Government. In relation to giving the Pictou Branch and Eastern Extension to a company, that hon. gentleman in the speech from which I quoted, further says:

“I presume that the Government of the Dominion propose to extend the road into Cape Breton; and I trust that they will not transfer the road, as it has been said they propose to do, to some company. Our experience of company roads in Nova Scotia has not been satisfactory: the rates will be higher, and the business will be much less, in the hands of the company than in the hands of the Dominion Government.”

He admitted it was a fact that it was the intention of the Local Government to do certain things, by which we may safely come to the conclusion that he obtained a great many more facts from the Local Government. Another fact is, that the Local Government, and other people interested in the Pictou Branch and the Eastern Extension, would persistently refuse in the future, as they had in the past, to give those roads to any railway company as an aid for railway extension into Cape Breton. Having laid these facts before the House, I may conclude by making a few observations in reference to my own faith in the present Dominion Government giving all the aid they possibly can, all the aid that this House will sanction, in order to secure railway extension in Cape Breton. While I am in hopes that the Dominion Government will aid—in continuance of the policy adopted by this Parliament in 1874—the railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, I, for one, will not fail to hold the Local Government of Nova Scotia responsible for a proportion of the amount of money expended in that Province since Confederation, by the representatives of Nova Scotia proper. At this stage of the Session it is impossible to say what this Government may do; but this I do say: that they will have no reason to complain—and I believe they have had no reason to complain up to this time—that the representatives of the Island of Cape Breton did not press with all the power, ability, and tact, which they may possess, the claims of Cape Breton for a subvention to build a railway from the Strait of Canso to Sydney and Louisburg. I feel assured that when the day comes, the people of Cape Breton will give us that credit to which we are entitled for doing so, and will not fail, if the representatives of Cape Breton, in Nova Scotia, will not press our claims just as vigorously in another place, to punish them for failing to discharge their duty in that Legislature. With these remarks, I thank the House most kindly for the very courteous manner in which they have received

me on this occasion, as they always have received me, when I laboured to present my views to the House.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) deserves the thanks of the country, and the House, for bringing this important matter before them. With every word of his singularly able and eloquent speech I heartily agree. We all remember, Sir, that when the Government, two Sessions ago, introduced what was then a new policy—that is, in addition to the building of the main lines of railway, that they should aid such roads as act as feeders for these railways, the assent of the House was almost universal to that policy. Last Session when the hon. Minister of Railways brought down his Bill granting aid to certain local railways, that policy had again the almost universal assent of the House. The hon. Minister of Railways, as he usually does, made an eloquent and able speech on that occasion. With his singular knowledge of the circumstances he pointed out the great importance which this system would have in opening up new tracts of country, and notably tracts of country lying almost in this immediate vicinity—lying, in fact, almost under the very shadow of this Parliament House; opening up what then was a *terra incognita*—a new country, to settlement and development. He pointed out the great work which Father Labelle was doing in the rear of that country, and he guaranteed us—for which we were very thankful—that he would liberally aid in the construction of our Gatineau Railway. I think my hon. friend who introduced this measure deserves the thanks of the House for again bringing it to the notice of the country. While we are willing to vote large sums to build Dominion railways and promote the interests of the Dominion generally, I think we should not neglect those sections which lie in our immediate vicinity. My hon. friend, with that eloquence which characterizes him, pointed out the importance of the Lake St. John Railway, and I quite agree with him as to the importance of that railway, and the importance of developing the region of country through which it passes; but I, too, have a railway in which I am very much interested, and that is the Gatineau Valley Railway. The hon. gentleman spoke of the wheat producing qualities of the Lake St. John region. I may say that I have a statement from Father Deleage, one of those excellent missionaries who have for many years lived and laboured in the Upper Gatineau region, and he assured me that he had frequently sown a bushel of wheat, and that from that one bushel of wheat he had reaped sixty bushels; and anyone that knows that excellent gentleman, and the great work he is performing in that region, knows that his word may be implicitly relied on. In my own region the Gatineau River extends some 400 miles into the interior, taking its rise near the source of that great affluent of the St. Lawrence, the St. Maurice; and that country can only be opened by means of this railway, which we have only commenced, and which, without additional assistance, we could never build. The lacustrine system of that country is one of the finest in the world, the lakes abounding in every kind of fish to be found in Canadian waters. There is a large proportion of the land admirably suited for settlement and colonization, and hundreds of miles of fine country upon which millions of Canadian people could find happy homes. Under the circumstances, I have great pleasure in saying a word in favour of the resolutions, and I think they will have the assent of almost every hon. member.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to address the House at any length, notwithstanding the very important sentiments which have been submitted for their consideration by the hon. mover of this motion, the member for Bagot. There is no doubt that it will be impossible to  
Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

overrate the importance of the various matters which he submitted for the consideration of the House. There is no doubt at all that the opinion is growing from day to day, that the responsibility of aiding the various sections of the country must, to a very large extent, rest upon this Parliament, because by opening up new sections of country, and thereby improving the trade, we increase the revenue of the country, and the direct advantage of these railway movements very largely inures to the Federal rather than to the Local Governments. I am afraid, therefore, that with the exception of the rich Province of Ontario—and even in that great Province they do not seem able to carry on to a much greater extent the aid to local lines of railway—I am afraid that in all the other Provinces we shall have largely to have recourse to such assistance as Parliament can give in opening up the new sections of the country. The grounds for that were very ably stated by the hon. mover of this motion, and I am quite certain that the steps which the Government have taken, especially at the last Session of Parliament, will satisfy this House that we are fully alive to the responsibility that rests upon us in this matter, and that these various efforts at local improvement will receive the most favourable consideration at the hands of the Government that it is possible to give them, and that the financial condition of the country and other claims pressing upon it will allow. We all attach very great importance to attracting immigrants into our country. There is no mode in which we can do that to a greater extent than by opening up the various sections of the country to successful development, and rendering the efforts of persons who come into our country successful in carrying on their industry. But I think we shall all agree, Sir, that great as is the importance of attracting immigration into our country, it is of still greater importance, as the hon. member for Bagot has forcibly and eloquently said, to keep those people we have; and every effort we can make to render their industry successful we are bound to make, in order not only to keep them within our borders, but to attract back to the country those who have been, in the past, unwillingly, from various causes, forced to seek homes in the adjoining country. I can assure the hon. gentleman that it would be impossible to overrate the importance which the present Government attach to every effort that can be made in that direction, and that he may confidently rely upon this and similar representations receiving prompt and careful attention at the hands of the Government. If the hon. gentleman will look at the report I had the honour to lay on the Table, he will find there a detailed statement as to what took place in regard to the appropriations made last Session down to the time at which this report was prepared. Of course there has been some additional money paid out since, but the short time which has elapsed since last Session has only rendered possible the initial steps in any of these enterprises. In the case of many of the roads to which votes were granted last Session, no money has been drawn from the Treasury, for the reason that there has not been time to organize the companies that would be required to carry on these enterprises. In several instances the work has been carried forward, and considerable sums of money withdrawn; and in other cases arrangements are in progress by which it will be found that the objects the Government had in view will be carried out. In some cases it may be found that the amount of aid granted was not sufficient. It will be the duty of the Government, not only to examine the various cases of this kind which may be presented to them, but to review the action the House has already taken, in order to see in what way we can accomplish the objects in view, and perhaps to increase somewhat the appropriations already made. I do not intend to go into the question raised at considerable length by the hon. member for Inverness. So far as I was able to catch

his remarks, he was, to a very large extent, criticising the action of the Government of Nova Scotia. Now, Sir, although I have no great indisposition, as the House knows, when there is absolute necessity, to criticize an opponent as well as I am able, I have very great objection to doing so when that opponent is not on the floor of this House, and is not in a position either to justify or defend his action; and I should be very reluctant, especially as the Government of Nova Scotia is not in accord with the Government of the Dominion, to follow the line adopted by the hon. gentleman in his remarks to the House. But I will say that the action of this Government last Session, as on various previous occasions—and not this Government only, but hon. gentlemen opposite when in power—is the best evidence that can be desired that we are not disposed to overlook the importance of extending railway communication in the Province of Nova Scotia, and especially in the Island of Cape Breton; and I am quite sure it will be found in the future, as in the past, that not only both Governments, past and present, but both sides of this House, will be prepared to give a fair and candid consideration to the claims of any section, however remote, as they are placed before us.

Mr. VAIL. I am glad to hear from the hon. Minister of Railways that he is desirous of doing anything that is reasonable to extend our railways in Nova Scotia. I am sorry he could not have given a more positive assurance to the hon. member for Inverness that a certain addition would be made to the grant of last year. I listened very carefully to the eloquent remarks of the hon. member for Inverness, and I could not, for some fifteen or twenty minutes, understand exactly what his object was; but I at last discovered that it was to censure the Local Government for not having done what he knows very well was impossible for them to do, that is, build the road through the Island of Cape Breton. The hon. gentleman did me the honour to read a large portion of a speech delivered by me in the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, when introducing the Government resolutions in 1872, in which I explained what the policy of the Local Government then was in regard to building railways in Nova Scotia; and I stated explicitly that it was the desire of the Local Government at that time, if possible, to extend the road in the west to Yarmouth, and in the east to the eastern end of the Island of Cape Breton. He also knows that at the time I held office in Nova Scotia we did all that was possible towards carrying out this object. He also knows that the Local Government subsequently actually made a contract for the extension of the road eastward, with the view, if possible, of extending it through to the Island of Cape Breton. He also knows that the road was extended from New Glasgow to Louisburg, some eighty miles in the direction of Cape Breton, and that, although his own friends went into office in 1878, and held office for three or four years, they did nothing towards extending the road through the Island of Cape Breton. He knows that, but he does not acknowledge it to this House, because he would not be carrying out the object he has in view. I see what my hon. friend is preparing for. He knows that he will be called upon very soon to give a vote one way or the other on the important Resolutions before the House, and he is trying to make it appear that the Government of Nova Scotia have failed in their duty, and that the Government of the Dominion are likely to make some grant to Nova Scotia, in order to excuse himself for the vote he intends to give. He said the failure of the Short Line Company was due to the Local Government not carrying out the arrangement of last year by which the Short Line Company would receive the Pictou Branch and the extension from New Glasgow to Canso. Is it worth while to tell the House to-day that they failed on that account, when everyone who knows

anything about the Short Line knows that they were not able to half complete the contract through the country represented by the hon. Minister of Railways, that they failed early last year and have not done anything since? I would advise my hon. friend, instead of trying to censure the Local Government for doing what he knows very well it was impossible for them to do, and which the papers, when they come before the House, will show they could not do—I say I would advise him and the other hon. gentlemen representing Cape Breton in this House to bring their influence to bear on their friends in the Dominion Government to get an additional subsidy to the grant of last year in order to extend the line of railway through Cape Breton. If the hon. gentleman will have the courage to stand up and tell the Government this must be done, he will, in all probability, get the promise that that something will be done before very long. It will not do for him to try to make it appear that he and his friends from Cape Breton are very desirous of having this road completed, when they have been in this House four or five years and the only thing they have done is to ask for papers, some of which I believe have not been brought down yet. I have shown my desire, and I believe the Local Government are equally anxious, to have the railway extended through Cape Breton. I gave the hon. Minister of Railways great credit last year for having made even the small grant of \$3,200 per mile for the completion of this road. I was sorry to see it so small, and told him it was not possible to have it built for that sum, and that I failed to see why he was not willing to give us as much as he gave to the road west of Callander. I am really in hopes that the Government, now that they will acquire this very valuable property, which I think is about 130 miles in length, will consider the peculiar position in which Nova Scotia, and especially the Island of Cape Breton, are placed, and do what they can in order to further the interest of that Island by an increased grant for the extension.

Mr. STAIRS. I do not wish to take up the time of the House this afternoon in discussing the question of the resolution, but as the hon. member for Pictou has seen fit to attack the late Government of Nova Scotia, of which I had the honour of being a member, I may be allowed to take one or two minutes for reply. The hon. gentleman said that the late Government of Nova Scotia held office for four years, and did nothing towards extending the railway to the Island. I would like to say that the late Local Government were unable to do anything to extend the railway into that Island, on account of the bungling and mismanagement of their predecessors. Every man in Nova Scotia knows that the contracts which were made to extend the road to the Strait of Canso were such weak and miserable instruments that it was impossible for any work to be carried out under them. The same remark applies to the contract which they made with the Western Counties Railway to extend the road.

Motion agreed to.

#### SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I was not present on Monday, but I understand that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made some promise in reference to the resolution that I have on the Order paper. Is it his intention, this Session, to introduce an amendment to that Act, and remedy the evil of which we complain?

Mr. McLELAN. I have put the matter before the Law Clerk, and I think I will be able to meet the hon. gentleman's views.

#### INDIAN AGENT'S OFFICE IN TORONTO.

Mr. COOK moved for copies of all Orders in Council, departmental orders, and correspondence respecting

the closing of the Indian Agent's office in Toronto and the removal of the same to Ottawa, with a statement showing the names of all parties since appointed to discharge the duties formerly performed by the Toronto agency; the name of each such person appointed; the salary of each such person appointed; the names of the localities where stationed; the amount of money paid to the Indians by each; the number of families in each agency; the date of each appointment and the present business, if any, carried on by all such agents. He said: The duty of the Government when making removals of this kind is, I consider, to economize as much as possible, consistent with efficiency. The removal of this office from Toronto to Ottawa has caused great inconvenience to people who have to deal with the Indian Department in connection with that agency, and in removing it I find that they have exercised no economy, but have caused great inconvenience. Mr. Plummer, the head of the Department at Ottawa, had the agency at Toronto where he received \$1,700 a year, and Mr. Dalton, his assistant, received \$800, which was too small a salary for so efficient an officer. Mr. Plummer now receives \$1,800, and Mr. Dalton \$1,100, making a total of \$2,900. I have no objection to the increase of salary given those gentlemen, but I say that, adding to the salaries in Toronto \$400 for office rent, we find that the cost in both cases is the same. A few days ago I asked the Government a question about the appointment of an Indian agent at Penetanguishene, and I received the reply from the Premier that Henry Thompson had been appointed to that agency on the 31st January, 1883, at \$500 per annum. I have received information from different sources during Recess that not only Thompson was appointed to this agency, but that other individuals were appointed, and I suppose at the salary mentioned by the Prime Minister. Now, Sir, if there are nine officials appointed—and there may be more for aught I know—and if the nine officials receive from the Government \$500 each, we have \$4,500 of a surplus to provide for. I find that Mr. Bull was appointed at Cape Croker, in the Saugeen Peninsula, in the North Riding of Bruce; that a Mr. John Creighton, of Chippewa, was appointed in that same district, and I am aware that there is an agency also at Wiarton in the eastern section of the Saugeen District, in the North Riding of Bruce. One would have thought that, if the Government were bound to remove the office from the city of Toronto, the office at Wiarton would have been sufficient to accomplish all that was necessary for the Saugeen Peninsula; but we find that there are two other officers appointed for that place, and I am curious to know—and I suppose the country would like to know—how many Indians these men have to look after and to pay. Why, I understand that the duties of an agency in this respect are to teach these people how to farm, to teach them the different modes of obtaining a livelihood, and that these people should be practical farmers, and should live near the place over which they have jurisdiction. I understand that this Mr. Creighton is a merchant, and insists upon the Indians dealing with him. I understand that he sells goods to them, and, of course, I suppose he does not sell goods to the Indians for very much less than he does to other individuals. Very likely, having the money to distribute to the Indians in his hands, he would, in all human probability, charge a little more than he would to ordinary customers. Mr. McPhee, of Uptergrove, was also appointed, and Mr. Stephenson, of Georgina, Mr. Edwin Harris, of Gore's Landing, Mr. Thackeray, of Roseneath, Mr. Thompson, of Penetanguishene, of whom we have just been talking, and Mr. Hill, of Shannonville—an officer, I believe, who held the position of Indian land agent before this appointment; and, if the Government had to appoint an officer in that place, I believe they were wise in giving the position to a man who held the office before,

**Mr. Cook.**

that is, combining the office of Indian agent with that of Indian land agent. I find also that there was a Mr. George Macdermott appointed at Seugog. There is also an agency at Parry Sound. That agency might have accomplished the work that Mr. Thompson does at Penetanguishene. As far as that appointment is concerned, he might as well live in the city of Toronto as at Penetanguishene, as far as the Indians are concerned. Mr. Thompson is not a practical farmer, and knows nothing about farming. He is a storekeeper at Penetanguishene, and I have no doubt that every time an Indian or a squaw appears at his store door he turns them away, and would not allow them to buy goods. It is so reported in that part of the country however. Now, if it is not true that nine men have been appointed—we will assume that nine men have been appointed—to fill the place that the office at Toronto filled, the country pays just \$7,000 more a year for the appointment of these individuals in the different reserves. It may be said by the Government that it is their duty to have an agency as near the reserves or as near the Indians as possible. Well, there may be some truth in that; but, at the same time, the office was held in Toronto for a number of years, and in that office the duties were performed without any difficulty, and without any objection by the Indians. As far as I can learn, the Indians now find a great deal more fault with the local agents than they did with the agent, Mr. Plummer, when he lived in Toronto. Mr. Plummer was a very efficient officer. He always minded his own business in Toronto. He never interfered with any elections while in the city of Toronto; but when he came to Ottawa, under the influences of this Government, he at once became a political bummer, and was sent out to Algoma and Muskoka to canvass and do what he could for the Conservative candidates at the last General Election for the Province of Ontario. Now, I find, by the answer given to me by the Premier, that Mr. Thompson was appointed on the 31st January, 1883, by the Order in Council passed that day. Mr. Thompson was nominated as a candidate in the Conservative interest in the Local Legislature on the 6th February. He was bound that he should get his pound of flesh before he put himself in the position of a candidate. I know as a fact that Mr. Thompson heretofore constantly and persistently refused the nomination in any respect in the county of Simcoe as a candidate, but Mr. Thompson got his appointment before his nomination, or before the convention that was held to nominate him as a candidate. The election was held on the 27th February, and I understand, from more than one reliable source, that throughout the election in East Simcoe Mr. Thompson persistently stated that he had not received a Government office, and that he was not the paid servant of the Government. Of course, I know that my hon. friend the Premier—if I may be allowed to call him my hon. friend—would say, in reply to that, that he was not a paid agent, because he did not receive any pay until the 31st March, or long after he had lost his election in East Simcoe. But I would like to know the position the hon. gentleman would have occupied if Mr. Thompson had unfortunately happened to have been elected in East Simcoe. There was an Order in Council passed on the 31st January, appointing him to the position of Indian Agent at Penetanguishene, to distribute the money amongst, I think, about twenty-three families in the islands of the Georgian Bay, the Christian Islands, etc. We find, from the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario, in an Act respecting the Legislative Assembly, in the 7th clause, referring to the disqualification of hon. members to sit and vote in the Local Legislature, these words:—

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, either in the service of the Dominion of Canada, or in the service of the Government of Ontario, at the nomination of the Crown or of the

Lieutenant Governor, to which any salary, or any fee, allowance or emolument in lieu of any salary from the Crown or from the Province is attached, or accepting or holding any office, commission or employment of profit at the nomination of the Crown, or of the Government, or of any head of a Department in the Government of Ontario, whether such profit is or is not payable out of the public fund."

Mr. Thompson's salary, of course, would not be paid out of the public funds—it would be paid from the Indian funds, I suppose—and my hon. friend may take exception to this. He may say that, because all the agents are paid from the Indian funds, the Dominion funds will not be appropriated in that direction; but, if all the Indian funds should be consumed, we know, of course, where they would have to look for money to pay what would be required for them. I will read the remainder of the clause:

"Shall be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly, or shall sit and vote in the same during the time he holds such office, commission or employment."

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

### After Recess.

#### SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 56) to empower the bondholders of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company to vote at meetings of the Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. White, Cardwell).

Bill (No. 64) to amend the Act relating to the Manitoba and North-West Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria).

Bill (No. 67) further to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin).

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Quebec Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Bossé).

Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the Ranchers' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Ross).

#### WELLAND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. RYKERT moved the second reading of Bill (No. 44) to authorize the transfer of the Welland Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and for other purposes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman please explain that Bill.

Mr. RYKERT. It is to carry out an arrangement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Welland Railway in reference to the road—to legalize that arrangement according to the resolutions of the stockholders and bondholders.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Grand Trunk Railway Company proposed then to acquire the Welland Railway, do they?

Mr. RYKERT. Yes; they did have a lease of it for twenty years, and this is to change it into a proprietary right.

Bill read the second time.

#### LAW OF EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 3) further to amend the law of evidence in criminal cases.

Mr. TUPPER. Before the House goes into Committee I desire briefly again to trouble the House with my views in regard to this question, which I am sure every member of the House will admit to be a most important one. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that previous to the division which occurred upon the second reading of this Bill, I laboured

under the impression—which the result of that division proved to be erroneous—that the sentiment of the House was entirely adverse to placing such an Act as the proposed one upon the Statutes of this country. I gave as a reason, when moving the six months' hoist, for not going into a discussion on the Bill then, and for the confidence I felt that the Bill would not carry, the fact that last Session this Bill, among others, had been discussed at some length by this House, and that the Bill had gone, with others, into a Committee of the Whole, and had never returned from the Committee, it having been thrown out in that way. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) charged me, in the discussion which last took place, with having somewhat misled the House in that statement. I think, if my language is looked at carefully, it will be found that I did not mislead the House, while at the same time, to a certain extent, as I have stated, I was misled myself. I considered it was unnecessary to explain my opinions further, because the Bill contained other objectionable clauses, one of which I remember my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé) most eloquently and forcibly discussed, that in respect to admitting Agnostics to testify in the Courts. But I did not think that if the sentiment of the House was in favour of such a Bill at the present, the fact that it contained an objectionable clause would necessarily defeat the whole. I was of the opinion that if the House wished to pass such legislation, if there was a serious desire to make so complete a change in the criminal legislation of the country, a motion would have been framed, as I think it could have been framed, to have saved this clause, if the mover of the present Bill believed the House would support and carry it. As no motion was made to save this part of the Bill, but as every clause was lost, I was correct in stating that when the House rejected the whole of it, it therefore dissented from every part of the Bill. I bow to the decision of the House to a certain extent. I recognize the fact that I counted without my host; that the House was of the opinion that the principle of the Bill should be considered, and considered carefully, by the Committee to which the Bill was sent, and to which Committee the hon. member in charge of the Bill moved on the last occasion to send it. But in justice to myself, considering I did not attempt to argue the question under the circumstances to which I alluded, I hope the House will have sufficient patience to permit me, even though speaking in a losing cause, to express the opinions I hold in regard to this Bill, and which I hold most tenaciously. I am prompted, moreover, to enter into a discussion on the question again, at some little length, owing to the extraordinary statements that were made by the hon. member for West Huron when he moved to send the Bill to a Special Committee. I am well aware that this question has been discussed most thoroughly in many countries. It has been discussed, as we know, in England. It has been discussed on the floor of this Parliament several times. It has been discussed in the magazines of the day; and we know the question has been treated as a serious one everywhere. But I never yet knew or heard any gentleman who had studied it, speak in so emphatic a manner as the mover of the Bill, and with such contempt as he expressed for hon. members who opposed the measure. I was surprised to hear the hon. member insinuate that the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) and myself, in opposing the Bill, were wiseacres, and gentlemen behind the spirit of the age, and not imbued with that tremendous spirit of reform that actuates the hon. gentleman and all those who support him. I was surprised to hear him treat with contempt arguments which, though they came from my mouth, were not original, and which at no time did I attempt to introduce into the House as original. They were arguments used, and eloquent arguments they were, by men who had more experience than I had in regard to the question, and indeed I would confess

that, though a member of the bar, I am a very young member, and would not attempt to discuss criminal practice and the administration of justice in this country to such an extent if those ideas were original. I would bow more promptly to the decision of the House under those circumstances, but to-night I wish briefly to go over some of the phases of the manner in which the question has been treated. I stated, last year, that it had been before the British Parliament, and that a Bill in that direction had not become law. I alluded with some pride to the fact that the administration of criminal justice in Great Britain was the most satisfactory throughout the civilized world. That statement cannot be challenged. It has been put to the proof during the last few years and had received the admiration of the world, and I consider that fact a strong feature in the discussion of this question; and though we should not implicitly follow all British legislation, and although I do not for a moment contend that we should wait for the British Parliament before we introduce measures here, I think we may, consistent with our national pride, and a feeling of admiration for our knowledge of the law, bow with great respect to the legal minds in England, and carefully follow in the footsteps of the law reformers of the United Kingdom. I would have much more faith in law reforms carried out by the Reform party of that country than in such measures initiated by Reformers here. The Reform party in England occupies a very different position from the Reform party here, which, when in power, and able to deal with the question now under consideration, which was then interesting the legal minds, was convinced there was nothing to reform. What do we find Reformers in England saying? When the Bill introduced by Mr. Ashley, with the same object as the present Bill, was introduced to the British Parliament, men who were not merely Reformers, but possessed of greater experience of criminal trials and practice than the hon. member for West Huron, such men as Sergeant Simon, who had for many years studied the subject, denounced the measure, and he, a Reformer, denounced it, not as a measure of Reform, but as a retrograde measure; and he was followed up and supported not only by members of the bar, but by eminent men such as Sir E. Wilmot, Sir Thos. Chambers and Knatchbull Huggessen, all of whom, with that eminent man, the late Sir John Holker, then Attorney General, aided in defeating the Bill. That was in 1876. Following that, a member of the Reform party came to this House in 1877 with a Bill which we may call the Dymond Bill. Mr. Dymond introduced a measure, which was the Bill now in the hands of the hon. member for West Huron, and endeavoured to carry it. This is an important fact I consider, because we have the benefit, as I have stated, not only of the experience of the eminent Attorney General of England to whom I have referred, who threw a similar measure out of the British House of Commons, but of the views of a member of this House, who then occupied a high position in it, a member who was charged with the administration of criminal justice and who occupied the position of Minister of Justice in the Reform Government of the day, and he opposed the measure which Mr. Dymond introduced, based on the Ashley Bill. Not only so, but with very able reasoning and arguments he showed to the satisfaction of the House that such legislation was not necessary for the country. I allude to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I say that at that time, with an experience far greater in his capacity as Minister of Justice, than the hon. member for Huron has acquired, and with the responsibilities of office weighing upon him, that hon. gentleman advised this House, in response to the then leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, to reject this Bill. I may be answered that the hon. gentleman has probably changed his opinion now, after additional experience; but it is a curious fact

Mr. TUPPER.

that this independent party, of which we heard the other evening, which at that time unanimously supported the member for West Durham, should just as unanimously wheel round and take the opposite position. I have alluded to this fact not only to point out that there are certain inconsistencies on the part of hon. gentlemen in connection with the measure, but more particularly to bring to my assistance the ably expressed views of the leader of the Opposition, who, in 1877, as I have stated, took such a course as to have this measure thrown out of the House, but who in 1884 silently votes in direct contradiction to those views. I also do this for the purpose of enabling the hon. gentleman to explain to this House the reasons which have caused him to change his opinion; and I need not say that as a lawyer I have very great respect for his legal opinions—more, perhaps, than for his opinions on constitutional questions. In the first place the hon. member for West Durham took exactly the same view of the second clause of this Bill which I take, that is, that it is entirely nugatory. I say that when you give a prisoner the option of going into the witness box, you are placing on the Statute Book an absurd and inconsistent measure. I say that such a Bill as the present cannot be, and will not be, supported in the Courts, and that the second clause makes the whole Bill absurd and ridiculous, no matter what opinion may be held as to the principle of the Bill. In effect it says, that if a prisoner does not exercise the option which is given him in the previous clause, of going into the witness box, his refusal shall not be made the subject of adverse comment. Now, Sir, in those States of the Union in which such legislation as this Bill has been passed, this clause is generally to the same effect—that the refusal of a prisoner to testify in his own behalf shall not be attempted to be made a presumption against him. But as every reasonable man would suppose, when that provision has come before the courts, the judges have alluded to it as being impossible to be enforced—that it is impossible to remove the natural presumption in such an event, by any legal rule or statute, no matter how strict. The courts have held that it was impossible to enforce such a provision. In a criminal prosecution under a similar Bill—the case of the State of Maine against Cleaves—an appeal was taken, and when the question came before the court, the judge held in direct contradiction to that clause, held in effect that it was nugatory, and sustained the appeal. Judge Appleton said:

“The silence of the accused, the omission to explain or contradict when the evidence tends to establish guilt, is a fact the probative effect of which may vary according to the varying conditions of the different trials in which it may occur; which the jury must perceive, and which perceiving, they can no more disregard than one can the light of the sun when shining with the full blaze on the open eye.”

That case is cited on a very able work of evidence, edited and written by Judge Best, and it agrees not only with my views of the case, but I am happy to state, with the views of that distinguished jurist, the leader of the Opposition, as he expressed them in 1877. That hon. gentleman said:

“If such were the case, it followed that, as a rule, prisoners would be obliged to give evidence. The question then arose as to whether the law would prove injurious in cases in which the accused was innocent. In the majority of cases it would not be to his injury, but to his advantage. He could conceive of some cases—they had occurred in his own experience in civil suits—in which an innocent man owing to his nervous habit, great excitement at the time, or unhappy mode of giving testimony, would be placed rather at a disadvantage than otherwise.”

He also goes on to state:

“Believing as he did that the fear of cross-examination was such that the prisoner, if untrue, would be demonstrated to be so, he thought that this law could not be calculated to be in favour of the escape of the guilty, though he thought the existing securities for the innocent were as powerful as, and perhaps more powerful, than the protection obtained by the prisoner telling his own story. Upon the whole he believed that the main difficulty in the question was to be found in the question of perjury in the very great temptation which already existed in civil cases, and still more in criminal cases, not to tell the

truth. He was satisfied that there was one class of cases in which the accused might be allowed to give evidence, namely, that of assaults between parties to which there were no witnesses."

With that I thoroughly agree. Now speaking of this as a measure of reform, it amused me to hear some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill. If he had looked into the matter thoroughly he would have found, that instead of its being so far in advance of the age, instead of his being so far ahead of the Rip Van Winkles, as he described those opposed to this measure, including his present leader, he will find that this is a retrograde measure, because he would discover that down to the seventeenth century it was the practice in England, and it was a practice that became a scandal, for the prisoner at the bar had not only to be examined by counsel, but was violently harassed and cross-examined by the Judges, who generally had a conviction of his guilt, and would take no answer but that which tended to prove it. But though it existed down to the seventeenth century, without any law on the Statute-Book on the subject, the practice was suddenly changed, and it has been held ever since that a prisoner should be allowed the protection of the presumption which admits him to be innocent until he is proved guilty, and that he should not be tortured, or placed in a position to be so, by a cross-examination which in many cases produced great injury to the interests of justice, and was often fraught with the greatest danger to the prisoner at the bar. Therefore, Sir, this is not such a measure of reform as ought to commend itself so highly to Reformers that they should vote blindly for it simply because it is described in that way. I appeal to those gentlemen who were in the House in 1877, and who voted for the motion to throw out the Bill at that time—I appeal to them whether they have heard an answer to the arguments then urged so strongly by the hon. member for West Durham, sufficient to induce them to vote blindly for such legislation. Not only was this practice discouraged and departed from in England, but though some States in the Union have adopted it—and it has brought a great scandal on the Courts in those States—it will be observed as a significant fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, the highest Court in the Union, permits no such privilege. "In the Courts of the United States," a note to Best's work, says, "a defendant in a criminal case cannot testify in his own behalf, although by Statute his testimony is admissible in the Courts of the State." Therefore, we have these facts—that up to the present day, such legislation is discouraged in England, that it is not the practice in the Courts of the United States, and that no longer ago than 1877, the Minister of Justice considered it his duty to advise the House to throw out similar legislation here. Besides, we have the report before us of the Royal Commission in England, which was composed of eminent jurists in that country, and upon which was Judge Stephen, the most distinguished Judge in favour of this measure in England; and that report shows that they disagreed on this question. They merely submitted it as a suggestion of eminent men, stating, at the same time, that they were divided in the opinion as to whether or not such legislation should be passed. After that report was adopted, it was alluded to by men eminent at the bar, in the magazines of the day, and by Judges on the bench, who universally conceded that the option proposed to be given to prisoners was strongly to be deplored and could not meet with a successful issue when it came before the House. The reasons, no doubt, that actuated people to take that view were reasons which have been urged repeatedly—that while in some cases this practice gives an undue advantage to the prisoner, in other cases it places him in an unfair position before the jury. The hon. member for Queen's, Nova Scotia, (Mr. Woodworth), the other night expressed the opinion that some of my objections were answered by

the second clause. I have already told the House what I think of that second clause; but I maintain that my position is quite consistent with that of the hon. gentleman who alluded to another feature of this legislation when he said that instead of being unduly advantageous to a prisoner, it would be prejudicial to him. As Serjeant Simon pointed out, and as many members of the bar will bear out, in certain cases an undue advantage will be given to the prisoner. He stands in the box, defended by counsel, with every presumption in his favour, and his counsel gets out of him certain short points on which the whole case that is to go to the jury will hinge. In such a case as that, the counsel will instruct the prisoner to go on the stand and tell a short, sharp and effective falsehood—and I am not disgracing my profession by stating that a counsel would do that. I noticed that the hon. leader of the Opposition left off reading his paper when I touched upon this point, and began to listen. I mean to say he will not tell the prisoner in so many words to do that, but he will tell him to confine himself to a certain few points, and not go into the whole story—to tell, for instance, where he was on a certain night, in which no person could contradict him. In such a case this legislation will give the prisoner an undue advantage. In other cases, again, I say it will unduly press him—when, for instance, with a forbidding countenance, with a confused manner, or with natural infirmities, he goes on the stand and is unable to tell a straight story; and I say that the more illiterate a man is, the more this law will press upon him, because the more illiterate a man is the more difficult it is for him to tell the same story four or five times in the same way. It is a peculiarity that has often been noticed in our Courts of law that witnesses with the best intentions of honesty, and without any substantial interest in a case, when telling a narrative in the witness box, will be made by the opposing counsel to tell the same story four or five times, and in such a confused manner that the counsel in his address to the jury will rest his case on the inconsistent statements that the witness has made. Well, if that is an evil in civil cases, is it right that we should place our fellow men in such a position that they must go on the rack and tell their story, or take the consequences? That is the view which has been taken by gentlemen eminent in the profession, and a view of human nature in which I am supported by the hon. leader of the Opposition in his speech made in 1877. He, with his great experience at the bar, alluded in that speech to the same fact. He, knowing that parties to a suit had been permitted to testify in civil proceedings, still felt that it would be dangerous to allow a prisoner the same permission. The hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill thinks the whole matter is settled by the fact that in revenue laws and in shipping laws, in which a *quasi* criminal action is brought against a party, the accused is allowed to testify in his own behalf. He thinks the fact that that permission has been granted by the British Parliament and our own, disposes of this question. I have shown him that the leader of the Opposition was of opinion that, though in civil cases this has become law, it would be only safe to introduce it in criminal cases where there have been assaults between parties to which there were no witnesses. The argument, I have no doubt, that induced the hon. leader of the Opposition to narrow the question down to that, was what is apparent to every one, that the liberty of the subject is not to such an extent concerned, and that the question of perjury would not enter there with the same force and effect as in the cases covered by this Bill. I would, before taking my seat, simply ask whether we cannot afford safely to wait till some case happens, or some case can be brought to the minds of hon. gentlemen, that will show them the necessity of passing such a measure—such cases of prominence as those which induced the British and afterwards our own Parliament to

introduce that change in civil practice, which permits parties to civil suits to testify in their own behalf. I ask the hon. gentleman not to tamper with our criminal legislation, or criminal practice, which has stood the test so well in the mother land in difficult times, in times of difficulty, such as we have never experienced in this country.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the question which is now occupying the attention of this House. I wish to make these few remarks in the English language, nevertheless, as we have the privilege of speaking the French language here, I deem it a duty to say in my mother tongue the first words which shall be uttered by me in this House, and I am aware of the fact that my French Acadian countrymen will be glad to know that I have taken advantage of the benefit given to us of speaking our own language here. I further desire to do so in order to show that we appreciate that privilege, and that in it we find one of the advantages of Confederation. These are the reasons why I was desirous first to address the House in my mother tongue and I will now go on in English. I have some diffidence in offering my opinion on this Bill, as a new member of this House rising for the first time to address the Chair. His speech on this occasion is always called the maiden speech, and is looked on by some as a great effort, and by others as a great failure, should it not come up to their expectations. But it is not my intention to make this my maiden speech, for I hope to make my maiden speech at some future time. At present my only desire is to make a few observations on this Bill, which I consider to be one of great importance. When the motion was made the other day that the Bill be read a second time, I did not offer any opinion concerning it, because I fully believed that the motion would be defeated by a large majority. To my great surprise, however, I found myself in a small minority. I have not the presumption now to imagine that any remarks of mine will change the opinions of hon. members who are in favour of this Bill, but it seems to me that the other day it did not receive sufficient consideration. To my mind, there are several reasons why it should not be adopted. In the first place, I would ask who has been convinced in this House, by any arguments advanced, that the administration of justice would be better subserved by the passing of this Bill? or how has it been shown that the administration of justice would be made more effective should this measure become law? Has it been pointed out by showing any crime to have hitherto gone unpunished, or that innocent persons have been punished who would have been acquitted had this principle been in force. I have heard no argument advanced on either one of these points, and on looking at the Bill itself I am strongly of opinion that it will have neither the effect of punishing crime heretofore not punished, or of preventing innocent people who hitherto may have been punished, from being convicted. Why do we endeavour before the Criminal Courts to punish crime—to fasten on one individual the guilt of crime and to punish him for having committed it? We do so for two objects. Firstly, to prevent crime by giving example to the world at large of the punishment that must be undergone by the one who is found guilty by the proper tribunal, and therefore must be guilty in the eyes of the law; the other object is to punish the individual who has committed the crime. If the prisoner be innocent, he will not in my opinion at least—in some instances he may and in some he may not—but taking them altogether, I do not believe that if he be innocent he will place himself in a better position by being allowed to take the stand and give evidence in his own behalf. And, why? Because in the majority of cases, the man who is accused of crime and who is innocent, who may not have mixed much with the world, who may be unsophisticated,

Mr. TUPPER.

who may never have been before a Court of Justice before, who may have been so surrounded by unfortunate circumstances as to have suspicion directed towards him, will come into the Court trembling. He comes into Court trembling; he comes there, perhaps, for the first time in his life, afraid of judges, afraid of lawyers, afraid of every one around him. The very fact of being under arrest, the very fact of being there under the clutches of the strong arm of the law and knowing that he is innocent, and the very fact that he, an innocent man, should be taken before that tribunal, all these things surrounding him will, perhaps, so affect him that, in the eyes of the jury, they may make him appear in a worse light than if he did not take the stand at all. Every word and every look will be interpreted as the action of guilt, whereas it may be the action of frightened innocence, the action of a man who has not been accustomed to this, and who, coming for the first time before a tribunal of this kind, will feel the danger to which he is exposed, and feeling all these things, will appear more like a guilty person, if he is innocent, than otherwise. Therefore, this will not help him, and this may be the result in the majority of cases. I can, of course, fancy cases where it might not be so. I can fancy an educated man coming there, a man who is accustomed to come in contact with his fellow men, and who will not be afraid, but, feeling his innocence within himself, will perhaps, by taking the stand, be able to clear himself very easily. But, Mr. Speaker, if he is deprived of taking the stand, can he not prove his innocence? Are there not circumstances which he can prove by other witnesses, and, if he cannot, the mere fact of his making a statement which is a true statement, which is a reasonable statement, which he is always permitted to make to his counsel, and to make to the Court and jury, by his counsel, if not by himself, a statement which is the truth, which will be plausible, which will be borne out by the circumstances, and which, if corroborated by other evidence, or by the lack of evidence, going to the jury, will have quite as much weight as if given under oath; because what great weight would the evidence have of a person accused of crime, if the jury, in the first place, suspect him of being guilty? The weight of his mere statement through his counsel or by himself will be just as great as his statement under oath. Therefore, in that instance, he would be benefited just as much by not going upon the stand as if he did go upon the stand. But it is not only that. It is the great principle laid down, which I believe will endure as a great principle for a long time yet, that it is better to allow nine guilty people to escape than one innocent man to be punished. Even if it were favourable to the prisoner, is it not better that he should escape through that favour, that a large number of guilty people should escape, than that one innocent man should suffer? I say it would be better. There is another object to be attained by the law. The law is enacted for the purpose of punishing crime, for the purpose of deterring others from committing crime; it is for the purpose of preventing crime from being committed. We will take the case of a guilty person brought before a tribunal, where the case is well proven against him, where the facts are well established by proper and competent testimony, and he has the privilege of coming upon the stand himself. What a great temptation for a man who has already committed a crime, who has already been guilty of a misdemeanor, which is sufficiently proved against him, so that, unless the evidence be contradicted, he will in all probability be found guilty by the jury; what a great temptation do we find for that man to step out of the criminal box and into the witness box; what a temptation for him to add another crime and a greater crime to the one he has already committed. There is the temptation; there is the premium for him to come forward and perjure himself, and so commit a crime which is greater

than ordinary misdemeanors. I may be mistaken as to this, because I have not looked through the law sufficiently and my memory does not serve me, but I think the crime of perjury, which is only a misdemeanor after all, is visited more severely than any other misdemeanor on our Statute-Book. That is my recollection of it. It can, I think, be punished to the extent of some fourteen years imprisonment, whereas the general punishment of other crimes of misdemeanor is one, two, three, four, five, six, and up to seven years. Therefore, the crime of perjury is considered by the law as a greater crime, as a crime which should be more punished, because it commits more injury, perhaps, than any other crime which comes into the category of misdemeanor. And it is easy to see why it should be so, because, if the crime of perjury should become prevalent, if people should come to the conclusion that it is a light thing to perjure oneself, where would be the administration of justice, where would be the sanctity of the oath, where would be the regard given by jurymen to the testimony of men under oath, if they thought they had no regard for the sanctity of their oath? Therefore, the law always considered that the crime of perjury should be severely punished, so as to make men feel that the sanctity of the oath is sacred, so that respect for the oath should be always in the minds of the jury, and that the Court should give proper weight to it. We will give to the criminal—I speak of the guilty man, the purely guilty man—that great incentive to go upon the stand and perjure himself. And would he hesitate for a moment? I venture to say that he would not hesitate, because he is already guilty. He sees that he is perhaps likely to be sent for four, five, or seven years to the penitentiary; he is hardened in crime, he is so hardened as to have committed that crime for which he is being tried, and he would not hesitate to go upon the stand and commit another crime by perjuring himself. True, it may not prevent his being punished; it may not prevent his being found guilty; the jury may see through him, and may say, you have added the crime of perjury to the one for which you are being tried, we do not believe what you have said; he may have been broken down altogether by the cross-examining counsel, but still there will be that great crime committed which the law has sanctioned, which the law has invited, which the law has forced upon that man, and upon the administration of criminal jurisprudence in this Dominion. And to say that a man who may refuse to go upon the witness box will not be prejudiced by it, is a thing which I cannot understand how any one of common sense can state, and I do not mean any offence to the hon. gentlemen who have expressed that view, but they may not have considered it; they may not have studied that point. It appears to me that, when they would advance before you, Sir, that the man who is in the criminal box, and has the opportunity of going upon the stand, and refuses to do that, will not suffer, I cannot see how any man can refuse to arrive at the conclusion that such a refusal will be taken as evidence against him. It is true that, if he refuses, the Judge will not be allowed to make any comments upon that fact. Then we must suppose—and it is not a strange supposition—that the Judge will know the law and will make no comments upon it, and that the prosecuting counsel will also know the law and will not make any comments upon it; but, if we think it is not going to prejudice the prisoner, we must come to the conclusion that no jurymen will know anything of the law. We are to discuss the question in this House. It is to go into the public press. Everybody will read it, but, in some mysterious way, the jurymen will not know anything about it until they are in the jury box, and sheriffs will take great care that only those men who have not read anything at all about this matter will try these cases. Jurymen are just as sensible as the presiding judges, though they may not know as much about

the law. They may have quite as much sense as the prosecuting attorney, or as the defending attorney, and their perceptions may be quite as bright as those of the gentlemen I have named, and their seeing that a prisoner does not avail himself of the opportunity to go into the witness box cannot fail to prejudice their minds. You may say that that does no harm, because, if he does not go into the witness box, it is evidence that he is guilty, and he suffers no wrong; but, if that be so, there is no necessity for that part of the law which says that no comments shall be made upon that fact. Sir, I have offered to the House sincerely my reasons for believing that this measure would result in great injury and, instead of improving the administration of criminal justice, would result in making it worse; it would result, perhaps, in punishing innocent people, and it might also induce guilty men to commit perjury and perhaps thereby get clear if they were brazen-faced enough to persist in their perjury. I say it would open the door for these evils, and perhaps would more often result in causing the innocent to suffer than in clearing the guilty. Mr. Speaker, I have offered these considerations with humility, and, I venture to hope that they may have some effect on those hon. members who, perhaps, had not given sufficient consideration to this matter when the House voted for the second reading a few nights ago. I do think, Sir, that in all the laws we enact here we ought to have in view their moral influence upon the people for whom we are legislating; and I contend that this Bill offers a premium to perjury, it offers a temptation to perjury, and would therefore have a bad influence. It would tend to lessen the sanctity of an oath in the minds of jurymen and in the mind of the public, and would consequently lessen public respect for the administration of justice. It was stated the other day that individuals who have large fortunes at stake, or whose honour is at stake, are open to the same temptation. That is true to some extent. There is temptation, and so much of it that it is a deplorable fact to-day that there are very few important cases tried in this Dominion, involving a large amount of money, where there is not such swearing on both sides as to make people believe that perjury has been committed, and where the jurymen have the greatest difficulty in arriving at a conclusion on account of the conflict of evidence. It is our duty as legislators not to encourage a state of things that has already become alarming, and is getting worse every year. I believe that there is more perjury committed in Courts of Justice to-day than there was ten, fifteen or twenty-five years ago. Formerly people had more respect for the sanctity of an oath, because the jurymen and witnesses showed more respect for it. To-day, when one's honour or one's purse is at stake, there are very few trials which do not give rise to a great deal of swearing that arouses very strong suspicion of perjury. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope this House will not allow this Bill to become law.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House informed us that this was not his maiden speech. Well, Sir, if it is not the House is to be congratulated on the treat we may expect at his hands when he chooses to address the House hereafter. I will say this much of the remarks he has made, that he has put in the very strongest possible light the case of those who are opposed to this Bill. He has said everything it is possible to say on that side of the question, everything it is possible at all to say against the Bill. The hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) has also addressed the House at considerable length, and it occurred to me while he was making his speech that the little combat which took place the other night had, perhaps, spurred him on to additional effort. I have no doubt he felt somewhat annoyed at the remark of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), that he

was twenty-five years behind the age; and we find he has loaded the barrel right up, and fired it off. Now, Sir, it appears to me this is a very small question to occasion so much talk. It does not appear to me that the constitution is going to be at all affected, whether this Bill becomes law or not. It is a question that should be dealt with by this House in a calm and dispassionate manner. If it is right, and in the interests of justice, and calculated to elicit the truth, then let it become law, no matter which side of the House it comes from. I sincerely hope that the hon. member from Pictou does not voice the feeling of the Conservative party when he objects to the measure because it comes from this side of the House. I should be very sorry indeed to think for one moment that the Conservative party in this House would reject a good measure simply because it came from a Reformer. On this point, I desire to say to the hon. gentleman and others, that if they will look back over the pages of history, they will find that the very best laws on the Statute Book of this country emanated from, and were passed by, the Reformers.

Mr. RYKERT. Point them out.

Mr. LISTER. I say we have passed the Ballot Act, and we have passed an Act against corruption in Elections; and I know that Act does not please the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, what is this Bill about which there is so much discussion? It simply proposes to allow parties who are charged with misdemeanors to give evidence in their own behalf. While I say this much, I will add that in the Province of Ontario, and I believe over the rest of the Dominion, in cases of assault, in cases of trespass, in cases of infraction of the revenue laws, parties accused are competent witnesses on their own behalf. In cases under the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, commonly called the Scott Act—a criminal Act, because persons who are convicted of offences are liable to imprisonment—the defendant is not only a competent witness, but one whom the prosecution may call and force to give evidence on the part of the prosecution. We have had some little experience of that law so far as it has gone. In the Province of Ontario, from which I come, we have a law which permits, in civil actions, parties to suits to give evidence on their own behalf. That has been the law for the last few years, and I can well remember that when it was first proposed that a man should be allowed to testify in his own behalf, all the reasons and arguments were advanced against it which hon. gentlemen opposite have advanced against this Bill. It was said that it would multiply cases of perjury, that it would be an inducement to them to commit perjury if they were allowed to go into the witness box. But we knew from experience that many a man who had a just claim was unable to prosecute it, because he had no witness to prove it. We knew that many a man who had a civil action was unable to defend it in a civil court, because he could not give evidence in his own behalf. That was the state of the law, and I appeal with confidence to the legal gentlemen from Ontario if, under any circumstances, they would consent to go back to the state of affairs which existed previous to the passing of that Act. We have found it work admirably; we have found that it aided justice; we have found that criminal prosecutions for perjury have not been increased since that Act came into force. Why, Sir, if the reasons given by hon. gentlemen opposite against this Bill becoming law were to hold good, it would be dangerous to put anybody into the witness box—no witness could be sworn either for the prosecution or the defence. What is asked to be done is to place on the Statute Book a similar law to that which is in existence in some countries to-day, under which the man who knows most about the facts of the particular case, who can throw most light on the case, is no longer excluded from the witness box. This law is in force in our Province, so far as civil cases are concerned, and as

Mr. LISTER.

far as criminal cases are concerned, to the extent that I have mentioned. Now, what does this Bill propose? We know that crimes are divided into felonies and misdemeanors, and under the criminal law of Canada, almost any crime of magnitude is a felony—stealing and all that character of crime, assault with intent, &c.—and the only serious misdemeanor not within the category of crime is that of perjury. I submit to this House that, in those cases, above every other, it would be proper and right that the man charged with the crime should have an opportunity of explaining the charge made against him. That crime is a question of intent. Five hundred persons may hear a man make certain statements, and every one of them will differ as to what he said. We know that human memory is frail, and that a number of men seeing a person commit a crime will give different statements as to how it was committed. Perjury with other crimes is a question of intent; it is not the mere fact of making a false declaration, but there must be intent to commit crime; he must know and intend to violate the law of the country. In that class of crimes, it is important and absolutely essential that the person charged should have an opportunity of going into the witness box and giving his version of the affair. That is the only crime of any seriousness to which the Bill will apply. Is it right that the party charged should be kept out of the witness box? Hon. gentlemen opposed to the Bill say it is. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), is not prepared to pass any law in this Parliament except it has already become the law of England. While I have as high a regard for the land from which my forefathers came as he can possibly have, I submit that, with our experience, we are as capable of judging what is suitable for this country as are the people of the old country; and it is not becoming in us as a Legislature to say that because a certain measure has not become the law of England it should not become the law of the Dominion. Has there been a single ground urged why this Bill should not become law? The hon. member for Pictou, the other night, when the matter was up, urged the House to reject the motion for the first reading, because the Bill would give a man the opportunity of putting himself in the witness box and of trying himself. Another hon. member on that side of the question rose and said that it would convict the prisoner; and upon that antagonistic reasoning those hon. members voted on the same side. This House has expressed its opinion on this Bill by a very large majority. Why should it go back to-night on the opinion it expressed the other night? Has there, I repeat, been any reason advanced by hon. members who have spoken on the subject why this Bill should not become the law. If it is right for a defendant to go into the witness box in cases of trespass and in cases under the revenue laws of the country, is there any good reason why he should not go into the box in other cases? I submit to the House that the hon. members who have spoken have not shown any good reason why this Bill should not become law. As I stated a moment ago, the object of testimony is to elicit the truth. No man should be convicted unless he is guilty. The hon. gentleman who spoke second said that every man is supposed to be innocent until he is proved guilty. That is the true ground, and anything that will tend to elicit the truth and show whether the prisoner is guilty or innocent should come before the Court and jury, and not be suppressed. We may carry our minds back to a time less than a century ago and go over cases where men have been tried on circumstantial evidence, and suffered the death penalty because they were not allowed to give their own statements. It is a matter for reflection and consideration as to the position of men convicted wrongfully, who, perhaps, if they had been able to give their own testimony, would have been able to sweep away the cobwebs surrounding the case. Such a state of affairs no hon.

gentleman would desire. Such cases have, however, occurred, and I appeal to hon. members, in a dispassionate spirit, to put on our Statute Book a law which is upon the Statute Books of other countries. We know that in the United States it has been the law for many years. Has it worked badly or been repealed there? Those laws have never been repealed since they were placed on the Statute Books of the different States, and the decision which an hon. gentleman read was a decision given, I think, many years ago. But after practical experience, there is no desire in the United States to-day to deprive the prisoner of the right to enter the witness box and give his testimony. Remember, that on the other side, the law extends to felonies as well as misdemeanors; in fact, to all classes of crime; and yet the law has worked so admirably that no State has repealed it, and no attempt is made to repeal it. In the interest of justice it should become the law here. I think it will facilitate the prosecution of cases. I think it will enable the Court and jury to come to a clearer decision as to the guilt or innocence of the person charged; and at all events, I can repeat that it is only a small step in advance in criminal law, because the cases to which it will apply are insignificant in themselves, except in the case of perjury, in which, for manifold reasons, the prisoner should be allowed to testify. I hope hon. members on both sides of the House will dismiss from their minds any idea of this Bill being introduced by a Reformer or Conservative. That thought is unworthy of hon. members sitting in this House and legislating for the public good, and I trust, so long as I have a seat here, I will never find an hon. gentleman rise and seek to defeat a Bill on such a ground.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I desire to offer one or two words in reply to the observations which have fallen from the hon. members for Pictou and Kent. I supposed that the question had been so fully debated when I had the privilege of moving the second reading of the Bill, that no further discussion would be necessary on the subject. No argument that I am aware of has been advanced to-night which was not advanced on the former occasion, and I think the sense of the House was very clearly expressed, that the arguments and objections to the Bill were fully answered by the hon. member for Queen's, Nova Scotia, and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. The principal argument was again repeated for the second and third time by the hon. member for Kent, namely, the perjury argument. I am not going to trespass on the time of the House by going over all the answers which can be very successfully made to that argument. They have been answered so often in the House, in our Local Legislatures, and in England, in dealing with the whole question, that I do not propose to take up time in answering them again to-night. It appears to me that if no other argument can be advanced except that the Bill, if passed, would lead to additional cases of perjury, then the arguments against the Bill are very slight indeed. The hon. gentleman said, as I understood him, that the effect of the change in the civil law, so as to allow parties to give testimony in their own behalf, had been to largely increase the number of cases of perjury. I do not believe that. I do not believe that there is any more perjury now than there was thirty or forty years ago. I believe that people give their testimony in Courts to-day, just as honestly and as fairly as they did twenty years ago; and I do not believe that, as a general rule, if this law should prevail, any more perjury would be committed under it than now. The hon. member for Kent, New Brunswick, asks what reasons, what arguments, exist which convince the promoters of this Bill, or those who are in favour of it, that it is a necessary measure? Sir, that enquiry is easily answered. We have the experience of the past, and the opinions of a man who will not gather lessons of wis-

dom from experience, are not of much value. I do not know that, in the Province from which the hon. gentleman comes, litigants in civil cases are allowed to give evidence, but the hon. gentleman knows that they are allowed to give testimony in cases of assault; and if the hon. gentleman has been practicing recently at the bar, and has had cases of that kind, I think I can challenge him to say whether or not more perjury has been committed in such cases than there formerly was. My own experience has convinced me to the contrary. As I said, I am not going to take up the time of the House in discussing this question again, but the elaborate argument, indeed I may say the able argument of my hon. friend from Pictou—because he has exhausted that side of the question—demands some attention from the promoter of this Bill. The hon. gentleman, who apparently wishes us to believe that he would like to draw all his inspiration from the Mother Country, says that there this law has not been adopted. Well, Sir, it has not been adopted to the extent which I propose that it should be adopted here; but it was under discussion there on more than one occasion and during several Sessions of the Legislature, and some of the ablest men in the Imperial Parliament, some of those whose practice in the Courts, and especially in the Criminal Courts, gave their opinion the greatest weight, pronounced strongly in favour of the English Bill. But my hon. friend must recollect that the Bill before Parliament was entirely different from this Bill. The Bill there was to abolish the distinction between a misdemeanor and a felony, and it proposed to make competent as witnesses all the prisoners in criminal cases, whether they were indicted for misdemeanors or felonies. At present I do not propose to go that far. My own opinion is that the administration of criminal justice would suffer nothing by allowing prisoners in every class of cases to go into the witness box and tell their own story. Sir, I have no fear that an innocent man, however unsophisticated, will suffer anything by going into the witness box if he is telling the truth. I say that no man need apprehend the strictest examination or cross-examination, either by the lawyer for the Crown or the lawyer for the defence, if he is telling a plain, straightforward, unvarnished story. It is only when a man lies, when his story is a pure fabrication, when he is building up falsehood step by step, and link by link, that he need have anything to fear. Nor do I care how forbidding a man's countenance is, whether he be as black as the ace of spades, or as deformed as the noted hunchback, if he is telling a truthful story there is no danger of his suffering a wrong at the hands of a Court or jury. It is not the appearance of a man's face that counts for or against him, but the evidence which is given; and fair play and justice will be dealt out to him in the criminal dock, even if he is allowed to go into the witness box and give evidence on his own behalf. The hon. gentleman says he would have had a good deal more confidence in this Bill if it had originated with the Reformers. Now, surely the hon. gentleman does not attach any importance to that. I am quite sure we need have no such fear as that Bills of this kind are going to be treated on political grounds; for we know very well from what the hon. First Minister said, that such is not the case. I should be very sorry if such should be the case.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me, if he says I stated that I was adverse to the Bill because it proceeded from the other side of the House.

Mr. CAMERON. What I understood him to say was, that he would have had more confidence in the Bill if it had originated while the Reformers were in power. Of course, if I misunderstood him, I have not another word to say.

Mr. TUPPER. I may just as well say that I only wondered why it did not originate when they were in power, ready to reform, and professing to be Reformers. I merely called attention to that fact.

Mr. CAMERON. I am not going to take up the time of the House in discussing a question of this kind; but the hon. gentleman knows very well that the Bill on the Statute Book, enabling defendants in assaults to give evidence in their own behalf, originated when the Reformers were in power, if that has anything to do with the question. I believe that in May, 1878, the Liberal party were in power, and a Bill enabling defendants to give evidence in cases of assault was passed then, but I attach but very little importance to a question of that kind. When I introduced a similar Bill to this in 1882, the First Minister was good enough to say that the principle of the Bill had his assent. The Minister of Justice in the Senate did the same thing; and this year the Premier stated that the principle of the Bill had his full approval; and though the motion to give the Bill the six months' hoist was moved by a supporter of his own, the First Minister was consistent enough to vote in favour of the second reading of the Bill. The hon. gentleman has entirely misapprehended the line of argument adopted by the hon. member for West Durham. He quotes the hon. gentleman as supporting his views. Why, Sir, he never was in favour of those views. The Bill was introduced in 1877, the first time in the history of Canada that it was sought to enable defendants to give evidence in their own behalf in criminal cases, and not long before we made parties to suits in civil cases competent witnesses in their own behalf. The hon. member for West Durham said, when a similar Bill to the present was introduced, that he was not as sure that public opinion was quite ripe for dealing with that question in the sense in which it was proposed to deal with it. He asked for time; he was not opposed to the principle; he did not so express himself, at all events, and if the hon. gentleman will only refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for West Durham, he will find that what I have stated is borne out. The hon. member for West Durham said:

"He thought that the discussion of that evening would have convinced his hon. friend that the measure was not right, even in the opinion of those who thought it would be a reform to be placed on the Statute Book."

There is nothing there against the principle of the Bill. The only question is whether public sentiment was ripe for its introduction. Now, it seldom happens when a change is made in the criminal law, unless by a Bill introduced on the responsibility of the Attorney General, that the principle of a Bill, changing or modifying or amending the criminal law, passes the first time it is introduced. It requires consideration and discussion; and I have always taken the ground that it is unwise to make these changes without a purpose; it is unwise to make them suddenly, to make them without due consideration; but in this case we have given it every consideration; we have been years over it, and, that being so, I think, to use the language of the hon. member for West Durham, that the time is now ripe for its consideration and adoption. The hon. member for West Durham said further:

"All those considerations left the question in an exceedingly perplexing condition, and his view was that public opinion was not ripe for the introduction of such a system as that proposed. If there was a practical defect in the criminal law, it was rather that the guilty escaped than that the innocent were convicted. That being the state of affairs, he thought Parliament could wait for some time to come—although he did not say that it should wait for an Act to be passed in Great Britain in order to produce a more logical state of things in the Statute Book, and in order to produce more efficient means of convicting the guilty—before the country tried the measure to which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond) proposed to commit the House."

Sir, that is what the hon. member for West Durham said. There is nothing there about his being opposed to the prin-

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.)

ciple of the Bill; and so far as I understand the line of argument of the hon. member in that speech, it is rather in favour of the Bill, but because public sentiment was not ripe for it, he urged some delay. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has given away the whole case. He admits that in the case of an assault, when only the assailant and the assailed are present, it is a proper thing that both parties should give evidence. In making that statement, the hon. gentleman has given away the whole case; because, if the defendant in an assault and battery case ought to give evidence, I fail to see why a defendant should not be just as competent to give evidence in a case of all misdemeanors. The hon. gentleman has quoted largely from writers on this question, to convince the House that the position he takes is right, and with the view, I presume, of asking the House to reverse the vote it gave the other night. I am not going to speak at any length, but the House will pardon me if I read the opinion of two eminent men, who were cited by the hon. member for East York, in 1877—men capable of giving an opinion on the question, from their long practice in courts of criminal justice. What does John Taylor say on that question—a man known by everybody, at least in the legal profession:

"That in all judicial investigations, the object to be attained is the discovery of the truth, and no species of evidence ought to be excluded which can materially aid in that discovery; the rules of evidence, so far as practicable, ought to be the same in civil and in criminal proceedings."

Now, that is the opinion of an eminent man, whose opinion is perhaps worth more than mine or the hon. gentleman's, or even than that of the hon. member for West Durham; for although I have profound faith in the hon. member for West Durham as a political leader and as an able lawyer, yet as a *nisi prius* lawyer I do not know that I have unlimited faith in him, because I believe his practice has not been in that branch of law. If I were in a criminal dock, I do not know that I would take the hon. member for West Durham to defend me. Perhaps I would prefer the hon. member for Queen's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth), or the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), both of whom have voted and have given most cogent reasons in favour of this Bill. I wish to go a little further and quote an extract from Sir Joseph Napier, a most distinguished Irish lawyer. I think I can attach more importance to the opinion of men of this stamp than to those of writers in the United States, however much I may respect them in a general way. This is what Sir Joseph Napier says:

"There are cases in which no one but the accused could expose the falsity of the accusation, and there are cases also in which the accusation would not have been made, perhaps not even contemplated, but for the very rule which may screen it from exposure. The accusation indeed should always be sustained by independent evidence, but for this very reason it should be open to the accused to meet such evidence by his account of what alone he may be able to testify; and, moreover, as whatever the accused may state would naturally be received with jealous suspicion, he should be allowed to submit his testimony to cross-examination, that its value may be tested."

Now, Sir, there is the opinion of two noted men on this question, and I think their opinion ought to have some weight with hon. members of this House. I regret that I should have taken up so much time in dealing with the question, for I have high respect for the gentlemen who have spoken, and spoken ably on the question. The House has already pronounced in favour of the Bill, and I shall be very much mistaken if, on the arguments adduced, the House will see fit to reverse its vote.

Mr. DOSSÉ. I beg to call the attention of the House to a feature of this Bill which has not yet been alluded to—I refer to that provision which enables a wife to be heard as a witness for her husband. Bad as this Bill may be, bad as I believe it is being shown to be, I do not think any of its features are as substantially and as completely bad as this one. I did not intend to speak on this question, nor do I intend to

make a speech; but I beg the House to bear in mind, before this question goes to a vote, the terrible position in which it would place the wife of the accused. She would stand in the witness box between her love for her husband and her oath, and between the love for her children and her oath. Her husband, if convicted, would be sent to gaol, perhaps to the penitentiary, deprived of his liberty for months, perhaps for years. The result for her would be poverty and starvation. Still, she would have to choose for herself and her children that poverty and that starvation, or her own perjury. I say, Sir, that to place the wife and the mother in such a position would be a great injustice to her, and a great injustice to the prisoner, who would stand in the dock witnessing either his own condemnation from the lips of his wife, or his liberation as the result of her perjury. I say this measure, far from being a moral training for the people, would be the most demoralizing possible. And we are asked to resort to this for what purpose? Is it to be for the good of the accused or for the better administration of justice? I say no, because the oath of a person placed under these extraordinary and very depressing circumstances would not be believed. It would go for nothing, except the misery of the wife, who would be forced to choose one of two evils. Suppose she has perjured herself and saved her husband, she brings home with her for the remainder of her life the remorse of a guilty conscience. Suppose she has not perjured herself, but, true to her own conscience, has related the truth, and sent her husband to prison, what would be the position of that family after the return of the husband from his confinement? What would be the peace and happiness of that family after the return of the husband from the trial? In whatever light we look at this matter, we find nothing but evil, and nothing certainly that will tend either to the good administration of justice or to the advantage of the people.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have a few objections to offer to the passing of this Bill, and I offer them with a great deal of reluctance, in view of the fact that when this Bill was taken up for its second reading, many hon. gentlemen expressed their opinions and recorded their votes in favour of its principle. I did not think then that some hon. gentlemen had properly considered the questions which might be fairly raised for discussion, and I assume to-night that many hon. gentlemen supported that Bill upon that occasion simply for the purpose of allowing it to go before the Committee, because if there were any objections, they considered that was the proper place to discuss them. There is one fact which I do not think has been mentioned so far in this discussion, and that is that none of the Judges of our Superior Courts or of our County Courts, so far as I can learn, in their charges to the grand juries, have stated that any necessity existed for a change in the law, such as the one now proposed. That I regard as a very important fact. With all the other members of the bar in this House and throughout Ontario, I have the very highest respect for the opinions of our Superior Court Judges, and I do not believe that if there was a defect in the criminal law, such as the one that is suggested and is sought to be removed by this Bill, it would have existed so long without comment on their part. Nor do I believe that did such defect exist, it would have been allowed to exist until this late day without some hon. member of this House long before this taking measures to have it removed. There is another objection to which I wish to draw attention. If it is right that a prisoner should be taken from the dock and put into the witness box to give evidence, when his liberty only is concerned, why do you not extend the same permission to the man who is placed on trial for his life, and give him a chance for his life? Surely this principle should also be extended to a man who is placed on trial for a crime in which his life is involved, assuming that it

should be at all adopted. I am of opinion that to adopt that principle would be bad. It is unnecessary for me to go over the ground which has been so ably and so eloquently gone over by the speakers who have preceded me against this measure, but I may say, however, in answer to the hon. member for West Lambton, that my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) did not insinuate, nor intend to insinuate, nor could any such inference be drawn from anything he said, that hon. members on this side intended to oppose this measure simply because it emanated from a gentleman whose political principles are opposed to ours, and who sits on the other side of the House. In all fairness to my hon. friend, I wish to emphasize that fact, because he is too intelligent and honourable and sensible to ever give utterance to such a doctrine. I trust this Bill will not become law. It is bad in principle, and I am satisfied, if it should become law, the effects would be bad, and it would be only a short time before it would be repealed. We should not introduce legislation of this kind until we hear from those who are in a position to judge authoritatively, whether such a measure is desirable in the interests of the administration of justice.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman who has last spoken, and the two or three others who preceded him, should have addressed their observations to the House after my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill had spoken. He waited, Mr. Speaker, until you had put the question a second time, and thought he would have had the customary privilege of hearing all that would be said against the Bill before rising to reply. I would not have risen to address the House at all, had it not be for some observations made by the hon. member for Kent, New Brunswick (Mr. Landry), upon which I desire to say a few words, and being on my feet, I will address an observation or two to the House, with its permission, on some of the points taken by the last speaker. I heard with regret what the hon. member for Kent said with reference to the condition of things, as regards the observance of the sanctity of the oath in judicial proceedings, which prevails in the Province from which he comes, and for which, no doubt, he speaks with authority. Had his observations been confined in terms to the state of affairs in that Province, much as I regret them, I should not have felt called upon to say a word upon them; but I have not heard in a long time, a greater slur on the state of society in Canada than that which the hon. gentleman's words, if they were applicable to the whole of this Dominion, would not merely imply but describe. That the condition of the morals of our population was steadily deteriorating, that the crime of perjury was now so rife that it is suspected, with too often good cause, to exist in the great majority of cases that take place is, if it be the true state of things in New Brunswick, a state of things most deplorable. My own experience, up to the time at which I ceased to practice actively, is entirely the reverse of that of the hon. gentleman, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned. For many years I have had the opportunity of observing the demeanor and of estimating the credibility of witnesses, on a tolerably extensive scale, in Ontario, and I state publicly what I have often stated privately, in conversation, that in my opinion cases of deliberate perjury were extremely rare within the limits of my cognizance and of my practice. There have been, it is true, blameable attempts to suppress the truth. Witnesses have required that the truth should be rather dragged from them; they have been disposed, unless the precise question was put which elicited the fact, not to discover the fact, owing to the partisanship which grows up frequently from relationship, from friendship or from interest. Such things have happened in the course of my experience. But I do not say they are common or general.

They have happened not infrequently, but deliberate perjury is a circumstance, as far as I can judge, of extreme rarity. I have heard of late there is more laxity of swearing in some of the tribunals before which petty cases are tried in the Division Courts. Whether the greater solemnity which prevails, the presence of a larger audience, the presence of counsel in the causes, instead of their being conducted as they usually are conducted in the Division Courts, may tend to a greater looseness in the other Courts or not, I know not; but I do speak of what I think I do know, when I say that that description, that lamentable description of things which the hon. member for Kent, N. B., (Mr. Landry) gave as the prevalent state of things in his own Province would be wholly inapplicable to the Province in which we are now situate. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) pointed out, as an objection to this Bill, that we have not heard complaints from the Judges upon the subject. Well, I desire to speak with all the regard which I feel for the judicial bench. I have towards it the feelings of filial reverence and of fraternal affection, independently of those feelings which a man who has practised for the best years of his life before the Judges must have; but, with all these feelings, I will tell the hon. gentleman that, if he determines not to have a legal reform until the Judges cry out for it, he will not be very much troubled with effecting legal reforms in the course of his Parliamentary career, no matter how long that career may last. There is no class in the community which seems to be more set, as a class, with certain exceptions, it is true, in the cake of custom, to be more believers in the perfection of that which is, and less to credit the possibility of mending the things which are, than the members of the judicial bench; and I may say to him that, when we were pressing in the Local Legislature of Ontario, a measure very nearly akin to this one, that, namely, in which the parties were admitted as witnesses in civil cases on their own behalf, one of the difficulties we had to contend with was, not merely that we had no favourable expression from the judicial bench, but also—I will not say with unanimity, for I cannot accurately remember, but, if not with unanimity, almost with unanimity—the judicial bench was entirely opposed to that law. Well, the hon. gentleman, I hope, does not differ from what I think is the very general opinion of the profession in Ontario, that that law has been an extremely beneficial law; that it has conduced to the elucidation of the truth; that it has diminished very much the extent of the controverted questions in cases, and that it has led to that which ought to be the object of all legislation in these matters—a narrowing, as far as possible, of the issues of fact between the parties, and a just determination of those narrowed issues. Now, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) has probably been sufficiently answered by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron). I should have been very glad if the hon. member for Pictou, instead of giving his own gloss of my speech, had been kind enough to read it to the House, and I think it would have answered the arguments and the commentary he made upon it. The state of things was such that, in my opinion, public sentiment was not at that time, public opinion, at that time, was not ripe for that measure. It had been made in that direction in civil cases many years before we succeeded in placing such a law upon the Statute Book. It had been in advance of public opinion in Ontario, that the law had been put upon the Statute Book, and the consequence of taking that step, so far in advance of the discussion of the subject, and so far in advance of the state of public opinion, was that the law was repealed the following Session, and the old law remained so in force for a great many years. I had before me, and I quoted, in the speech to which he has referred—though his reading of it varies very much from my own—I had before me that

Mr. BLAKE.

instance of legislating in this direction in advance of public opinion, and I stated that I thought public opinion was not ripe at that time for this measure; but I guarded myself from the statement that we should wait here even until it should be possible to have the precedent of an English Act of Parliament. I said, particularly, that I did not say that we should wait until they had legislated in England before we legislated in the direction which Mr. Dymond then proposed to us to legislate. The hon. gentleman thinks it very extraordinary that, after seven more years have elapsed; after we have had seven years' more experience of the working of the Act in civil cases in my own Province, after we have had seven years' more discussion of this question, after we have had six years' experience of the working of an Act of this kind in assault cases; after the discussion of this question in this Parliament on a former occasion, I should not still hold that public opinion is still not ripe for that measure; that I should not be still of opinion that the measure should be opposed. If he thinks that, he is welcome to do so, but I venture to hope that there will not be a great many hon. members who will think so, or who will think that there is any occasion for an explanation from me of the circumstances which I have now stated briefly, and of the reasons why I now support, as I do support, this Bill. The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé) has referred to one of the details of the Bill which is, of course, open for discussion, but which it is not convenient to discuss on the motion to go into Committee, because we are not now dealing with isolated details. In fact, this whole discussion, though regular, is perhaps hardly opportune, because it is, so far as I am aware, the first case in which, after the principle of the Bill has been sanctioned by a decisive vote of the House—a vote of nearly two to one, drawn from the ranks of both political parties—we should have been treated with a fresh discussion of that principle, just as if it could be expected that the House was going to reverse the solemn judgment to which, by a decided majority, it had already come upon that principle. I quite agree with the hon. gentlemen who have argued that the adoption of the principle does not involve the sanction of all the details of the measure, and that these are open for discussion in the Committee; but we would be reversing the judgment we have already given on the principle of the Bill, if we were to decline to go into Committee for the purpose of perfecting the measure, and of eliminating, if there be any objectionable features, those objectionable features. That, I think, is the present position of this measure, and I do not think that anything that has been said to-night has thrown any further light upon the question upon which the House so unequivocally expressed its opinion a few nights ago.

Mr. WELDON. I had not intended to speak upon this question had not the hon. member for Kent referred to the state of affairs in the Province of New Brunswick. As the only other gentleman of the same profession as himself from that Province, with perhaps a larger experience, extending over thirty years, at the bar, I entirely dispute the proposition he has put forward. So far as my experience is concerned, and I think I have been engaged in every county in the Province, my experience has been that perjury does not exist to anything like the extent to which the hon. member's remarks would lead. No doubt, there are some cases in the experience of every professional man in which no amount of charity can preclude the idea that deliberate perjury has been committed, but those cases are the exception and not the rule in New Brunswick, and I shall be supported by the remarks of some of the learned Judges who have presided in the Province of New Brunswick in the opinion that the legislation which took place some twenty-seven years ago in that Province has led to

causes being better tried and the truth being better brought out than before. I am surprised at the statement made by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) as to the state of society in reference to perjury, existing in the Province of New Brunswick. So far as my own experience goes, I entirely repudiate the hon. gentleman's statement, and I believe that no such state of things exists. In criminal trials, as a general rule, I believe parties tell the truth. No doubt witnesses frequently differ in their statements, but those statements may often be reconciled. I believe that, as a rule, persons honestly tell the truth, and that wilful and deliberate perjury is the exception and not the rule.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am sorry I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman who promotes this Bill made his speech in its favour. However, I wish to state my opinion before this House concerning the Bill itself. I think the principle of it is wrong; I think the application of it will prove to be wrong; and I think that those who have had experience in the Courts of Justice in regard to such evidence as that which it is sought to make admissible, will agree that the principle of this Bill is not right. I have practiced for some years before the Courts of Queen's Bench, and I am still of the opinion I formerly entertained, that the legislation and the jurisprudence of England in the matter of evidence in criminal cases, was, after all, one upon which it was difficult to improve. Sir, I have not spent a great deal of time with the ancients, I have not read a great deal of the past, but the little I have read in old books, in very old books, has convinced me that wisdom is not all confined to the present age, and that those who lived before us had also a large measure of wisdom, especially in cases like the one which is now under the consideration of the House. At a time when people were less troubled with politics, with railway schemes, with electricity and other things; when the progress of the physical sciences engrossed less of the attention of men—I think that in those old times men reflected as much, and perhaps more, and perhaps better, than we do, upon those moral questions like the one involved in this Bill. And in the light of the wisdom of the past, I ask myself the question which was so well put, I think, by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), when he said: What is the necessity for such legislation? What representations have been made by those who interpret the law in these cases? What remonstrances have been made by Judges upon this question? My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, says that seven years ago he had his opinion upon this question, and he challenged any one to say that he was not right in changing it, because, during those seven years, public opinion had also changed.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Public opinion, then, was not ripe. But I would like very much to ask the hon. gentleman what causes have ripened public opinion since then? What facts have been elicited before the Courts of Justice which have had the effect of ripening public opinion upon this question? There are grand juries holding grand inquests in the several districts of the Dominion; have any of those grand juries, who are very often led by eminent men conducting prosecutions for the Crown, made representations as to the necessity of amending our law procedure in the sense proposed? Have there been any representations made by any grand jury in the Dominion? I say there have been none, and I go further, and I challenge any one to say the contrary. I am perfectly sure that if we were to consult the Judges of the Criminal Courts of this country; if we were to ask those who have served as grand jurors, or as petit jurors, their opinion in respect to this legislation, they would all answer that this kind of evidence is not one that can be trusted; is not one which should be adduced before a tribunal; is not one which could benefit

society or the accused. There is a strange feature in this Bill, and one which the promoter of it, perhaps, has not considered, and that is, that he proposes to adopt a mode of procedure which has been repudiated for many a year by the most eminent jurists in England. My hon. friend is opening the way to the French mode of procedure in criminal cases—the examination of the accused. He goes even further, because the French law, compelling the accused to answer the magistrate in the preliminary investigation, or the public prosecutor, does not subject the accused to the humiliation or danger of giving his evidence under oath. In France, the accused is questioned by the magistrate and is allowed to make his statement. The proposition of this Bill has not only been considered too arbitrary ever to have been adopted by the English Courts of Justice, but even in France, the accused is not put under oath. When the accused comes into Court he is also examined by the public prosecutor, but even then he is not put under oath. I go back to the English method of procedure; and I ask, why was it always held in England that the accused should not be questioned unless he volunteered to make a statement? There must be some reason for that jurisprudence; there must be some wisdom in it—and, as I said before, I believe in the wisdom of the past and the experience it has bequeathed to us—in the experience of learned and eminent Judges who have been the pride of English tribunals, in respect to just such evidence as it is here sought to make admissible in our courts. The reason is this: that if you allow the accused to give his evidence, you perhaps afford an opportunity to a clever scoundrel, to a consummate reprobate, of confusing the jury, who are generally composed of innocent men, who are not accustomed to the rules of evidence, and who would not be acquainted with all the *détours* which lawyers sometimes resort to in these cases. I heard the other day my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe say that this Bill was greatly in the interests of the accused. I beg to differ with him. It is to be remembered that a great many cases of misdemeanor are equivalent to felonies, because they seem to be punished almost as severely as some cases of felony. Well, I say that in those cases, the accused is not a witness, he is rather his own lawyer; and we may well apply to him the old maxim that the man who is his own lawyer has a fool for a client. It is only the consummate scoundrel, the man who knows the ins and outs of Criminal Courts, who would benefit by the privilege this legislation would give him of being a witness in his own behalf. The old English law said that you must not prejudice the jury against the accused; you must not force him to be a witness in his own case, because the interests of justice might thereby be frustrated; and then there was this other grand reason, that you must not introduce into legislation anything that would tend to increase perjury. The leader of the Opposition may say whatever he chooses about the remarks made by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), that he had cast a slur upon his Province in saying that perjury was of very frequent occurrence in courts of justice, especially of criminal jurisdiction. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. leader of the Opposition will admit with me, if he has had practical experience before the Court of Queen's Bench, that unfortunately perjury is a great deal more frequent there than in civil courts, and that in small petty cases, perjury is more common than in the great and important cases in which the hon. gentleman is generally engaged. I say that those who have had experience in Courts of Justice will say that perjury is frequent. And why? Because of the interests at stake; because of the liberty of the accused, because of the sympathy elicited either of relatives or friends or of accomplices. To say this is not to cast a slur upon any part of society or any part of the Dominion, only upon a certain class—that

which haunts and frequents the Criminal Courts. The general idea that pervades the old English rule—I have read it—is that the accused should not be examined under oath, that he may be saved from the temptation to commit perjury. Perjury, as has been said, is a most heinous crime. A man may have committed a fault, a grievous offence, sometimes done in a fit of passion, acting under the influence of stimulants. Poverty, indeed, might be the cause of it. If it is his first fault, there is still a strong element of honesty which might remain in his being. But if a man once commits perjury, he is a lost man to society, he is a degraded man to the end of his life, because he has offended against the truth, which is the essence of all that is grand and great. You may place a man in the dock for the crime of having stolen through poverty, or struck a man through passion, and still, after conviction and punishment, he might be an honest man; but, if you tempt and induce him to commit perjury, he is a lost man to society, he is degraded in his own estimation, and when a man is degraded in his own estimation and conscience, he is lost, and lost forever. These were the principles that pervaded the old procedure in England, and after all the investigations that were made and discussions that took place, it was not found desirable to change the law. We are told here: why should we wait until England should have done this or that before we do it? I am not one of those who would treat lightly the position which the old country has acquired in science, in law and in jurisprudence. I bow with veneration, I must say, to the opinions I see expressed in books of English jurists, and hear from the mouths of English Judges; and to those men and to the authority of their doctrine, I do bow. But I come to the discussion of the principle itself, and I take the arguments which were used by the promoter of the Bill. He says: You accept the evidence of the accused in a case of assault and battery, why should you not accept it in a case of misdemeanor? I will continue his argument: Why not accept it in cases of felony and murder? If it is necessary to prevent a man from being convicted in a simple case of assault, why not take the evidence of the prisoner when his life may be taken from him? If the argument is good in one case it is good in the other. But it is bad in the case of felony and is also bad in the case of misdemeanor. In cases of assault, it is the legislation of the old country. An assault takes place. Two men meet, a few angry words pass and a blow is struck. Why not allow the parties who came face to face, with the result that an assault was committed, to come and each tell his own story? It is only a trifle. Generally these assaults happen when two persons only are present. In France, when a man is assaulted upon the streets, you take to the police station, not only the man who committed the assault, but also the man on whom it has been committed. Both tell their stories, and both give security to appear next morning to give evidence in the case to be determined before the Court. In those trifling cases, the evidence of the defendant might be permitted; but even as regards those, I am not prepared to say that such evidence is beneficial in securing the ends of justice. The remarks made by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé) apply. I do not wish to discuss the details of the Bill, nor do I wish the House, as the leader of the Opposition has said, to reverse its own judgment. It is well understood that Bills should not receive a second reading until they are somewhat fully discussed, and perhaps it was from personal consideration for the promoter of the Bill, that discussion was postponed till the Bill should come before the Committee of the Whole. At all events, in speaking at the present moment, and giving the House the expression of my experience in Courts of Justice—and I have had some experience before the Court of Queen's Bench—I do it, so that if the

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Bill goes before the Committee, it may be amended by striking out certain portions mentioned by the hon. member for Quebec Centre and some portions which I will point out myself. The promoter of the Bill has himself seen, as appears by a proviso which he places in the first clause, that the Bill will not work, and it is provided that a prisoner cannot be called as a witness by the prosecution. Why not? If the principle of the Bill is good, and if truth is to be elicited at whatever cost, whether dangerous to society or dangerous to the accused; if truth is to be elicited even by falsehood and perjury, the system should be made equally applicable to all. But the promoter of the Bill has said that the prisoner shall not be called as a witness by the prosecution, and he says afterwards that this witness can be cross-examined. Difficulty will arise, because the evidence will not be a statement. I will go so far as to say that I do not think it would further the ends of justice that the prisoner should make a statement, as his counsel can make a statement; he is allowed to make a statement before the magistrate and before the jury when on his trial: The clause runs as follows:—

“Provided, that so far as the cross-examination relates to the credit of the accused, the justice or justices, or the court, may limit such cross-examination to such extent as it thinks proper, although the proposed cross-examination might be permissible in the case of any other witness.”

Let us suppose a case in which the husband might be examined against the wife or the wife against the husband. The fact of the credibility of the witness would be a bar to the capacity of any such evidence. The second clause—and I am sure my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, will agree with me—shows the inanity of the Bill—shows that there is something wrong with the measure. You will allow a person to go and give his evidence, and for what purpose? To be believed? No; if a man is called he may tell a false story, he may tell a story which is more to his prejudice than to his advantage. It is provided that in case such evidence is not tendered, no observation shall be allowed to be made as to the non-tender of such evidence. But can you prevent juries from forming their own opinions? Can you prevent them from saying: here is a man who is allowed to give his evidence and does not do so, and he, therefore, must be a scoundrel? Petty jurors may be very good men, but they have not a knowledge of the law, and you cannot prevent them from acting as if the non-tender of such evidence must prejudice the accused. To such an extent is this the case, that the very fact of a man not giving evidence in his own case, when he is allowed to do so, will be regarded as a sure sign that there is something wrong. On the other hand, the man who has a knowledge of the Courts, who may be a consummate scoundrel, who has often been seen in the Courts before, and who can plead as well as his lawyer, will be the one who will reap the benefit, while the innocent man may suffer great prejudice by such a provision. The last clause of the Bill also convinces me that the measure is one which will not work well. It says that if a man is accused of a crime, other than a misdemeanor, and the Court decides at the close of the evidence of the prosecution that it is only a case of misdemeanor, the defendant and his wife, or, if the defendant be a woman, her husband, shall be a competent witness. That is to say, the Judge may change the mode of procedure at the close of the evidence for the prosecution. But why should it not as well be done at the close of the evidence for the defence? Why limit it in that way? The petty jury may say: We have heard the case on both sides, and we are of opinion that the case of felony is not made out. It would then be a case for such evidence, and perhaps the tribunal would be disposed to say that the case was not a felony, but only one of misdemeanor. If the jury, who have heard the whole trial, come back and tell the

Judge and the whole world that the prisoner is not guilty of a felony, but only a misdemeanor, why not then allow him to come forward and offer his evidence, to clear himself from the accusation? I say that the measure is impracticable in this respect, as in others, and that if it were to pass, judges and juries would declare before long that it was impracticable. I contend that the Courts would receive no assistance, and that the interests of justice would not be benefited, if this measure were put in force. One of the hon. gentlemen said that the Bill was not so important, and what was the use of having so long a discussion about it? I say, Sir, that the Bill is very important, as it means the introduction of a system of giving evidence which will crush down and destroy entirely the whole mode of procedure in similar cases; that it will extend from misdemeanors to felonies, and that afterwards may be applied to cases of murder. I would like to know what benefit we would have from such a measure, if the legitimate and logical consequence of the Bill were followed up, and it were made to apply even in cases of felony.

Mr. DAVIES. I had not intended to take any part in this discussion, because I was satisfied from what took place the other evening, that the promoter of the Bill, and the various hon. gentlemen on both sides who supported it, had stated the arguments in its favour as strongly as they possibly could be stated. But the question having been reopened by some hon. members, I desire to say a word or two in reply. The hon. member from Quebec (Mr. Bossé) objects to the Bill in almost every detail. He seemed to base his objection to the clause permitting the husband to testify for the wife, or the wife for the husband, on the supposition that that clause was compulsory. But, on the contrary, if he will read the Bill, he will find that, so far as that clause is concerned, it is simply permissive. It allows the wife, in a case in which she has a knowledge of the facts which no other person possesses—as it sometimes happens she has—to go to the stand and give the jury the benefit of that knowledge. Therefore, while there would be a good deal of weight in the hon. gentleman's argument if the Bill had gone so far as he seemed to suppose it did, I do not think any weight attaches to his argument, since, so far as such evidence is concerned, the provision is simply permissive. It seems to me that the arguments against this Bill are not very strong, for this reason, that the principle of the Bill has been enacted by Parliament time and again, and applied by Parliament, not only to the trial of civil cases, but to *quasi* criminal cases. Hon. gentlemen know very well that for many years—in the Maritime Provinces for at least twenty-five years—we have had the principle of permitting those who are interested, no matter how deeply, to give evidence in civil cases. The arguments which have been made use of on this occasion—that the Bill would conduce to perjury—that such parties might perjure themselves to put money in their own pockets—was made use of to the fullest extent when this reform was introduced. But that prediction has not been verified by experience. I say unhesitatingly that to-day there is not a layman who has been unfortunate enough to have business in the Courts, nor a lawyer who has had any business in the Courts, who would stand up and ask for a repeal of the law which extends that privilege to defendants. Now, you have adopted that principle in all these civil cases; you have gone further, and extended that principle to *quasi* criminal cases—to assaults and matters of that kind, referred to by the promoter of the Bill. Look at the anomalous position in which we stand with reference to matters in which, after an action is brought, in one way, as a civil case, it may be brought in another, as a misdemeanor. In an action for a nuisance, if a man sues his neighbour, the defendant may go on the stand and give evidence; but if he prosecutes him the next day, for the identical nuisance,

as a misdemeanor, the defendant's mouth is closed. Having applied this principle to cases of libel and assault, you are not asked now to make a sweeping provision to apply to all cases of criminal prosecution; you are not asked to apply it to felonies, but, to misdemeanors. The hon. Secretary of State, who spoke last, misunderstood, I think, the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham, as to the position he occupied on this question. He did not oppose the principle of the Bill, when it was introduced in 1877, but he remarked at that time that public opinion was not ripe for its passage. He held that the principle of the Bill was good, and now he thinks that public opinion is ripe. That is the simple difference between his position then and his position now. But the hon. Secretary of State relies very much on the wisdom of our ancestors, and he asks the House to refuse to make this change, because our ancestors did not see fit to make it. Well, Sir, I have a certain respect for the opinion of our ancestors, but I think this can be pushed too far. The hon. gentleman knows that our ancestors did not allow defendants in civil cases to give evidence. We have changed that, and, so far as I know, no one desires to go back to the old system. Our ancestors in their wisdom did not allow a person accused of a crime to have counsel at all. We have changed all that, and I think wisely. Then, again, everyone knows that the wisdom of our ancestors enacted a criminal code so barbarous that, in the light of the present day, it would be regarded as opposed to every principle of natural justice, and would not be allowed to remain on the Statute Book of Canada one day; and we know it took two generations for Lord Romilly and Lord Brougham to wipe out that blot on the Criminal Code of Great Britain. Now, I do not think the wisdom of our ancestors is an entirely safe guide in this matter. We have taken some steps, and the steps so far taken have proven judicious and wise. The hon. Secretary of State appears to me to take a curious position when at one time he complains that the Bill goes too far, and at another time complains that it does not go far enough. The Bill is, to some extent, a tentative measure. The hon. member for West Huron wants to apply to misdemeanors the principle which has been already applied with such success to civil cases and to cases of assault. Everybody acquainted with *nisi prius* courts knows that it was a monstrous injustice that defendants in assault cases were not allowed to give evidence. You have changed that, and I believe that same principle can be introduced with good results in misdemeanors, such as nuisances and the like. I know of no good reasons for voting against this Bill. I think it is a step in the right direction, a conservative advance which is in accordance with the action taken by the Parliament of Canada some years ago, and therefore I will vote for the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not suppose this Bill could meet with the opposition shown against it, were it not a known fact that no reform has ever been made in the world without having been opposed. My hon. friend the Secretary of State derived his ideas of jurisprudence and law from old books, written at a time when there were no railways, no telegraphs, or any of the things that constitute the modern world. At the present time, we have telegraphs, railways, telephones, and so forth, and I think my hon. friend will admit that the world is all the happier and better for it, and although I respect as much as anybody the old laws of England, which, in their way, are probably the wisest that have ever been enacted, the hon. gentleman will, perhaps, admit that those laws are susceptible of amendment and improvement. I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend the Secretary of State to the fact that laws which are revered as much as he reveres the laws of England—the civil laws of France, which are in their way just

as wise as the criminal laws of England—have been amended in the same direction as this Bill goes, by a man whose memory he holds dear—Sir George Cartier. It is in the knowledge of everybody, at least from the Province of Quebec, that although a suitor cannot offer evidence in his own behalf, still he can be tendered the oath by the adverse party. The plaintiff may put the defendant in the box, and the defendant may put the plaintiff in the box. If this is the law of the Province of Quebec to-day, it has only been so for twenty-three or twenty-four years. The members who sat in the Legislature in Lower Canada remember the Judicature Act of Sir George Cartier. That was the first time that it was proposed in this country to force a party to become a witness against himself. Up to that time, a suitor had to make out his case as best he could, but he could not tender the oath to his adversary. Though I was a boy when Sir George Cartier introduced his measure, I remember perfectly well the storm and the tempest of opposition which was raised against it. I remember the characteristic words of Sir George Cartier at the time, that the principle was a just one, and that he would carry it in spite of bar and bench. It was urged at that time, as it is urged now, that to put a defendant in the witness box was to place him between his conscience and his interest. Well, it is placing him between his conscience and his interest, but the invariable testimony has been that although that is the case, still the truth always prevails; and now there is not one case in ten tried in Lower Canada but the first thing done is to put the defendant in the box and let him tell his own story. I am not aware that this system has been productive of perjury or of injury to the cause of justice. On the contrary, it is a most popular system, and if an attempt were made to go back to the old system, it would fail, because it would receive the most strenuous opposition from both bench and bar, although both opposed the measure when it was introduced. The same result will follow this measure. There is but one fault in the Bill—it does not go far enough. If the principle is a true one, and I believe it is, it ought not to apply only to misdemeanors, but to felonies as well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not rise to discuss the principle of the measure at all, although I must say I am deeply impressed with the able arguments against the principle of the Bill which hon. gentlemen have advanced. I rise to say that I cannot go so far as the hon. member for West Huron, as to the effect of the vote which took place the other day. As a general principle, it is true that the second reading of a Bill is supposed to carry with it the expression of the House of Commons that they accede to its general principle; but that is not universally the case. Not infrequently the reverse is the case. I do not think, in the present instance, that any hon. gentleman who voted for the second reading of the Bill the other day, would be guilty of any inconsistency in reversing his opinion to-day if he thought proper to do so, convinced by the arguments he has heard. Last Session, not only this Bill but four or five others proposing to amend the criminal law were sent to a Special Committee to be dealt with and reported upon. All the second readings of these Bills were carried *pro forma*, as, according to Parliamentary practice, they could not be sent to a Special Committee unless they received that *pro forma* consent of Parliament. Then the committee made a report, if I remember a right, affecting all these Bills, embracing them in one omnibus Bill, and this Bill of my hon. friend was lost. In introducing it this Session, the hon. gentleman said, that one reason why it did not receive the approval of the House last Session was, that it was linked with other Bills, and that all those hon. members who were opposed to any one branch of this omnibus Bill, opposed the entire Bill, so that not one single measure embraced in it had a chance.

Mr. LAURIER.

That was a good argument. Before the hon. gentleman moved the second reading, he submitted his list of a Committee to me, and I said I thought it ought to go to a Committee. But I consider that every hon. member who voted for the second reading for the purpose of allowing it to go to Committee may, without any inconsistency, vote against it at this stage. The points raised against the Bill are numerous, and I must say I was rather surprised at the unanimity of the report. The Committee must have just met and said, we will adopt the Bill and throw it before the House; so that, in fact, it comes before the House for its second reading now. I said I would not go into a discussion of the measure. It has been discussed ably on both sides, in a proper spirit, on its merits, without any reference to extraneous matter. I do not know if the House will go into Committee to-night. The Bill will evidently have to receive careful scanning, clause by clause. I do not suppose that my hon. friend will move that the House will go into Committee to-night, because we cannot hope, at this late hour, to make any progress.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	Macmaster,
Allison (Hants),	Farrow,	McCraney,
Allison (Lennox),	Ferguson (Welland),	McIntyre,
Auger,	Fleming,	McIsaac,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	McMullen,
Baker (Victoria),	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Bécharé,	Girouard,	Paterson (Brant),
Benson,	Gordon,	Platt,
Bernier,	Gunn,	Ray,
Blake,	Hall,	Reid,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Brecken,	Hay,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burnham,	Hickey,	Scriver,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Hilliard,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Homer,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Irvine,	Thompson,
Casey,	Jackson,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Kilvert,	Vail,
Catudal,	King,	Vanasse,
Charlton,	Kinney,	Wallace (Albert),
Cochrane,	Kirk,	Wallace (York),
Cockburn,	Kranz,	Watson,
Cook,	Landerkin,	Wells,
Davies,	Laurier,	Wheler,
De St. Georges,	Lister,	White (Hastings),
Dickinson,	Livingstone,	Wilson.—86.
Dundas,	Macdonald (Sir John),	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Desjardins,	McGreery,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dugas,	McLelan,
Beaty,	Dupont,	Massue,
Bell,	Ferguson (Leed. & Gren.),	Méthot,
Belleau,	Fréchette,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Quimet,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Pope,
Bourbeau,	Haggart,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hawkins,	Royal,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Rykert,
Burns,	Houde,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Tassé,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Labrosse,	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Tupper (Pictou),
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Langevin,	Valin,
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	White (Renfrew),
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	Wigle,
Daoust,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Williams,
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brookville),
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Wood (West'land)—91.

Bill considered in Committee and progress ordered to be reported, Committee to sit again.

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

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Will the hon. gentleman tell me when he will bring down the returns asked for with reference to No. 20 farm, on Fish Creek. I made the charge that not only Lieutenant-Governor Robitaille, but that another Lieutenant-Governor was interested in the purchase of that farm. I now wish to say that to-day I have had a communication from one of the Lieutenant-Governors to whom I referred—not Lieutenant-Governor Robitaille—stating that he had no interest and has no interest now in the purchase of that farm, and of course I am bound to accept his statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will attend to bringing down the return at once.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. the Finance Minister give me an idea when he can bring down his financial statement.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will let the hon. gentleman know when I am ready.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:30 o'clock, p. m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 14th February, 1884

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Real Estate Loan Company of Canada, limited.—(Mr. Beatty.)

Bill (No. 89) to amend the Act incorporating the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Bossé.)

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Niagara Frontier Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

### REFUND OF SUPERANNUATION CONTRIBUTIONS.

Mr. CURRAN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to reimburse to certain persons in the employ of the Department of Railways and Canals, on the Lachine Canal, such persons not being members of the Civil Service, any sums of money that may have been charged against them for the Superannuation Fund, under the misapprehension that such persons belonged to the Civil Service of Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the intention of the Government to put a sufficient sum in the Estimates for this purpose.

### NAVAL STATION AT ESQUIMALT.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) enquired, What steps have been taken by the Government with a view to impressing upon the Imperial Government the desirability of the continued maintenance of the naval station at Esquimalt, and of securing the continuous presence of at least one of Her Majesty's ships in British Columbian waters?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been correspondence with the Imperial Government on this subject, which I think will be found quite satisfactory; and if the hon. gentleman will put a notice on the paper to have the papers brought down, they will be brought down.

### THE BRITISH COLUMBIA MILITIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) enquired, What steps have been taken, or are now under consideration of the Government, with the view of increasing the fortifications in the vicinity of Victoria and Esquimalt; what has been done, or is contemplated in regard to the establishment of a school of gunnery at Victoria; the formation and maintenance of a permanent battery of artillery in said city; and generally to improve the strength and status of the militia in British Columbia?

Mr. CARON. The matters referred to in this question are now under the consideration of the Government. As far as the battery of artillery is concerned, we are now treating for the purpose of securing a site for barracks for that battery.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to form a naval brigade and torpedo corps in the Province of British Columbia, provided the men can be found for reasonable remuneration to compose such much needed adjuncts to the militia defence of said Province?

Mr. CARON. It is not the intention of the Government at present.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) enquired, What further aid is contemplated with regard to rifle associations in order to encourage them to become permanent feeders to the active militia?

Mr. CARON. When the Estimates are brought down, I hope to enter fully into an explanation of the matter referred to in this question.

### PORT MULGRAVE, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. KIRK enquired, Has Port Mulgrave, Guysboro', Nova Scotia, an out-port of Guysboro', been made a sub-port of Port Hawkesbury, in Inverness County. If so, when was the change made, and why was it made?

Mr. BOWELL. The out-port of Mulgrave was transferred to the Port of Guysboro', by Order in Council of the 5th of July, 1883, because of its close proximity to the chief port and consequently easier supervision, and for the greater convenience of those who had to frequent it.

### SALARIES OF CUSTOMS OFFICERS.

Mr. GAULT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to put the appraisers in the Customs Department on the salaries to which they are entitled under the Customs Act of 1883?

Mr. BOWELL. The Civil Service Act provides that the salaries of appraisers in the Customs Department shall range from \$800 to \$2,000 per annum, and in all cases these salaries are regulated in accordance with the duties and responsibilities of the appraisers at the different ports.

### FRAUD IN SALE OF PATENT RIGHTS.

Mr. MULLOCK moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 26) for the better prevention of fraud in connection with the sale of patent rights.

Motion agreed to; Bill considered in Committee, amended and reported.

## CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHARLTON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 6) to provide for the punishment of seduction and like offences.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CURRAN. I had not the advantage of being present when the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill addressed this honourable House in support of its provisions, but I have read with a very great deal of pleasure the speech that was delivered by my hon. friend on that occasion. I do not think that any one occupying a seat in this House, or any one having a heart in his bosom, or any one who is father of a family, can possibly say otherwise, than that he endorses every word which has been uttered by my hon. friend regarding the enormity of the offence which he seeks to suppress. But I think that he is calling upon us to adopt a measure which the experience of ages has condemned. I have read in his remarks that the Roman law provided punishment against this offence; I have also read in his remarks that the Canon law provides similar redress, and that the law of France meets the case as he desires it should be met. I think that with regard to that branch of the subject my hon. friend has hardly been very candid in his quotations. I think I can place my hand upon the authorities that he has selected, and show that while he has given the arguments adduced in the repertory in favour of his side of the case, he has totally failed to give the conclusions arrived at by the writers in question, who, one and all, agree that this legislation has proved a disastrous failure. First of all, with regard to the Roman law, the cases are not at all similar. The state of society to-day is not similar to that which existed at the time the *Lex Julia* was passed, which law is incorporated, in so far as its provisions are concerned, in the fourth book of the Institutes, and wherein the penalty which has been mentioned by my hon. friend was prescribed against this offence. I will take the liberty of quoting from Ortolan, in his work entitled *Législation Romaine*, where he refers to what was the state of society at the time this law was passed, and I think it will be found that no such state of society exists here. On the other hand, we have no commentary, no statement in any book written on this subject to show that the *Lex Julia* of the Roman law had the effect that my hon. friend hopes his law will produce in the country. I shall first read the following quotation:—

“ Les derniers temps de la république qui avaient offert une dépravation de mœurs étonnante. Le mariage de citoyen (*juste nuptiæ*) avait été abandonné ou changé en libertinage par des divorces annuels. On pouvait dire alors des dames romaines : elles ne comptent point les années par les consuls mais par leurs maris. Le célibat était chose de mode. Les guerres civiles et les proscriptions avaient laissé de grands vides dans les familles ; et sous le flot des esclaves, des affranchis ou des pérégrins la race des citoyens s'en allait. Plus d'une fois la censure avait signalé le péril. Auguste tenta de remédier par la législation et par la fiscalité à la corruption des mœurs et à l'épuisement de la population légitime.”—(Ortolan, *Législation romaine.*) *Loi Julia*, page 278, sec. 63.

Now, Sir, that is what Ortolan says. Another authority, and one equally worthy of respect, which is also in French, but of which I have made a hasty translation, says :

“ The Roman law punished this offence by the confiscation of one-half of the delinquent's goods, if he were a citizen. If he belonged to an inferior cast, corporal punishment was inflicted, and sentence of transportation. The Canon law obliged the seducer to marry the girl, or to grant her a dowry, and this was for a long time in vogue in certain parts of France, but as it frequently happened that the seduced one appealed on the penalty, to procure for themselves advantageous marriages, a declaration of the 22nd November, 1730, pronounced an express abrogation of the enactments, and substituted damages to be assessed by the tribunals in their discretion.”—(*Journal du Palais, Voir Attention aux Mœurs.*)

Mr. MULOCK.

Therefore, we find that, as regards the statement of my hon. friend, with reference to the law of France, he is labouring under a grave mistake. Following the Canon law, they did introduce into certain parts of France, a law against seduction, but, it was found that this opened the door to all kinds of abuses, to such an extent, that an express provision, as I have shown, passed in 1730, caused this law to be abolished. Now, Sir, what was the effect with regard to the Canon law? The Canon law, I admit, still exists. The Canon law still contains the provisions my hon. friend has noticed in his speech; but I find a very eminent commentator saying, with regard to the Canon law :

“ Le droit canonique, moins sévère que le droit romain, condamnait à épouser ou à doter la fille séduite. Cette disposition qui fut longtemps en usage, finit par tomber en désuétude. Elle avait tellement ouvert la porte aux abus que ce droit avait dégénéré en spéculation effrontée, et l'état de fille séduite était devenu un métier. On s'effraya des difficultés de la preuve ; on recula devant une inquisition dans la vie privée, et on reconnut que par la divulgation, au lieu de remédier au mal, on l'empirait. Le remède était pire que le mal.” (P. Larousse, *Dic. 19e siècle.*)

I really imagine, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend, when he says that, in twenty-seven of the United States of America, there exist laws similar to that which he now seeks to put upon our Statute Book, with reference to the crime of seduction, is labouring under a very grievous mistake. I have taken the trouble, being interested in this legislation, to look up the authorities upon this point. I have not been able to find the legislation which he refers to. It would have been advisable that he should have pointed out and read the enactments, in order that we might see that these enactments are similar to that which he now seeks to place upon the Statutes of this country. I apprehend he will find that he is labouring under this mistake which I have indicated, and I apprehend still further that he cannot place his hand upon a single authority worthy of one moment's consideration, not upon a single authority of any Judge, or of any jurist of distinction, either in this country or in the United States, or in England or in France, that will endorse the views which he has enunciated, or point out that wherever a law of this kind has existed, it has proved beneficial to the community for whose benefit it was passed. Now, Sir, I contend that when we come to pass laws of this kind, whatever our feelings may be, we are not here to introduce sentimental legislation. We must face this question as practical men with the experience of ages before us. We cannot afford to ignore the teachings of history; and, certainly, when we take into consideration that no one authority has asked for this legislation; when we take into consideration that our Judges—who are never backward in stating from the bench, in their charges to grand juries, any improvements that they think ought to be made in our laws—have never asked for this legislation; when we consider that in no part of this Dominion have we heard an expression of opinion from any Judge, no matter what his position, that he thinks the condition of our society would be improved by legislation such as this, then, Sir, I think we ought to hesitate, and not blindly rush forward and place upon our Statute Books a law, which, as I have clearly and conclusively pointed out, is not calculated to benefit the country, but is calculated to do here what it has done elsewhere, namely, that, as we find it laid down in the books in express terms, it would open the door to the gravest and most serious offences, would open the door to abuses which may be difficult to repress. It is probable, Sir, that if we adopt this measure now we shall have to go back, after having made the experiment, as other countries have gone back, and abrogate a law which I think should never find a place upon the Statutes of this country.

Mr. BOSSE moved that the Committee rise and report progress.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the provisions of this

Bill. There are three totally distinct offences enumerated, as I understand it. One is that to which the hon. member who has just spoken has directed attention, namely, the seduction of a woman under promise of marriage. Now, I quite understand that the hon. gentleman opposite may object to apply the provision of this Bill to that particular offence; but, there are two other offences of a very grave character, and one of these is a fraudulent or mock marriage. Now, Sir, I consider that if our law does not make the entrapping of a woman into a fraudulent marriage a criminal offence, our law ought to do so without any delay; and I think the common sense of the House, and the common sense of the country, will entirely respond to the proposition of my hon. friend, that the entrapping of any woman into a fraudulent marriage is a most exceedingly grave offence. I do not think my hon. friend who last spoke—if he will permit me to call him so—called attention to these provisions of the Bill. I understood his remarks to be wholly directed to the first item, that of seduction under promise of marriage. Now, Sir, the second offence is a very grave one. I think that it was stated here that our present criminal law makes no provision, or no adequate provision, for dealing with that offence; if so, I repeat it ought to be dealt with in the severest possible manner. Then, Sir, the third offence is that of entrapping a woman of heretofore good character into houses of prostitution. That, to my mind, is almost as grave an offence as could possibly be conceived, and is also deserving of very severe punishment at the hands of the criminal law. Therefore, although, as I said, I can quite understand the objections of hon. gentlemen and others also, to the first clause, I think that it would be very much to be regretted indeed if, by reason of their objections to one particular provision, they should go the length of destroying the other provisions of the Bill, in which I think all of us will agree, or ought to agree. As the Minister of Justice is not a member of this House, I think the First Minister might give us the benefit of his long experience, and of his views on this important question—because it is an important question—in the event of the law not being, as I am informed, adequate to the punishment of the two latter offences.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would make just one remark. The hon. gentleman says that we ought, at all events, to vote in favour of that clause which makes the leading of a woman into a mock marriage illegal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not say illegal, I said a crime punishable by the criminal law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is any such clause in the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, here it is:

"Any man who shall, under promise of marriage, seduce and have connection with any unmarried female of previous chaste character, or any man who, by means of a feigned or pretended marriage—"

I think that covers the ground.

Mr. COURSOL. During the discussion that took place yesterday on the Bill brought before the House by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), many members spoke of their long experience, and the many years they had practiced at the criminal bar. Well, Sir, I may mention that I, too, have had some experience with cases such as those contemplated by the Bill. I have been over twenty years administering the criminal law in the city of Montreal, for the whole district of Montreal, and many cases have come before me of a similar nature to those alluded to in this Bill. I have been accustomed to look upon our Statutes as the most perfect we could have. They were framed upon the criminal Statutes of England, and certainly no country in the world can boast of Statutes so nearly perfect. Fortunately

for Canada, we have copied in our Statutes the criminal Statutes of England almost verbatim, and every improvement that has taken place from year to year in England has been adopted in our Statutes; and it is only by following the Statutes of England that we, in this country, have such a set of Statutes as we possess. But because we have followed English Statutes so successfully, because we are in the habit of copying them, simply changing the United Kingdom to Canada, we have now and then occasion to improve on them, if the spirit of our society asks for and requires it. And in this case I must say there are certain parts of the Bill which, I believe, ought to become law. The second clause refers to women, or rather young girls being allured into houses of ill-fame for purposes of prostitution. It is a well-known fact that in all large cities, especially now that hundreds of passengers, by cars and steamers, arrive in a city during night as well as day, cases of this description come before the Courts. Anyone who reads the newspapers will be struck with the numerous offences of this kind, and there is now no real remedy for them. We hear of respectable girls coming from the country, alone and unprotected, being sent to an address in a certain street either in Montreal or any other large city, and being taken by a carter with some associates to houses of ill-fame. The police and the authorities know well that such cases occur, and we should put a stop to such practices. It is high time the morality of the country should be maintained by such a law as is proposed. At present we see fathers coming to cities in search of a daughter and mothers deploring the loss of their daughter's virtue, and all that for the want of such a law as this. Men looking for these kind of passengers have accomplices; they draw out a plan and wait for their arrival, and when one of these girls arrives and wishes to be conveyed to a certain address a carter will drive her around the city for probably half an hour and will land her in a house of prostitution. I approve of the clause in the Bill which deals with these cases and I will vote for it. As to the first section, I am not afraid of the consequences mentioned. I disapprove, however, of its terms, for I think it should be limited to girls under twenty-one years of age. As drawn, it applies to all unmarried women, whatever their age. If it applied only to minors, I would be prepared to support it. I believe when a girl has attained twenty-one years of age she knows pretty well how to behave herself, and if she does not she will probably never know. Her experience of the world should be such that she should not require to be protected by a law of this description; but a minor, probably fourteen, fifteen or sixteen, and up to twenty-one years, not having mature judgment, ought to be presumed to be under the guidance of the man who seduces her. If this amendment were made I would support the clause and the whole Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not read the Bill this Session, but I take it to be the same as was introduced last Session, and I believe it is. I was, therefore, very positive that there was no clause in the Bill providing that a person should be punishable for a feigned or pretended marriage. In reading the clause I find I am correct. There is no provision in the Bill making it a crime to have a feigned or pretended marriage with a woman; but, if the hon. gentleman will read the clause, he will find the offence is the criminal conversation, and not the feigned marriage.

Mr. FOSTER. I voted in favour of the principle of the Bill introduced last year, which was similar in its terms to that now before the House. I have seen no reason since to change my opinion on the subject. I am very sure the best course for the House to adopt is to give it a candid and deliberate investigation. I do not see any reason why we should hurry this Bill at double speed. It is at least a question in which the mass of the people take some interest; it is a question, as shown by the votes last

year, in which a large number of members on both sides of the House take a deep interest; and it is, therefore, worthy of calm and deliberate consideration at the hands of the House. I entertain as much respect for authority as any hon. member. I believe in paying deference to what is old, not simply because it is old, but being old it is the result of the experience of generations which have lived before us. But while I have respect for what is old and will pay respect to it, I still believe we have the liberty to change our methods of procedure, our methods of action, from generation to generation. I do not believe that law is any more a divine thing, so far as we find it on our Statute Books, than that I believe philosophy is a divine thing, as we find it in our books of philosophy. These are simply philosophical formulae, or theological formulae or law formulae, they are simply the result of the best thoughts of the people who collected and concentrated them; and as people's thoughts and sentiments change; it is perfectly right for them to change the expressions of those thoughts and sentiments; and I believe that will apply with respect to law as to other things. So, while a good deal is to be learned from precedents, we have to look at the conditions of the present and the needs of the present. An hon. member who spoke last night gave a pretty full and philosophical definition of what law was meant for. I could not better that; I might vary it by saying something like this: every law is meant to accomplish three things, first, to exalt the right; second, to punish the wrong-doer; and third, to protect the person who is involved. Take the law against slavery and follow out these three lines, and you will see what benefit it was. The law gave freedom to the slave, and exalted the right to human freedom. It did more than that, it punished the person who should go against that canon of right; and it protected those who were liable to be whipped and injured by slave drivers. These things enter into any law, and they enter into the consideration of the question before the House to-day. Is it right between man and man in a community that confidence ought not to be betrayed and that sacred contracts ought not to be violated? If that is right, I say it is right in this particular instance, and that right ought to be emphasized on the Statute Book. In this matter, it is not a question of mere sentiment, which has been pooh-poohed by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). I am surprised at his thinking that in this Assembly, or in any other, we shall not take sentiment into account when making laws. I had supposed that our laws were based on sentiment, and that it was necessary to get down to a right and true sentiment and have our laws based on that before they could be satisfactory. It will be a sad day for this country, and for any country, when the majority of our legislators come to the conclusion that law is not to be based on correct sentiment, that it is to be a mere mechanical thing, something enacted only for convenience sake. I do not believe in that. I do believe in the remarks offered by the hon. gentleman from Montreal East, whose large and mature experience outweigh to my mind all that has been stated in the opposite view of the case by the hon. member for Montreal Centre. So I believe that we ought, by putting this law on the Statute Book, to emphasize what we believe to be right in the matter of confidence and sacred contract, the inviolability of both, so that neither ought to be betrayed or outraged. I say that so long as there is one single wrong-doer—and my hon. friend representing Montreal East stated that there were cases which had occurred in his own experience over and over again—if there be only one such case out of ten thousand; if there be such an example as that; if there be such a scoundrel as that; I say it is a sufficient reason to put a law on the Statute Book to punish that wrong-doer. Then again with reference to the

Mr. FOSTER.

third clause, I think there are persons liable to be injured. All have not the same experience. Girls coming from rural districts are not quite so experienced, quite so able to take care of themselves, in certain respects, as girls who have mingled more in society, and have had better advantages and opportunities in that respect. There are cases which crop up every now and again. No person can read the newspapers for a consecutive week without seeing the records of cases in which we find that innocent persons are wronged, and we cannot do better than place a law on the Statute Book which, so far as we can possibly do so, will make it less possible for the innocent to be wronged. It has been stated that there are States in the American Union which have passed such laws, and the question has been asked, whether or not morals are better there than here. I say that question does not go to the bottom of this matter; it is not a fair parallel. You have to ask whether the conditions of those States are just the same as the conditions here; and you have to ask this other question, whether, if such laws had not existed, the state of morals would be quite as good as they are. If not, it is a pretty fair proof of the wisdom and the necessity of such laws, that men, as intelligent as we ourselves are, have, in State after State, placed them on the Statute Book, and if we cannot point to one of those States where they have repealed such laws, that is a pretty fair proof that they have not worked any harm, but that they have been considered to have done some good. I am in favour of placing this law on the Statute Book. If it is right, let the right be exalted; place the law on the Statute Book, protect the innocent and punish the wrong-doer. Then we can go to work and exercise our ingenuity in preventing any fraud from taking place under that law; make your safeguards against frauds and blackmailing as broad and deep as you please, but after that let the cardinal principle be to punish the wrong-doer and protect the innocent. I hope this Committee will not vote to rise and kill all portions of this Bill. I give to every other gentleman the same right to hold his opinion and to hold it just as strongly as I hold my own; but I should feel that we had done something which I do not think would exalt the dignity of this Parliament in the eyes of the country, if we refused, for instance, to pass a law that where any person, vile and ingenious, makes it a trade to inveigle young girls, or older ones, into a house of ill-fame, there should be some strong and steady and powerful arm of the law to come down for the protection of the innocent and the punishment of the guilty. If we vote that the Committee shall rise, we kill every section of the Bill—we have to take the onus of killing the good and the bad. If there are particular sections which we may consider not to be good, let us go on as a Committee to expunge them; let us not vote to rise and thereby kill everything which is good in the Bill.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I do not agree with the opinion of the hon. member for King's, that a law must be based on sentiment; I think it should be based on reason, and it is for that reason that I think the first clause cannot be accepted by this House, as it now stands. By this clause you give a premium to girls of bad character—you reward them for their bad conduct, by allowing them to make a certain compromise after the deed; you endeavour to make the thing good, which you have declared to be bad under certain other conditions. If you think it necessary to punish the act of seduction, why condone the offences of the two criminals, on the condition that they shall marry? If it be a crime at first, it cannot be otherwise afterwards. I do not believe, for my part, that a woman is so much inferior to a man in intelligence, that she cannot distinguish between right and wrong; and if it is so, I do not see why we should reward the woman who has done the wrong

by giving her a chance to blackmail, or obtain from her accomplice either her reward, or such a position in society that her character would not entitled her to. It is for that reason that I am opposed to the clause as it stands. I would be willing to punish a man who, through an accomplice, would entrap a woman into a mock marriage. I think in that case, there is a crime to be punished. But I would not go further than that, because I think that in the first case there is the will of both, and I do not see why the law should protect the one and punish the other, when both are guilty. I am in favour of the second clause, and if the first clause is amended so as to limit the enactment to mock marriages I should vote for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that although the hon. First Minister may be right enough in saying that the mere fact of the mock marriage may be not punishable under this clause, still the consequences which usually ensue in such cases, are distinctly made punishable; and that is a crime, and a very grave crime itself, which, if not at present punished by our criminal law should undoubtedly, I contend, be made a criminal offence. That point seems rather mixed up in the clause to which I call attention; and I think it would be better if a distinct clause should be introduced in which we could make both the mere fact of contracting a fraudulent marriage and any subsequent intercourse taking place in consequence thereof, severely punishable. As to the fact stated by the member for Montreal East, every one who knows anything of large cities, knows that there are in them a number of vile hags who deliberately plot for the purpose of destroying innocent young girls who fall into their clutches. This subject has over and over again been brought to the attention of the English House of Commons and other deliberative assemblies; and I think in most other countries it is made severely punishable by the criminal law.

Motion that the Committee rise withdrawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am strongly opposed to the first clause, for the reasons which I gave last Session, and which have been given by my hon. friend who spoke first to-day. I am in favour of the second clause, and so stated when the Bill was before the House last Session. The first clause is simply this, that if any man, under promise of marriage, or by means of a feigned or pretended marriage, has sexual intercourse with any woman of previously chaste character, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanour. I think it is a great mistake to offer additional inducement to blackmail. At present, if a woman is engaged to a man under a promise of marriage, and there is a breach of that promise, there is a civil action for damages. That is a sufficient protection for a woman whose time has been taken up and whose future has been destroyed by a promise of marriage and a breach of that promise. But the fault of this clause is that it puts every man at the mercy of every woman. To be sure, the clause says she must be a woman of previous chaste character; but every woman must be supposed to be innocent until she is proved to be guilty, and the clause, in effect, puts every man at the mercy of a woman who claims that there has been a promise of marriage, and that improper consequences have ensued from that promise. At present, the woman knows that if there is a breach of promise, she can have an action for damages; but if she wants to hold the young man, she will go further, in order that she may have a double hold upon him—first, in a civil action for damages, and second, in an indictment for misdemeanour. Now, Sir, we can fancy the nature of the evidence that would be given in this case. When the Act was first introduced, there was no such clause in it as the third clause, which relates to corroborative evidence. That was introduced in consequence of the strong expression of opinion

in the House that some such protection should be given. I believe, however, that this corroboration would be nugatory. The section provides that the evidence of the woman shall be corroborative as to both the promise of marriage and the seduction. The promise of marriage can be proved, and is proved continually in cases of breach of promise. If there have been certain consequences from the seduction, that is a corroboration of itself. But what corroboration can there be given of the fact of improper intercourse, except such evidence as we cannot well discuss in the House with strangers in the gallery; but one can fancy the nature of the evidence that must be produced in order to prove the fact of the seduction. There is no living proof of it, and there must be in the first place the woman coming forward and deliberately declaring her own shame, when, by keeping her own counsel, she might live before the world as a virtuous and chaste woman. She comes forward and swears to it, and she must, either by contrivance or by convinance with some strange witness, make a corroboration of it; otherwise, there could be no corroboration, unless the parties were actually taken in the fact, or unless by an arrangement made by which the evidence is manufactured. I consider that this clause is altogether objectionable. Now, Sir, the inducement that is offered by this clause to women to force young men to marry them, is increased to an enormous extent by the provision that in the case of an unmarried man, the subsequent marriage of the parties, or a *bona fide* offer of marriage on the part of the defendant, may be pleaded in bar of conviction. The crime has been committed, the promise has been made, the woman has been seduced, and she can say to the young man now, "You have seduced me, and you must marry me, or I will prosecute you." The inducement to levy blackmail offered by this clause is heightened to such an extent that, I think, both fathers and sons would be very unwilling to allow it to become law. That is my objection to the first clause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's objection, however, does not cover the offence contained in the first clause, of obtaining intercourse by means of a fraudulent or pretended marriage. The two offences, as the hon. gentleman will see, are wrapped up together in that clause. I must say candidly that I admit that there is great force in much of what the hon. gentleman has said, and I do not usually say he is correct unless I entirely believe him to be so. But there are the two other offences—the offence of obtaining intercourse with a woman by means of a fraudulent marriage, and the offence, which the hon. gentleman agrees with the mover of the Bill should be declared criminal, of bringing young girls into houses of ill-fame—also provided for in the Bill. These should, undoubtedly, I think, be made criminal offences. But I call attention to the fact that the first clause mentions the two distinct offences.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it does not. There is the one offence of improper intercourse. That is either by promise of marriage or by a feigned marriage. This clause might be made quite effective as providing for the punishment of seduction by means of a feigned marriage, and I have no objection, as a member of this House, that a clause should be prepared and inserted in the Bill, making a feigned marriage a punishable offence.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand, the limit of the clause would be as the hon. gentleman states. It would not be intercourse that would be punishable, but intercourse procured by feigned or mock marriage. What the hon. gentleman intimates is that a feigned or mock marriage should be made an offence, whether or not followed by the intercourse. It would, therefore, be a more stringent measure in that sense than the Bill. I do not object to it, because I think his view is correct. It is hardly conceivable that a feigned

or mock marriage should be brought about for any other purpose than to be followed by the intercourse which is conjoined with the offence. It is not the intercourse alone or the marriage alone, but the intercourse obtained by means of a feigned or mock marriage. It would, therefore, be very easy, if it were the sense of the Committee, to drop that portion of the clause which relates to seduction under promise of marriage, and to simply make a criminal offence the procuring of a mock marriage. The question is whether any hon. gentleman is disposed to move an amendment to the clause in that direction, leaving out that earlier part which has relation to seduction under promise of marriage and then recasting the clause in the other sense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There might be several reasons besides the one suggested in this clause for a feigned marriage, such as the right to property.

Mr. BLAKE. A feigned marriage would not touch that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is something in that. This clause had better be struck out, as it is ineffective for any purpose, and a clause prepared by the hon. gentleman, making a feigned marriage a misdemeanour, and providing that if the feigned marriage be followed by cohabitation, it would be an aggravation of the offence.

Mr. CHARLTON. I consider the crime of seduction under the promise of marriage, the most grievous offence named in this Bill. I am unable to understand how the hon. the First Minister should entertain the fears he does with reference to abuses on the part of designing females arising under this Bill, such as blackmailing. I have looked up the American record of cases of this kind, and from that record I judge that the hon. gentleman's fears are entirely unfounded. I do not believe there would be any danger of successful attempts at blackmailing under this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have known of several cases in my own practice.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course false charges may be made in connection with any kind of crime. It is a reflection upon the character of a man to be accused of stealing or perjury, and it is equally possible such charges might be made for the purpose of extorting blackmail. I do not believe there is any greater danger under this Bill of a charge of that kind being made than under the criminal law, in respect to other crimes for which penalties are imposed. With regard to the objection raised by the hon. gentleman, that the Bill provides the woman should be previously of a chaste character and the law presumes this until the contrary is proved. That, I consider, is perfectly proper. It is proper that the onus of proving previous unchastity should rest upon the party who asserts the contrary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The indictment would have to state the fact of the seduction, the promise of marriage and that she was of chaste character, and every material allegation in the indictment would have to be proved.

Mr. CHARLTON. According to the reports of American cases, the law presumes the woman was chaste, and it must be proved that she was not before action can lie. With regard to the contention that civil damages cover the case entirely, that a certain amount of money is a sufficient remedy, there are cases in which to ask for damages would be a mockery. Suppose the woman was driven to commit suicide, or that her character was blasted for life and she became an outcast from society, would any civil damages repay the loss she has sustained? Should the seducer be imprisoned for two years, as this Bill provides, he would not suffer the punishment which has to

Mr. BLAKE.

be undergone by the woman who can never recover her position in society. The man can hold up his head, and with a certain class of men his baseness is applauded; but the contrary is the case with the woman, and this is where the law should step in and say that a few paltry dollars is no compensation, but that punishment must be inflicted. The corroborative evidence required in this matter makes it utterly impossible that blackmailing should be attempted, and besides in being allowed to give evidence in his own behalf, the man is surrounded with a safeguard such as he is not provided with in any other country in Christendom. No law, elsewhere, provides that he may tender his own evidence, and this, in addition to the corroborative evidence which must be furnished by the woman upon every charge contained in the indictment, will effectually prevent the danger feared. With regard to the evidence, the hon. gentleman says the promise of marriage is quite easily proved, but the seduction is almost impossible to prove. I do not see any material difficulty in proving one more than the other, as probably the same class of evidence would be used in both cases. Marriage engagements are not generally made in public, but are matters of as much secrecy, as a rule, as the other matter referred to in the hon. gentleman's remarks. With regard to the provision making marriage a bar to conviction, I am willing to surrender that point. As I said last year, I think where a man obtains conjugal favours under promise of marriage, the promise, if carried out, should be a bar to conviction, but if it is the sense of the Committee that it should not, I am willing to strike it out of the Bill. With regard to feigned marriages, of course, if it is the sense of the Committee that seduction under promise of marriage be not considered a penal offence, I shall gladly retain the other part, although I consider it an insignificant portion of the Bill, because marriages of this kind are very rare. I may say a few words in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Montreal Centre. At the outset he told us that experience had condemned a measure of this kind. I doubt that assertion. This measure was a principle of the Roman code for many centuries. It is true that under the Empire, great licentiousness prevailed in Roman society. But that was not due to the fact that there was a law prohibiting licentiousness. The prevalence of crime is never due to the fact that crime is prohibited or punished, and it is folly to say that because licentiousness prevailed in Roman society it must be concluded that the existence in the Roman Statutes of a law punishing seduction led, by some occult process, to this state of society. With regard to the law of France, although the Canon law was abrogated in 1730, the law in France still provides that the seducer shall either marry the person seduced or settle a dowry upon her. The following abstract of the French law shows that, though it does not actually provide a penalty for the crime of seduction, it provides safeguards against it:

"The French law, though not actually defining any penalty for the crime of seduction, provides many safeguards for the protection of single women, such as: the rights of minors, filiation, damages, etc. In 1867, the master of a female apprentice, who had been guilty of seduction, was condemned by the Assize Court of the same to settle an annuity on his victim, and this precedent has been acted upon by the different Assize Courts of France ever since."

The hon. gentleman in referring to my remarks about the existence of laws of this kind in the Statute Books of various States of the Union, questioned the truth of that assertion, and said I should have pointed out the enactments. I did not think it was worth while detaining the House with a list of these enactments, but I have here a list of them in twenty-seven States, in every one of which, with the exception of possibly one or two, there is punishment for seduction under promise of marriage, and the penalties are generally very severe. In Michigan, the maximum is as high as ten years imprisonment; and in very few States is

it less than three years. In many of the States adultery is punished, and the laws, though differing in many other respects, are uniform in this one respect that they punish seduction under promise of marriage. My friend from Montreal East says he would approve of this Bill if the provision as to seduction under promise of marriage applied only to minors, to girls or women under 21 years of age. I have given considerable thought to that matter, and have been sometimes ready to arrive at the conclusion that that would be a salutary provision. It is a provision in some of the United States, and in some one or two of them the limit is 18 years of age—the seduction of a girl under that age is punishable, but not the seduction of a woman over it. These minor matters—these amendments to the Bill, are matters that can be settled in Committee. Anything that is reasonable I shall be glad to agree to; anything which does not require the abandonment of the principle of the Bill. The member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) does not approve of making a subsequent marriage a bar to conviction. It was not the sense of the House that it was proper to retain that provision last year. It is inserted in the Bill and is left to the sense of the Committee. If it is the sense of the Committee that that should be expunged, let it be expunged, but I hold that we ought to retain the principle of the Bill, as it refers to seduction under promise of marriage. It may be proper to limit the age to twenty-one years, and it may be proper to provide that a subsequent marriage shall not be a bar to conviction, but that the Bill should provide for the punishment of seduction under promise of marriage is my firm conviction; and I submit these views to the Committee, hoping that they will take them into consideration, and, with such modifications as may be proper, will report the Bill.

Mr. MACMASTER. The object of this Bill is professedly to punish offences against chastity, but, while such is its general object, it proposes to punish only offences against chastity in the man, and omits to do so in regard to the woman. It would be entirely illusory, and would bespeak a want of experience of mortals, to suppose that the man is always the misleading party. Are there no designing women, who make designs upon men, and especially upon young men, and lead them astray? And shall women go unwhipped, while a new crime is added to the Statute-Book as against men? Again, the hon. gentleman proposes to make a crime what is really not a crime, and, above all, is not a crime in one party unless it is also in the other. In seduction, both parties must consent. If there be the carnal knowledge against the consent of one of the parties, it is rape, and the criminal law makes ample provisions for it, but it cannot be a crime where both parties are consenting. It look very plausible to say a woman should not be seduced under promise of marriage; but a woman must know, and women do know, that a promise of marriage is not marriage; and, if the temptation is held out to a designing woman, as the First Minister has clearly pointed out, that she will have, not merely for the breach of promise, a civil action for damages, but in addition a criminal remedy, unless the marriage is consummated, a great leverage is placed in her hands to yield her virtue and consent to seduction. I do not think, in the interests of morality, of which my friend from King's is such a zealous guardian, and very properly so, in this House, that a temptation should be placed in the way of women, to coerce a marriage at a subsequent stage by temporarily yielding to seduction. I think the proper rule is the old rule, that eternal vigilance is the price of virtue as well as the price of liberty, as Junius has said. A woman must know that, although marriage is a very fine thing in the prospect, she is not to be permitted to put her virtue in the balance, and to think that the law will protect her with

the double remedy of a civil action and a criminal action against a man, because she may think it proper to yield to that man's enticings or to his blandishments. A woman now has the protection of an action for damages. I quite agree with the remarks of the First Minister and I base my opinion not only on his experience and the experience of other hon. gentleman, but on my own experience on the criminal side of the court—that offenses would be very largely increased, and morality would not be served by this Bill, and especially the first clause of it, becoming law.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is competent to me, I should like to move an amendment to the first clause. I move that the first clause be adopted with the omission of all after the words "as hereinafter mentioned," leaving out entirely the proviso, and then it will read:

"Any man who shall, under promise of marriage, seduce and have illicit connection with any unmarried female of previously chaste character, or any man who by means of a feigned or pretended marriage, has sexual intercourse with any woman of previous chaste character, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall be punishable as hereinafter mentioned."

Mr. BERGIN. It appears to me that that is not an amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; it proposes to omit some words.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). In case this is decided as lost, I presume it does not mean the adoption of the whole section as it is. I would suggest that, instead of striking out what the hon. gentleman has spoken of striking out, it would be better to strike out all after the first four words, "any man who shall," until you come to the word "has," which should be "have" in the fourth line, and then continue until you reach the proviso. Then it will provide against the crime of a feigned marriage and its consequences, and will leave out the first part about promise of marriage and the proviso that a *bona fide* offer of marriage shall be a compensation. That would be my idea of the section, if adopted at all.

Mr. BERGIN. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should add the words "or woman" after the words "any man."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Several hon. members including my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), have spoken of their experience, and I suppose my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) is speaking of his experience.

Mr. MACKENZIE. So did the member for Carleton.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the amendment of my hon. friend to strike out the proviso, because the clause is not so objectionable without that proviso as it is with it. At the same time, after it is so struck out I shall vote against the whole clause.

Amendment agreed to, on a division.

On section 2.

Mr. ABBOTT. With regard to this second clause I think it is one that ought to be adopted, but it does not quite satisfy me as to its terms. I am not quite sure I understand what is meant by a person who shall "inveigle or entice any female." The female may be enticed into a place by treaty, by persuasion, by soft speeches, etc., and I think that would not be sufficient to constitute a crime according to the view we have taken in striking out the first clause. I see in former legislation on such subjects we have required that the woman shall be drawn into the offence by some false pretences, or false representation of some kind. In the Criminal Acts of 1869, where a somewhat similar offense

is spoken of, the words, "By false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means are used" are used. I would suggest that this clause should be amended by inserting these words in the first line of this second clause, and that the clause should read:

"Any person who shall, by false pretences, false representations or other fraudulent means, inveigle or entice any female.—"

I move that those words be inserted there as an amendment to the clause as it stands.

Mr. CHARLTON. I accept that amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the words "of virtuous and chaste character" should be struck out. If a woman, no matter what her previous character might be, should by fraudulent means be induced to enter a house of ill-fame, should be protected as much as the most virtuous woman in the land, for she might be desirous of leading a reformed life. If the clause is adopted with these words, they must be inserted, in the indictment they would form a material allegation, and as such would have to be proved. It would be no answer to say that every person in a criminal trial is supposed to be innocent of the offense until proved guilty. That has no reference to this provision; because this would be the allegation of a specific fact, just the same as if it were stated that a female was of the age of twenty-one years, it would have to be established. For these reasons I move that the words "of a virtuous and chaste character" be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved to strike out of the third clause all the words from "corroborated," in the third line, to "hereof," in the second last line.

Mr. ABBOTT. I think the hon. gentleman should go further, and that these words as to the inveiglement or enticement should also be struck out, as they are essential elements of the crime.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think these words should be struck out, because the language of the previous clause makes the definition of these offenses clear enough.

Mr. ABBOTT. The purposes of the inveiglement or the enticement are elements of the crime, and therefore there should be corroboration as regards them also.

Amendment agreed to.

On the section 4,

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman should allow this clause to stand until the House shall have dealt with the other Bill in relation to this class of evidence.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think the request of the hon. gentleman is a reasonable one, because the House insisted upon the insertion of this clause as a protection against blackmailing, and it was one of the principles of the Bill most fully discussed, and one which the great majority of members insisted upon.

Mr. TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will not consent to have the clause stand over, I shall be obliged to move that it be struck out.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I think since you have permitted any female, no matter whether she is chaste or not, to go into the box and swear away the character of a man, it would only be fair and reasonable that the party charged should be allowed to give his evidence.

Bill reported.

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

Mr. ABBOTT.

### After Recess.

#### PREVENTION OF FRAUD IN RELATION TO CONTRACTS INVOLVING THE EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation), in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 12) "An Act to amend the Act intituled: 'An Act for the better prevention of Fraud in relation to Contracts involving the expenditure of Public Moneys,'" said: Mr. Speaker, at two different times I have already had occasion to lay before this House the Bill, of which I have now the honour to propose the second reading. The first time I met with a tolerably marked hostility on the part of the Government. Nevertheless, I have not been lacking in perseverance. I introduced the Bill a second time, and I met with more success. I succeeded in having embodied in our Statute Books a part of the Bill I had then submitted; but a particular clause was eliminated. The amendment I now propose to this law is intended to prevent the contractor, having contracts with the Government, from subscribing any money for the purpose of assisting in elections. In a few moments, I shall have occasion to say a few words on the details of this Bill. Two objections were formulated against this Bill, the first and second time that it was introduced, which objections may be summed up as follows: the first partook more of an exception to the form than of anything else, because it was said this law ought to form part of the electoral law. Well, it matters very little whether the law is classified in a particular way or not, as long as it is embodied in our Statutes, and there cannot be any inconvenience to have it put in a special chapter, so that this objection ought now to disappear. The other objection which was made at the time was, that people were waiting the result of a similar Bill which was then before the House of Commons in England, and they wanted to wait after the adoption of this Bill so as to have a precedent to go by. Well, since that time the Bill has been passed by the House of Commons in England, and in a few moments I shall have the honour to refer to that law which aims at a purpose nearly similar to that of the Bill whose second reading I now propose. I may say also—if I am rightly informed, and I have reasons to believe that I am—that a similar Bill, introduced by Senator Pendleton, and of which I had a copy when I introduced my own Bill last year, has been adopted by the Congress of the United States. Well, with these precedents before us, I think I am justified this year in bringing again before the House, the Bill which was rejected last year, and I think I and at the same time justified in saying that I ought to succeed this time, since the reasons which have provoked a vote against my Bill last year have now ceased to exist. Now, will the Bill I have the honour to submit produce the desired effect? I know that it is very difficult to discover the secret practices which take place during the elections; but it is the same with this kind of offence as with any others, which the law seeks to discover and to punish. There are a great number of misdemeanours, and even crimes which remain unperceived, because the law is unable to discover them. This would not be a reason to reject the Bill I now submit, for the moment the guilty party could be found, the law would come in and punish him for the grievous and serious offense which it ought to repress. I think I am justified in stating here, and it will be readily admitted, that in the past, contractors have in fact contributed pretty large sums towards facilitating the elections of their friends, and giving the victory to the party of their choice, with a view to ensuring the success of their own enterprises. It goes without saying that it would be a great anomaly, if, in the body of our laws,

which now punishes in a pretty severe manner all offences tending to corrupt the electoral body, there could not be found one law having in view the exhaustion of the source from which flows the evils which I desire to remedy. Now, if we preclude the subscribing of large sums in this manner, it is obvious that we will remove by this means a direct and immediate cause of corruption and of buying of votes. Since the electoral law has been found necessary; we must, at the same time, make it useful and practical by preventing the evil I have just pointed out. There is also another reason why this Bill ought, it seems to me, to be adopted. It is an acknowledged fact that when contractors make pretty large advances to ensure the victory of one party over another in an electoral contest, they do not do it without a mental reservation, that is to say, without the firm intention of being well repaid, or to use an old French proverb: "They give an egg to get an ox." Probably the cause of their superabundant charity, if I may use the expression while speaking of certain candidates, lies at the bottom of this mental reservation. Since it is admitted in theory that the moneys coming from that source are productive of evil, why should we continue this system? Why not immediately put a stop to it? The Bill I have the honour to submit to this House would succeed in hindering the guilty parties, at least through fear of the pretty severe punishment which is the sanction of the law, from continuing to incur expenses which are certainly not made in the interest of the public, but which, on the contrary, are conducive to the gangrening of the electoral body. There has been formulated against this Bill an objection, saying that it would deprive the contractors of the rights and privileges they now enjoy, and which are common to all citizens. Well, I find an apology between the position in which the present law puts the contractors and the position in which this Bill would put them. In fact the law, as it now exists, provides that no contractor having contracts with the Government shall be a candidate or be declared elected as a member of this House. This law is founded on a just and legitimate reason which lies in the object of putting the members of this House in such a position that they will be perfectly independent of their colleagues, and of Parliament. Therefore, we are not depriving the contractors of any of their privileges when we say to them: "If you do not want to be a candidate yourself you cannot create candidates of your own choice; you cannot, out of your own money, or in other words out of the moneys you are receiving by virtue of your contracts with the Government, assist in procuring the election of members." This provision of the law is most wise and does not deprive the contractors of any of their privileges, either in one case or the other. I had occasion a moment ago to say that this principle had been admitted by England and that it had been inserted in the Statute Books of the Parliament of Great Britain. I have in my hand the Statutes of the year 1883, and I shall quote 46-47 Vict., chap. 51, sec. 13. This clause forbids either the payments of subscriptions or the advance of moneys, with the exception of the sums paid in a strictly legal sense. By the way, I may add that this law is extremely stringent; that the expenses of election are reduced to their lowest terms, that is to say, to a sum which seems excessively low when compared to the enormous sums formerly expended in England for electoral purposes. Clause 13 of this Statute says:

"When a person knowingly provides money for any payment which is contrary to the provisions of this Act, or for any expenses incurred in excess of any maximum amount allowed by this Act, or for replacing any money expended in any such payment or expenses, except where the same may have been previously allowed in pursuance of this Act to be an exception, such person shall be guilty of illegal payment."

Well, we see that it is forbidden to pay, subscribe, or give, in order to meet the expenses of an election, any sum of

money that will exceed the limit established by the Statute. By analogy, in our country the electoral expenses have been restricted by law and those expenses must be stated in a report certified by the candidate who is returned, they must be given in detail, so that each item of these expenses may be verified. Now, I ask, if we intend to maintain this law in all its integrity, of what earthly use is there to allow the subscribing of enormous sums, or even of any sums exceeding the ordinary limit of those necessary for an election? As the electoral expenses are now reduced to their lowest terms most of the candidates can pay those expenses themselves, and it is not necessary for them to have recourse to strangers, to get the assistance of their money. I shall not repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I have said on two or three different occasions on the subject of this Bill. I will only say, that I am certain that public morals would be better off, if, as is the intention of the present law, the electoral expenses were restricted to an extremely low sum. I will now point out which are the cases which the law is intended to cover. Here is the Bill in a few words:

"Whosoever, for the purpose of assisting in any election to the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of any of the Provinces of Canada while performing any such contract . . ."

A contractor during the execution of his contract is really dependent on the Government; he has, in a manner, an official character; he is not fully and perfectly free, as he stands, so to speak, face to face with his creditors, who ought to require of him the full accomplishment of his contract, and who can make conditions, more or less hard, more or less difficult, for the acceptance of the work under contract. Well, by virtue of this law, as long as the contract exists, he cannot subscribe to the election fund. Besides, if after having completed his work, he has not yet received the payment therefor, he will still be deprived of the right of subscribing for electoral purposes. And this limitation will also extend to the twelve months next preceding this election, and to the twelve months next following the election. Finally, if he contracts again, and there is still money due him on this new contract, he will be equally excluded from the right of making an election subscription. Should he violate these prohibitions, he becomes liable to a penalty, which may amount as high as \$1,000. But this penalty would be delusive if he was allowed to release himself at once, without any further trouble to him, but the payment of the fine; but if we attach an ignominious penalty to this misdemeanor, if we add to the one an imprisonment which may vary from one to twelve months, at the discretion of the court, it is easily conceived that a man who does not wish to lose his name and reputation will not dare to incur the penalty of imprisonment. If the penalty was only a fine, it is obvious that it would be very easy to get out of scrape, especially for a man who owns considerable wealth; and this happens every day in our police courts, where, a man fined \$20 for striking another hits him again and is very glad to get off by paying again, double that fine. Therefore, the mere fine would not be a sufficient punishment, and I think the fear of imprisonment will have the effect of stopping completely these subscriptions, which are not made in the interest of the public, but in the interest of the contractors. With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I submit this Bill to this hon. House, and I hope that it will this year receive a more friendly consideration than it did last year. I should have wished to have seen the Government themselves introducing this measure, which is in the interest of the public, but I hope that the Government will not oppose it this year, but on the contrary, that they will look at in a favourable light, and that the Bill will become law.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) I do not wish to enter into the merits of the Bill now submitted, but I will take the

liberty of asking the promoter of this Bill, if it is constitutional to legislate in this Parliament, on matters connected with Provincial Legislatures. The first clause of this Bill reads as follows:—

“Whosoever, for the purpose of assisting in any election to the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of any of the Provinces of Canada\*\*\*”

Mr. CASGRAIN. If my hon. friend will allow me I will tell him that we have discussed that question last year before the Committee to which it had been referred. This point has been very fully argued and we decided that we had this right, and the law was passed both as regards Provincial Legislatures and the Federal Parliament. Therefore, the principle is admitted by the law which has been passed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation). Mr. Speaker' in answer to the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), I must say that I agree with him that it is wise and proper to prevent corruption in the elections, and such being the principle of the Bill, I have no objection, under the circumstances, to its being read the second time. I am not prepared to admit the Bill in all its details. Although the measure is short it is one which ought to be considered attentively, because it concerns not only the members of this House, but also the electors of the country. Consequently, I must expect that the hon. member will make a motion to refer this Bill back to a special Committee before it is taken into consideration by a Committee of the Whole House, so that the measure may be well digested. I do not pretend that the hon. member has not given the necessary attention to the measure, but as he very well knows, several heads put together are worth more than one, and consequently I will ask him to refer the Bill back to a special Committee, as was done for the first measure a year or two ago.

I would suggest, if the hon. gentleman will agree to it, that the Bill be read a second time and referred to a Special Committee to consist of himself, Mr. Amyot, Mr. Patterson, of Essex, Mr. Rykert, Mr. Mulock, Mr. Brecken, and Mr. Tupper of Pictou. If the hon. gentleman prefers to have a Committee of nine we can add two other names.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says he thinks this measure will affect the electors outside. It is the want of this measure that affects the electors outside.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We may differ about that, but if we look to the past we may find some circumstances on which we might agree. Perhaps it is as well not to give localities or names.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee composed of Messrs. Amyot, Patterson, (Essex), Rykert, Mulock, Brecken, Tupper, (Pictou), Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Victoria), and the mover.

Motion agreed to.

#### AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS.

Mr. MASSUE, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 38) for the prevention of fraud in the manufacture and sale of agricultural fertilizers, said: The object of this Bill is to protect the farmers against spurious fertilizers by obliging the manufacturer to state what kind of fertilizer he sells, and in case he does not comply with the rule to pay a fine.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. MASSUE moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Farrow, Orton, Bourbeau, M. BERGERON.

Benoit, Allison (Hants), Scriver, Fisher, Trow and the mover.

Motion agreed to.

#### INDIAN AGENT'S OFFICE IN TORONTO.

House resumed the debate on Mr. Cook's motion (page 269) respecting Indian Agents in Toronto, &c.

Mr. COOK. When the House took recess last evening, I had just quoted a portion of the Ontario Statutes to show that a gentleman holding a position under this Government or under the Ontario Government, or in the pay of either Government, was not eligible for a seat in the Local Legislature of Ontario. I contend that the appointment of Mr. H. H. Thompson, by the Order in Council passed on the 31st of January, 1883, disqualified him from being a member of the Local Legislature. If this be the case—and there can be no doubt it is—it was, to say the least, a great impropriety on the part of the Government to make this appointment, because they must have known at the time that Mr. Thompson was to be a candidate for the Local House. I think the word impropriety a very mild expression. I should say it was an outrage on the electorate of the county of East Simcoe to place them in the position that one of the candidates for that county for the Local Legislature was not eligible; and had he been elected he could not have taken his seat, thus rendering necessary a new election and entailing consequently considerable expense on the people. This gentleman, however, was not elected. I stated on a former occasion, in speaking on this motion, that I was surprised Mr. Thompson should have declared to the constituency that he had not received any appointment at the hands of the Dominion Government. Is it possible that these gentlemen here in Ottawa, in council assembled, passed, without Mr. Thompson's knowledge, that Order in Council appointing him to that position? I would not venture to say whether or not they apprised him of it, but I believe I am only saying what the people thought when this appointment was made known, when I say that Mr. Thompson must have been well aware it had been made. Now, Sir, the two points that I wish to convey to this House in reference to Mr. Thompson's candidature, and in reference to the removal of the office from Toronto to Ottawa, are these, that the expense to the country has been increased to the tune of from \$7,000 to \$10,000 a year by the removal of the office, and that the appointment of Mr. Thompson was, to say the least, a very injudicious act. I stated on a former occasion that the cost would be about \$7,000, but there are, in connection with appointments of that kind, incidental expenses which I took no account of; for instance, fuel and light and house rent and so forth, have to be furnished to the recipients of the offices, in addition to the salary, which would amount to, I suppose, in at least \$200 more. That would bring the increased expenditure up to about \$10,000. But I suppose that the members of this Government will look upon this as a very trivial offence. When they are the dealing with millions, when they are asking people of this country to advance millions upon millions of money for other enterprises, they will think that the people have almost forgotten the small sums that have been increased by the reckless management of the Government of the day; but I doubt if the people will forget, at the time of another general election, to call these gentlemen to account for this and other expenses that have been increased in the government of the country. I stated on a former occasion that one of the parties who had received the appointment of Indian Agent, had also been appointed the Indian Land Agent some years before. I think, if they found it necessary and had decided upon the removal of the

office from Toronto, it would have been a prudent act, on the part of the Government, to have given the appointments to these parties, and so combine the office of Indian Land Agent with that of Indian Agent. I also stated that at Parry Sound there was an Indian Land Agency which did very effective service. Captain Skeene, the gentleman managing that office at Parry Sound, is a very efficient officer, a man who is capable of doing a great deal more work than he has to do. He only has to look after a few Indians on the north shore up as far as Shewanigog, or a little further perhaps, up as far as French River. But the duties at the point are very light indeed. He does attend to the payment of the Indians as well as to looking after the land. His duties might have been extended to the east as far as Christian Islands. It is as near, to all intents and purposes, as Penetanguishene is. The distance may probably be a little greater, but the facilities for reaching this point are very much better than they would be from Penetanguishene, because, from Penetanguishene to the Christian Islands there is an open space which in heavy storms even large vessels cannot reach. I shall look forward with some interest to this return coming down. I do not know but that more gentlemen may have been appointed to the position than I have discovered. As I have already stated, it has been intimated to me that nine of these gentlemen received appointments to fill the vacancy caused by the removal of the office from Toronto to Ottawa, but that may be increased to a very much larger number. I do not know, and I shall not be in a position to know and to tell the country, through this House, until the papers come down, what the extra cost will be with which the people are saddled by the removal of this office. I will say nothing further upon the matter. I did intend to make other statements, which I will not do in the absence of the Premier, who, I see, is not in his seat to-night. Therefore, I will simply place in your hands the Resolution which I move.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will not oppose the granting of this Address, but I am sure that when the papers come down, the hon. gentleman will see that there were good reasons why the change took place.

Motion agreed to.

#### MAJOR GENERAL LUARD.

Mr. MULOCK, on the Order being called for the following motion, of which he had given notice, namely: For copies of all letters of complaint respecting the conduct of Major General Luard, at Cobourg or elsewhere, sent by Lieutenant Colonel A. T. Williams, M.P., or any person or persons to the Government, or any member thereof, together with copies of all replies thereto, and of all documents and other correspondence in the possession of the Government relating to such matters, said: I would ask the Government to allow this notice to stand, for the reason that the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright) desired to be present when this motion was made, and is unable to be present this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER. Notices of motion cannot stand unless at the request of the Government.

Mr. CARON. If the hon. gentleman wishes the notice may stand.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the hon. Minister of Militia, on behalf of the Government, requests that it shall stand. That will save the necessity of renewing the notice.

#### PORT STANLEY HARBOUR.

Mr. WILSON moved for copies of all statements in reference to the collection and expenditure of the revenue of the Port Stanley Harbour, showing in detail the tolls

collected on all articles and in what localities, and for what works expenditure has been incurred made by the Great Western Railway Company under the terms of their lease of that harbour, and all reports of Government engineers in regard to the condition of that harbour, and the manner in which the Company has fulfilled its obligations under its lease since the date of the last return. He said: I would like, with the permission of the Government and the House, to add also the following words: "Also, copies of all reports of Government engineers of surveys with reference to the Port Stanley Harbour."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must say to the hon. gentleman that this would be a new motion, because it refers to another subject. The first subject refers to Inland Revenue; this refers to my Department. The hon. gentleman had better give notice of it: I do not think I will object to it.

Mr. WILSON. In any case I may be allowed to give some reasons why I ask for the information that this motion calls for. It will be remembered that a number of years ago a railway called the London and Port Stanley Railway was built from the city of London to Port Stanley. At that time the Government granted a lease of the harbour to the Railway Company, on condition that the Company should expend the tolls and revenue derived from the port in keeping the harbour in sufficient repair and good condition; and it also entered into an agreement to make annual returns to the Government, showing the manner in which the money had been expended, and for what purpose it was so expended. I believe that during the time the London and Port Stanley road was run as an independent road, they did, to a certain extent, make these annual returns; but when the road was leased to the Great Western it passed under the control of that Company, and I have been unable to ascertain from the public records whether since then so full returns have been made as formerly. Since it passed into the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company I do not know whether they have made, as a rule, the necessary returns. I feel that it is of very great importance indeed that we should have these returns, in order to know whether the money received by the Company has been expended at that point. It is well known that this port, being situated about midway between the East and the West, is of very great importance to the mariners going up and down those lakes. I suppose, Sir, that if the Government had seen the importance of this port, and could have seen their way clearly to expend a certain amount of money for the repairs of the harbour, the people during the year gone by would have had to deplore far less loss of life upon that lake than has unfortunately occurred. Whatever the faults of the Government may be, and however bad we may regard it, I think, Sir, it is much better that it should have possession of these ports and that the Government should look after their efficiency, instead of allowing them to remain in charge of private corporations. I may say here that I regret exceedingly that we have not had full and ample information brought down in order to ascertain whether this port is kept in as efficient a condition as it ought to have been kept. If everything has not been done that the importance that the port required, then an absolute necessity rests upon the Government of taking some further course to put that harbour into a proper condition. I therefore move this Resolution with the hope that I shall get all the information necessary, and with the hope that the Government may see whether they cannot make that harbour more efficient than it is at the present time, or at least, if something else cannot be done to protect the poor people there.

Motion agreed to.

#### DREDGING AT JEMSEG, N.B.

Mr. KING, in moving for copies of report of surveys made with a view to dredging at Jemseg, Queen's Co., N.B.,

and all correspondence relating thereto; also the names of persons employed in making said surveys and the amount paid to each, said: My object in making this motion is to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the importance of completing the work already begun at that place. I may say that previous to Confederation the Local Government of New Brunswick had undertaken the work of dredging the channel at Jemseg, which is the outlet of the Grand Lake and the St. John's River. I may further state that the amount of traffic which is carried on on that lake by sailing vessels and otherwise is very considerable, and that the inconvenience which has been experienced by persons engaged in this commerce, is serious indeed. I think both Governments have spent some money in making improvements at that place. A year or two ago application was made to this Government to complete the work and last Session the sum of \$5,000 was placed in the Estimates to be expended, as I supposed, during the past summer at that particular point. I may say, too, Mr. Speaker, that the disappointment which was felt by the people in the neighbourhood was very great in consequence of the very great loss and inconvenience to which they were subjected for want of this improvement in the channel at Jemseg. It is a fact that during the whole of the past season a large number of vessels were engaged in trading between that lake and ports in the United States, making trips which occupied fully a month, and on account of the condition of that channel, they were obliged in many cases to take much smaller cargoes, and during part of the season they could only take two-thirds of a cargo. I am surprised that the Minister should not have thought it desirable to have carried out dredging at Jemseg. The Government have at their disposal in New Brunswick a steam dredge, very suitable for the class of work required to be done in those waters, I refer to the steam dredge "New Dominion." I was anxious to ascertain where that dredge was employed during last season, and on turning up the Report of the Minister of Public Works, I found it was in Nova Scotia waters, across the Bay of Fundy, at Digby, where I do not think it could be very profitably employed. On referring to the same Report I find:—

"On the 12th May, 1883, dredging was commenced at the public wharf at Digby, N.S., and up to the close of the fiscal year, 6,235 cubic yards of clay, blue mud and stone had been removed. Owing to the range of the tide at Digby—from 25 to 30 feet—and the fact that the dredge is arranged to dig to a depth of 18 feet only, about three hours was all the time that could be worked during a tide, hence delay and increased expense."

I am not aware as to how important the work at Digby was, and of course it may have been of great importance. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the dredge should not have been taken from St. John River to Digby, as the representative of that county stands in the same relation to the Government as I occupy. Some special reason must have influenced the Minister in his action, and I am anxious to obtain the report of the surveys made, in order that I may understand how the matter stands. I am very anxious that the Minister should agree to take this subject into consideration and make further enquiries, and I hope he will, if possible, agree to make provision for carrying on the work to which I have referred next year. If he will send the dredge to Jemseg next spring he will find a month's work there, and that it can be occupied its full time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman had been kind enough to inform me that he intended to bring up the question of dredging at Digby in connection with his motion, I would have been able to have answered him. But unfortunately he forgot to mention it, and therefore I am not in a position to state the exact number of days the dredge was employed, why the dredge was employed,

Mr. King.

whether it was employed all the time, etc. But if the hon. member thinks proper to place another notice on the paper regarding dredging at Digby Pier, I will be able to give him all the information. As he remarks, it cannot have been for political reasons that the dredge in question was sent to Digby Pier, for the county where that pier is situated is represented by an hon. member who sits on the Opposition side of the House, and with him the hon. member for King's is in political accord. If I sent the dredge to Digby it was because it was required there. Perhaps time was lost and more work could have been done elsewhere. That is not our fault. If, owing to the tides, the dredge could not work more than so many hours a day, we should not therefore send it away and abandon the pier, which, being a very important one, should not be neglected. The Government, whether the county where that pier is situated has been represented by a supporter or an opponent in this House, has not neglected that work; and when dredging was required it has been done. In regard to the dredging at Jemseg, the hon. member will see in the reports reasons why the work has not been proceeded with. My attention has been called to the work especially by the hon. Finance Minister, who comes from that Province; but I am not in a position to do what he wishes. I do not say the matter will not be attended to this year; it is now receiving my attention, while I am preparing the work for the year. The hon. gentleman will obtain the papers, and if he wishes more information in regard to the work done at Digby, he has only to place a notice on the paper, and I will give him all the information he requires.

Motion agreed to.

#### MAILS IN THE COUNTY OF LOTBINIÈRE.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation), in moving for copies of all petitions, correspondence, returns and papers of any nature whatsoever, respecting the establishing of a daily mail service in the parishes of St. Giles, St. Patrick and St. Sylvester, in the County of Lotbinière, said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to remark to the hon. Postmaster General that the mail service is altogether insufficient in the parishes of St. Giles, St. Sylvester and St. Patrick. These three parishes only get their mails three times a week. Besides, the mode of distribution is entirely defective, as is proved beyond doubt by the following facts: The mail arrives at Craig's Road Station at 9:30 p.m., by the Quebec train. The mail carrier starts immediately to go by Craig's Road to the parishes of St. Giles, St. Patrick, St. Sylvester, and as far as Leeds, in the County of Megantic. He comes back the following evening to deliver the mail to the same train, which arrives at 9:30 at Craig's Station, so that the letters and papers of all description take a day's journey to Richmond, and only come back the next morning by the Montreal train, which does not stop at Craig's Station. Thus it happens that the western mail, and that which comes from Montreal, must go down as far as Lévis, to come back only the following evening by the train which only arrives at Craig's Road at 9:30, so that these people only receive their mail two or three days after it has been sent, and it will be easily understood that great inconveniences are the result. I am informed that a couple of years ago the electors of the parishes of St. Patrick and St. Sylvester signed a petition asking that a daily mail *via* the Quebec Central Railway, be granted to them. This petition was delivered into the hands of the Postmaster General, but the request was never granted. I am also told that, at about the same time, the parish of St. Giles asked for a daily mail, and that those who made the demand were refused. Quite recently—two or three months ago—the three parishes of St. Sylvester, St. Patrick and St. Giles signed joint petitions asking for a daily mail service, and the Government again

refused to grant their request. Well, Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster-General to the fact that those three parishes lying on Craig's Road are very important parishes; they are situated on one of the most beautiful sites in the country, and besides they are far advanced in an agricultural point of view. I even think they are further advanced than most of the parishes of the Province of Quebec. There is found there, as in the parish of Leeds, in the county of Megantic, some cattle breeders; I think it is worth while to put up with expense in order to give them a daily mail service. If the hon. Postmaster-General felt disposed to grant my request, I would suggest the following as the easiest and most advantageous mode of distribution. The mail ought to be delivered at Craig's Road at six o'clock in the morning, instead of half-past nine in the evening, on board the train going down from Montreal. Then the mail carrier should start at once and go up to the parishes of St. Patrick, St. Sylvester and St. Giles, to come back again in the afternoon and deliver the mail on board the train coming from Point Lévis at half-past nine. The mail would then go to Richmond to come back to Quebec the next morning. In this manner all these people would receive the western mail at once, and the eastern mail would go to Richmond and return to Quebec on the morning of the following day. In this manner the only time lost would be the night, which would not be an inconvenience, because during those hours people could not get their mail, even if it was at the office. I think this system would be far more advantageous and not any more expensive. It ought even to be more economical, because a mail carrier who travels by day ought to cost less than one who travels by night. Well, if the hon. Postmaster-General wished to establish this mode of distribution and to grant a daily mail service, these people will be satisfied. It is really curious to see that such important parishes should not, to this day, have had the benefit of a daily mail service, and I am satisfied that if the hon. Postmaster-General knew their importance he would not hesitate for one moment in granting them their request, which would simply be doing an act of justice. Therefore, I hope that this demand will be taken into consideration by the Government.

Motion agreed to.

#### AMHERSTBURG CUSTOM HOUSE AND POST OFFICE.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), in moving for the reports of architects and all other papers and correspondence in connection with the selection of a site for the Amherstburg Custom House and Post Office, said: I may say that this return is intended to be a supplement to the motion passed the other day, asking for a return showing the lots offered for the purposes of a Custom House and Post Office, in the town of Amherstburg, and the prices at which these lots were offered to the Department of Public Works. I do not think a return of that kind, without any explanation from the architects, who valued the lots, and made a report to the Department, would be at all satisfactory, or be of a sufficiently explanatory character. In 1880, and again in 1881, the question of the erection of a Custom House at this place was pressed on the attention of the Minister of Public Works, and finally, in 1882, an amendment was placed in the Estimates for that purpose. No pretensions have been made that the town is, by its size, entitled to a Post Office, but owing to its position on the main channel of the great chain of lakes, and its importance as a coaling point as well as a point for the purchase of ship supplies, it was considered that it was fairly entitled to a Custom House; and it has been the custom, in such cases, to find accommo-

dation for the Post Office in connection with such a building. The site selected is within 40 yards of the present Post Office, and within less than 400 yards of the building which has been used as a Custom House for the last fifty years. The site is near the river, and it will be found, I believe, by the report of the architects, to have been selected for wise reasons, among them being the convenience of the Custom House to shippers and the owners of vessels touching at that point. It was also found advisable to have it close to the river, for the reason that there was no adequate system of drainage in the town, and no system of waterworks whatever, so that it was essentially necessary that the building should be near the river. Mr. Tracy, an architect from London, Ontario, a gentleman whom I have not the pleasure of knowing, was sent by the Government to inspect the various sites offered. He made a report, and recommended the site which the Government ultimately chose—a property which he valued at from \$2,800 to \$3,000. About the same time, Mr. Scott, an architect from Windsor, was also employed to enquire into the desirability of selecting that site, or another along the river. He valued it considerably lower—at about \$1,800. He advised the necessity of procuring a site near the river, and consulted with the Mayor, Reeve and Councillors of Amherstburg, who were almost unanimously in favour of having a property, either on the side of the river, or close to it. A number of parties were anxious to have the building on their property, in order that they might be benefited by the increased value which it would give their property, but as public buildings are built for the benefit of the public and not of private individuals, these offers, some of which were made at considerably lower rates than the one selected, and which would have been perfectly valueless for the purposes of a Custom House, were not entertained. I think when the papers are brought down, it will be seen that the choice made by the Public Works Department will be fully sustained. I feel quite certain that this choice will be satisfactory to the locality and, what is of more importance, satisfactory to the shippers and those who have occasion to stop there for coaling supplies or other purposes. The hon. leader of the Opposition had occasion to refer, in a speech which he made in the country some time ago, to some remarks of mine, in connection with that building. I have never had an opportunity to refer to his observations before, and while I felt he was justified in the remarks which he made, basing them, as he did, on a report taken from *The Mail* newspaper, I have only to say that I was misrepresented on that occasion, and did not use the language attributed to me in that report. What I did say in reference to the building was said in jest, and I am quite satisfied that if the hon. gentleman had known that, he would not have made the use he did of my language.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would repeat his joke here.

Mr. PATTERSON. It will scarcely be necessary, I think, to repeat here the remarks made at a jolification which took place just after the elections of 1882. So far as I am concerned and so far as my colleague from the South Riding of Essex is concerned, whatever feeling there might be locally on this subject, we believe that all parties will be thoroughly satisfied that the site chosen was the best one possible for the purposes of the Custom House; and at any rate, we had nothing whatever to do with the selection of the site. That selection was made, as I have stated, by the architects acting independently of each other, and referring their reports to the Chief Architect at Ottawa, who finally decided upon the site. The final decision rests upon that gentleman and also upon the broad shoulders of the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers will be brought down. I may say that, so far as I can recollect, the choice of the lot was made on reports from architects who had been sent specially to examine the sites which were offered. The Chief Engineer made a report to me on those reports, and I recommended to my colleagues the site which was ultimately chosen. As my hon. friend says, I suppose I shall carry the weight on my own shoulders if necessary.

Motion agreed to.

#### SEIZURE OF COAL OIL BARRELS IN ESSEX.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), in moving for reports and correspondence respecting the seizure of coal oil barrels at Sandwich, Windsor and Walkerville, said: When the complaints respecting those seizures first reached me within the last few days, I thought it was again one of the insidious attacks of my ancient enemy, the Minister of Customs, on certain proclivities of my constituents; but I find that I was wrong, and that these seizures were made under the Inland Revenue laws. These coal oil barrels paid the Customs duties when they were brought in, the coal oil was used, and the barrels were lying in out-houses or sheds; but the zeal and activity of the Inland Revenue officers were so great that they seized them because the brands had not been obliterated upon them. I find that the punishment inflicted on the people for having the barrels in their possession is a fine of from one to ten dollars. I think the Department ought to take care to notify the public of this, because the people who make these complaints have had twenty or thirty barrels taken from them. In writing to me, they complain that they knew nothing whatever of such an enactment; that they had no desire to defraud the revenue in any way, and that they would have taken these stamps or brands off the barrels if they had known that they were committing any offence. Such being the case, I would urge on the Minister of Inland Revenue to deal leniently with these people in this instance, and warn them not to do it again. I do not think they will trouble the hon. gentleman again. There is no desire on the part of any of my constituents to evade the law. We have been so very stringently dealt with by the Minister of Customs and his minions that we have no desire to evade the law, either with respect to Customs or Inland Revenue, particularly the latter. I think, in this case, the fine might be remitted and the barrels returned, and I am satisfied that the present occurrence will prevent any neglect of that kind in the near future.

Motion agreed to.

#### SALARIES ON THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES, in moving for a comparative statement showing the names, offices or positions, yearly salary and time of entering the service, of the employés on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, in the following Departments: Superintendent's Office, Road Department, Mechanical Department, Stores Department, Accountant's Office; also, the names and average monthly wages paid to conductors, drivers and station agents on the said respective roads, said: It is believed by the employés of the Island Railway that a very great and unjust discrepancy exists between the wages paid to them and the wages paid to men in similar employment on the Intercolonial Railway. I am not in a position to state to what extent this discrepancy exists, and it is for the purpose of obtaining possession of that information that I move for this return. I shall, of course, have an opportunity at a future time of showing the desirability of removing any such discrepancies, because I am satisfied they will not be approved by

Mr. PATTERSON.

the Government or sanctioned by the House. It is unfair that men employed on the Prince Edward Island Railway should be paid only one-half of what persons are paid in the adjoining Province for discharging the same duties. I think we have a right to claim that workmen, particularly those engaged on the railways, who have to pay as much for their living in Prince Edward Island as in the adjoining Province, should be paid at the same rate. We know that men migrate from places where wages are low to places where they are high. On no ground can these discrepancies be justified. I am anxious to know to what extent they exist, and therefore I move for these statements.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection to this motion passing, although its tendency is very mischievous. It is calculated to produce discontent and dissatisfaction among the employés of the Government, and although that may be a very interesting occupation for my hon. friend who has made this motion, it is not in the public interest. I will admit at once, frankly, that there is a difference in the salaries paid to the employés of the railway in Prince Edward Island, and those paid to the employés on the Intercolonial Railway; and, I think, I should be quite willing to leave this question to the arbitrament of the hon. gentleman's leader, whose views on a somewhat similar question in this House, I think, will afford the most complete answer to that that could possibly be made to the views the hon. gentleman has propounded. I take exception at once to the statement that similar employment or similar duties, or the offices to which similar duties belong, in different localities, must necessarily be remunerated with exactly the same amount of money. I take the ground that it is my duty, being responsible for the management of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, to obtain the services of competent officials at the lowest rate at which I can obtain them. I deny that the responsibilities of the position or the arduous character of the duties on the Prince Edward Island Railway are at all to be compared to those on the Intercolonial Railway. The one is burdened with a great traffic passing to and fro, and the duties of every person, from the Superintendent down to the humblest official on the road, are much more arduous and responsible than they are on the Prince Edward Island Railway. My hon. friend, I dare say, knows, although he was not in the House at the time, that when I was called to take charge of the Intercolonial Railway, I made a great reduction in the salaries of all the officials of the road, from the highest down to the lowest, because the charge on the Government for the operation of the railway was so great, and the discrepancy between the receipts and the expenditures was so large as to involve the necessity of placing everything on the most economical footing possible. But I stated, at the same time, that whenever we should be able to restore the balance between revenue and expenditure, it would give me the greatest possible pleasure to do the fullest justice in my power to the employés of the road; and when the time happily came when the road was no longer a burthen to the country, and the receipts balanced the expenditure, the old salaries were restored. On the Prince Edward Island Railway, as the hon. gentleman knows, notwithstanding the best efforts that could be made by the Department, the discrepancy is still very great. He knows that while we have been enabled to keep a small balance on the right side of the ledger in the operation of the Intercolonial Railway, the result is very different in the operation of the Prince Edward Island Railway, and the business of the Island is being carried on at a great expense to the taxpayers of this country. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. gentleman will hardly maintain that we should pay to the Superintendent of the Island Railway the same salary that we pay to the Superintendent of the Intercolonial; yet his argument would lead to that.

since he maintains that the same rate of expenditures should rule on the Island Railway as on the Intercolonial. I join issue with the hon. gentleman on the question altogether, especially in the existing state of things. In putting the road in first-class condition, as I am happy to say it is, and keeping it properly supplied with rolling stock and making, as we are, large additional expenditure for extending the railway to Cape Traverse, there is no principle of justice, in my judgment, why we should pay to the employés on the Prince Edward Island Railway larger wages than those at which we can obtain competent and efficient men.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not wish the hon. Minister to have the impression that I contend that the same salary should be paid to the Superintendent of the Island Railway as that which we pay the Superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway. I advanced no such proposition. I understand quite well that the duties and responsibilities of those two gentlemen are very different; that the duties of the one are much more onerous and arduous than that of the other and demand a greater salary, but the proposition I do advance is this, that as regards the labour of men whose work is to a large extent merely mechanical, who are hired by the day to do a certain amount of work, it is preposterous to assert that they should be paid \$2 per day in Moncton and only \$1 a day in Charlottetown. I do not think the hon. Minister desires that a man should receive only 80 or 90 cents a day in Charlottetown, when, if he crosses the Straits, he will receive for exactly the same work \$1 a day in Moncton. I do not think the fact that the hon. member is trying to carry out the terms of the union by building the railway to Cape Traverse, which necessarily involves a large expenditure, justifies him in keeping the wages of men on the Island below the rates paid those doing the same work in the neighboring Province.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE FISHERY ACT.

Mr. O'BRIEN, in moving that the petition of D. W. Post, and others, interested in the fisheries of Georgian Bay, Lake Huron and Lake Superior; praying for amendments to the Fishery Act, presented to the House, and read and received on the 7th day of February, 1884, be referred to a Select Committee, consisting of Messrs. Dawson, Sproule, McNeill, Cameron (Huron), Lister, McCarthy, Allen and the mover; with power to send for persons, papers and records, said: I make this motion to a great extent on the allegation contained in the petition itself, which I think justifies me in saying that our fishermen of the upper lakes labour under very great difficulties. They state that:

"The large fish are not now found in numbers sufficient to encourage shore fishing, and fishermen have to fish from 20 to 30 miles from shore, with larger boats and more costly nets and appliances, than in earlier days."

It amounts to this, that these fishermen, in their own protection, are compelled to make the allegation that, under the existing system of fishing and the existing Fishery Act, the in-shore fisheries on Georgian Bay, Lakes Huron and Superior are being destroyed, and they are now compelled to go further from shore and use larger boats, requiring larger capital. There are a great many other questions concerning this subject to which I drew the attention of the House last Session. The question of the size of the nets is one, of course, requiring careful investigation, and also that of the protection of the fish. The latter question is one, I think, upon which the regulations of the Department can hardly be perfect, because great doubts exist on the north shore as to whether the close season has been properly ascertained. Great improvements might be effected in the method of protecting the fisheries. I pointed out last Session that the present system of naming inspectors in

inland places is altogether ineffective and that the whole of the fisheries on the north shores of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay are practically without any protection, the result being precisely what is alleged in the petition. The greatest trouble in dealing with this question arises from the fact that while we, to some extent, harass our fishermen with restrictions in order to preserve the fish, the fishermen on the other side of the lakes are free from any restrictions. They use pound nets and nets of all sorts without any restriction whatever. The consequence is that the fish are destroyed on the American shore and the scarcity there extends over the whole of our inland waters. These fisheries are too important to allow them to be entirely destroyed, if their destruction can by any means be prevented, and in making this motion I have the support of every hon. member representing the fisheries on our shores of Lakes Superior, Huron and Georgian Bay, including Algoma. If we appoint this Fishery Committee, they will probably be able to collect from independent sources information of great value, and may be able to suggest some means of preventing the destruction of fish. The time has come when the matter should be taken seriously into consideration and an effort should be made to induce the several States on the other side to enter into some mutual arrangement with us for the preservation of the fish, and thus prevent our fishermen from being subjected to the great disadvantages under which they now labour. I would humbly urge on the hon. Minister that if he thinks proper to allow this committee to be appointed, information of great value would be obtained. The evidence of fishermen could be taken on the subject, and satisfactory regulations could hardly fail to be suggested. I do not wish to reflect on the manner in which the regulations have hitherto been carried out, but I hope some improvement may be effected. I think the facts I have stated fully justify a most searching enquiry, whether it be carried on by the Department itself or by a committee of this House. I am sorry that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who takes a deep interest in this question, and who had intended to speak on it, is not in his place, but I think the facts I have stated, and the facts which are within the knowledge of other hon. gentlemen in this House, will fully justify me in making this motion, which I hope will meet with the acceptance of the Government.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is of great importance that something should be done in this matter to satisfy the fishermen of the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. Complaints have, I believe, been advanced by them for a number of years in reference to the position they occupy, as they say this Government has paid so much attention and so much money to the fishermen of the Eastern Provinces, while the fisheries on our lakes are of equal importance to the country. There are several hundred fishermen on these lakes, and the meshes which they have been in the habit of using have been  $4\frac{1}{2}$ , while the law now insists that the mesh must be at least 5 inches. Now, these fishermen are men who have a good deal of capital invested in boats and nets. The nets are of such a character that they are used one season, and then a great many are repaired and carried on the next season, and it would be a very great hardship to them to have to throw all these aside at any season of the year, and to purchase new nets, which have to be made in England and ordered six months in advance, to be made up and used for the spring fishing. Complaints are also made by them that the American fishermen use any size of mesh, and that they can fish with a smaller mesh than our men can. I understand, however, that the whole complaint has been caused by some of our Dominion Inspectors in the cities, who have found that fish sent from these waters to those cities for sale have been smaller than should have been caught, and complaint has been made to the Department here,

that these fishermen were using nets which should not be allowed. Now, I understand that the fishermen say that these small fish are caught in what we call pound nets, that is, nets that are set in deep water and whose mesh is much smaller than  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches. I recommend this committee to enquire into the complaints of these fishermen, and see if they are right. If these small fish are caught in these pound nets, measures should be taken to prevent their being worked in our water. They also complain that the American fishermen come into our waters, set these pound nets on our shores, and carry off the fish which belong to us into the United States. If these reports are true, I believe the committee should make enquiry, and report to this House, and set this matter at rest; and I hope this House will grant this committee, which is so much needed to satisfy these poor, hard-working men in that part of the country.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, representing a county on the lakes, a county in which the fishing industry is carried on to a very large extent, I feel it incumbent on me to make a remark or two in reference to this motion. I do not intend to take up the time of the House by saying very much, but simply to say a few words supplementary to the remarks of my hon. friend who has spoken; and, in what I say, I wish the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to understand that I do not intend for a moment to reflect upon the management of his Department, but I feel that if the fishermen of this country have any complaints it is the duty of this Parliament to listen to them, and, if well founded, to redress them. I have no doubt that, as far as the regulations of the Department are concerned, as to the size of the nets, the fishermen of the inland waters of this country are suffering to a considerable extent. It is true, as the hon. gentleman from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has stated, that the mesh is too large for the fish they are now able to catch. It would be in the interest of the fishermen, and in the interest of the people generally, that the size of the nets should be reduced. There is another thing which has been brought to the attention of this House, and it is the use of these pound nets. I believe that, under the law as it now exists, it is unlawful to use these pound nets. We do know, however, as a matter of fact, that they are extensively used in the United States, and the result is a needless waste of fish. Anyone who understands pound nets can understand how the fish are wasted, those which are too small being injured so as to be utterly valueless. I believe there is a law in this country against using these nets, but that law is not in force in the United States, and as long as they use them, and our fishermen do not, I believe the result will be that the supply of fish will be largely diminished in this country, unless steps are taken to prevent the use of these nets. In addition to this law, we have very good laws regulating the fisheries, but in the United States I believe the laws are very defective. I believe it would be in the interests of the inland fisheries in this country that the laws should be uniform on both sides of the line. I feel that, by the efforts of the committee which is proposed by my hon. friend, representations might be made by the Government, based upon evidence which this committee might be able to obtain, that might have the effect of redressing or removing this grievance. This industry is one of very great importance to this country. No one has any idea of the size of it or of the amount of money invested in it unless he has gone where these fisheries are to be found. It is an industry which, as the Government fosters everything else, I am sure they will be happy to foster. If these men have grievances, it is the duty of this Parliament, as I have already said, to hear them, and I do not know of any better mode to bring these grievances before the attention of Parliament, than by the committee proposed by my hon. friend from Muskoka. I feel that the hon. Minister of Marine will not object to the motion, and I scarcely think he will object, as the effect may

Mr. ALLEN.

be to benefit the people immediately interested in this business, and in that way, benefit the country at large.

Mr. McLELAN. I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the hon. gentleman moving in this matter, as I am aware that the fishermen of the various constituencies are continually pressing upon their representatives and upon the Department that facilities should be given to them for larger catches of fish. I have been continually pressed for the extension of the fishing season at various times. I may mention that within a few weeks, the fishermen in one of the counties of the Maritime Provinces, have been pressing for an extension of time to catch a certain description of fish. Before granting their request, I felt it my duty to gather what information I could upon that point, and I find that to accede to their wishes would mean the virtual destruction of that fish. The fishermen were pressing to get another week to catch a kind of fish that is very much sought after in the market, and at the same time there were unsold and on hand in that county, 500 tons of this small fish, enough to supply the market of America for the present season. That is an instance of the efforts fishermen are continually making to get an extension of time to catch all the fish they possibly can, regardless of the effect it may have upon the fisheries in future years. I am, therefore, not surprised that my hon. friend has presented his petition and has made this motion, which has been supported by other hon. gentlemen representing fishing constituencies, for I know something of the pressure that is brought to bear upon members by fishermen. Although the hon. gentleman has not favoured me with a copy of that petition, I gather from the remarks made that they seek permission to use a smaller mesh than the law now permits in the lakes. I think the law fixing the size of the mesh in Canada was first passed in 1858; it stood for seven years, and then a smaller mesh was permitted for a few years, but it was found to work destruction to the fisheries, and ultimately the law was changed and a 5 inch mesh was again substituted. Now, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Cockburn) says that the in-shore fisheries are comparatively destroyed, and that very few fish are now caught without going out further into the lakes. Now, the House will see that with the 5 inch mesh there has been what may be regarded as a destruction of the in-shore fisheries, and that the better fish are caught at a distance from the shore; consequently, if the prayer of this petition were granted and a smaller size permitted to be used, the effect would be more speedily to sweep the fish entirely from the lakes. Now, the great object we have in view should be the preservation of our fisheries; they should be used and not abused, and from all the information I can gather, to reduce the size of the mesh would just hasten the entire destruction of the lake fisheries, which, as the hon. gentlemen opposite have said, is an industry of very great importance, and is pursued by a large number of men. I have in my possession a letter addressed to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, of which I will read an extract, as showing the importance of the fish industry in the lakes:

"DEAR SIR,—In answer to your verbal enquiry, I beg to state that, I have been engaged fishing on Lake Huron, Georgian Bay, Detroit River and Lake Erie for the last sixteen years; that I employ on an average 200 men, and have a capital of \$200,000 engaged in the fishing business, of which \$160,000 is invested in steamers, nets, buildings and plant connected with the fishing business; that during the whole of this period I have never used anything but 5 inch mesh, and that I found it not only the cheapest but the safest mode of catching large merchantable fish."

Some idea of the value of the lake fisheries may be gathered from the fact that one single man is giving employment to 200 men, and uses a capital of \$200,000. The House will therefore see that an industry of so much importance deserves and receives from the Department the closest attention, and requires that the best means be taken to preserve it and maintain it at its present high standard.

The Department is continually gathering information from those who are practically engaged in the lake fisheries, and those who buy and sell fish, as to the best means to be adopted for the preservation of that important industry, and I think there is no information which a committee could gather in the limited time of a Parliamentary Session which is not already in the possession of the Department, and which is being, from time to time, acted upon by the Department. Reference was made by the hon. member who moved the Address, to the fact that American fishermen have destroyed their fisheries. That is true. They had no restrictions, neither as to time nor mode of fishing, nor size of nets, and their fisheries, as the hon. gentleman has stated, are comparatively cleaned out. The reason why this has been permitted to go on is that the Federal Government in the United States does not attempt to control the fisheries; that is left to each State, and the different States have not taken up the matter until they have found the fisheries destroyed. One of the States adjoining our territory has now a Bill before the Legislature of a more restrictive character than any law or regulation we have on this side of the water. If that Bill should become the law of the State, the American fisheries will be greatly improved and our fishermen will not be able to complain that the American fishermen are unrestricted. It is for the benefit of the fishermen and the fisheries that there should be restrictions, both as to time of fishing and size of mesh. Our officers have not been, in times past, so strict in enforcing the law respecting the size of mesh as they should have been, and in some localities, perhaps in the locality to which the hon. gentleman refers, the size of mesh was gradually reduced down to  $4\frac{1}{2}$  or  $4\frac{3}{4}$  inches; and our attention having been called to that, we have instructed our inspectors to see that the fishermen return to the lawful size of mesh, namely 5 inches. We do not mean to force the fishermen to return to that standard by any arbitrary means. We know that some of the poor fishermen have invested considerable sums in nets with  $4\frac{3}{4}$  inch mesh, and it is proposed that these shall be used for the present season, until 1885, and that all new nets purchased must be of the legal size. I suppose it is the fact that the Department called on the inspectors to look after this matter more closely, that has led the fishermen to move in favour of a change in the law. But I think that all hon. members who know anything of the lake fisheries, of their value and the enormous quantities of fish taken, even with the present size of mesh, will admit that the fisheries should not be wholly ruined and destroyed; and from the experience of the Department, and my own experience, gathered during the short time I have been at its head, I am satisfied that if we keep on reducing the size of mesh we shall destroy our fisheries. If the hon. gentleman will visit the Department we will be able to give him such information as will satisfy him that it would be unwise to reduce the size of the mesh, and that it is not in the interests of the fishermen themselves and of the country which is dependent on a supply of fresh fish, that there should be any change made. The hon. gentleman should be content with such information as we would be able to afford him in the Department, where we are gathering it day by day by all the means at our command, and this will satisfy him that the proposed Committee is unnecessary. Under these circumstances, I hope the motion will be withdrawn.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with some interest to the explanations given by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I think there is no subject at present under the consideration of Parliament of more interest to the country than that which is contained in the motion. The explanations given by the hon. Minister are just such explanations as I would have given, with the slight infor-

mation I possess of what the fisheries are to-day, or which I would have given when I had the honour to preside over that Department. Everyone knows that no scale of regulations which the Department of Marine and Fisheries could prepare, would be acceptable to the fishermen throughout Canada, whether on the Atlantic Coast or on the great lakes. The regulations which are in existence to-day are regulations based upon years of experience of able men connected with the Department, and they are not regulations which can be made uniform from one end of the country to the other. In each district certain kinds of fish are caught, and the officers have, from time to time, during a long period of years, furnished the Department with material information, which has enabled it to frame regulations suited to the particular localities and classes of fish caught. The hon. gentleman hit me rather hard in the course of his remarks, without specially mentioning my name, and I feel bound to answer what he said. It has been my duty within the last three or four days to present a petition to the hon. Minister from about 500 of the fishermen of my county engaged in the smelt fishery. That industry contributes an immense revenue to the people in my county. The petitioners, numbering as I have stated 400 or 500, represented that owing to the shortness of the season and the open character of the fall, they were unable to utilize the full time, and they asked to have the time extended so as to be able to fish to the end of the present month. The time will expire to-morrow, and I have urged upon the Minister that he should grant its prayer on the ground that these respectable and industrious people were deprived, from the fact that ice had not formed in the early months of the season, and during a portion of the time allotted to the fishery, and therefore no hardship could accrue from such time being added to the end of the season. But when the Minister furnished me with information, and I subsequently obtained similar information myself, that there were in stock, prepared for shipment to New York, Boston, Baltimore, Montreal and other markets, no less than 500 tons of those fish; and that, as my hon. friend represented that the officers who are engaged in the performance of duties in that section of the country had represented to him that the immense quantities of this fish that were taken were likely to deplete in a few years the supply of food for the larger fishes which frequent those rivers, I felt that my hon. friend was right in refusing to grant the request that was made, and I had reluctantly to tell my numerous friends who had applied to me that the hon. Minister of the Department had refused to comply. Within the last fifteen minutes, and before my hon. friend had commenced his speech, I had sent that telegram, and I felt bound also to say to them that I thought he was justified in the course he had pursued. Sir, we all know that it is a matter of great interest to us to protect and encourage the particular industries in the sections from which we come, and we know that it is a very disagreeable thing to have to refuse, especially to a large number of our constituents, a request which, on the face of it seems reasonable; and we know with what peculiar suspicion every request that is made and not complied with, is viewed by the people who make it. Sir, in view of the responsible position of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to-day, looking at the importance of the interest which he has to guard, taking into consideration, not alone the needs of this year or the next, but the needs of the future, in a great country such as ours, I feel it is the duty of this House, when the hon. gentleman has made the statement which he has made, and given his reasons so frankly and clearly, and which I, from my experience of seven or eight years in the administration of that office, so heartily and fully endorse—I feel, I say, that it is the duty of this House, before they appoint committees or commissions, to consider the explanations which he has given and the statements

he has made, and which, in my judgment, seem thoroughly conclusive. Sir, my hon. friend has made a statement relative to the size of the meshes. Who is there more likely to give an impartial opinion in relation to what ought to be the size of the meshes which should be used in the catch of a particular kind of fish, and who is more likely to be correct, than the experienced officers who have had the responsibility of advising the Department in relation thereto, who have had the experience of years in that work? Sir, I know it is a most ungracious and unpleasant duty for the overseers of the fisheries in those localities to have to refuse what the fishermen regard as a reasonable request, or to do something that may seem to them unreasonable in relation to restrictions which are so necessary. Sir, we know that the reduction of one-eighth, or one-sixteenth, and more particularly one-half, an inch in the meshes, in some quarters, makes an enormous difference in the amount of catch, and an enormous destruction of fish. It would be unwise, in my opinion, particularly as the Session is so far advanced, to go to the expense of appointing a committee to take testimony and receive evidence—evidence which must be brought from all parts of this Dominion at an enormous expense. My friends on the Georgian Bay, and upon Lakes Huron and Superior, must know that if such a commission as this is instituted, in the eastern portion of this Dominion, all along the St. Lawrence and on the shores of the Gulf, all around the coast of the Bay of Fundy, extending from Calais to Labrador, there are people with complaints and grievances, and they will feel that they should put in their testimony and have their witnesses here to give evidence. It would be a work of months to accept every statement, and to hear all those witnesses who will desire to come before this House. Sir, if anything of that kind is to be done, if it is felt by this House, or by any hon. gentleman in the House, that the Department does not possess all the information it ought to possess to enable it to lay before us a statement of the facts and to deal with them properly in the execution of the duties devolving upon the Department, the proper way will be to appoint a commission to take evidence, not alone from one of the western lakes, but from all of them; to take evidence over the whole Dominion; to have the thing dealt with thoroughly before we attempt to paralyze the hon. gentleman's Department or to interfere with the operation of the officers in the execution of existing regulations. If any thing of that kind has to be done, if there is to be all this information laid before the House, I would say to my hon. friend that I am not sure that it would not be desirable that it should be done in view of new regulations, and in view of contingencies that are likely to arise at a not very remote period in connection with our fishery relations with the people on the other side of the border. We find that notice has been given of the repeal of the existing Treaty, in relation to the privileges which Americans have enjoyed, of fishing on our coasts; and it would be extremely desirable that, in view of a possible, and a more than probable, effort to create new arrangements, that information of that kind should be obtained. It certainly would be desirable that the most perfect information should be obtained as to our own domestic arrangements; and if any thing is to be done, it should be done, I would suggest, by means of a commission, which should draw information from every portion of the Dominion, which could go through the country, if necessary, from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific, getting its information from every possible source, not merely from the fishery superintendents, but from the fishermen themselves, whose evidence would have to be filtered through the criticisms of the experienced men connected with the Department. I am not going to place myself in opposition to the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution, but if he desires to get that information, it should not be of a partial character, and it should not be hastily submitted, or hastily

Mr. MITCHELL.

considered. If not obtained by the means I have suggested, some other means should be adopted, so that the fullest information could be laid before the House, in order that the matter might be dealt with after due and calm deliberation. Reference has been made to some of the reasons why the fisheries have not been as fruitful in some portions of the country as they were in former years. We know that in all the lakes, bordering on the American coasts, while we have protected our fisheries, they have not been so well protected by the American people. And speaking of our own fisheries, I say that the manner in which the fisheries are protected in this country is a credit to us; and though it may be supposed that I am reflecting some little credit on myself in saying so, I will, at the risk of being considered egotistical, pay this tribute, not only to my own administration of affairs, but to the gentleman who succeeded me, and to the gentleman who now occupies the position of head of the Marine and Fisheries Department, notwithstanding that complaints have been made from one quarter and another. What we have had to contend against all along, has been the want of protection on the other side of the border. While our fisheries have been protected all along our coasts, while our fishermen have limited the size of their meshes, the extent of their nets, the manner of killing the fish, the traps and weapons by which they are caught or killed, on the other side of the line they have been practically unrestrained in these respects. Here the central Government at Ottawa controls the regulation of our fisheries, but we find that, on the other side of the border, the separate States deal with their control and regulation, the Federal Government having no control except the very general control, required for the proper administration and protection of the States, which they cannot positively and absolutely control. We find that along Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, the River St. Lawrence, Lake Memphramagog and other Lakes and waters on the borders of the United States, while the people of the country are using all sorts of means of destroying their fish, we cannot protect ours as fully or effectually as we could if we had full control over those waters, as we have over waters in which the control is undivided. That is the great practical difficulty, and if we are ever to have a perfect protection of these fisheries, it must be by some arrangement with the States bordering on waters which partially flow along the United States, and partially on our own shores, by which we should endeavour to press on them the necessity of uniting in a common measure, as to the size and character of the nets, the method of taking these fish, and the seasons for taking them, so that there may be a mutual protection, which will result in perpetuating one of the greatest industries of this country. I may take this opportunity of telling those gentlemen who, not many years ago, spoke of the Intercolonial Railway with something like derision—spoke of it as running in the wrong place, and as of little benefit to the country—what it has done in the country which I have the honor to represent. Before the establishment of that road, the only use which was made of the small fish caught in winter—that is the smelt, which are not longer than seven or eight or nine inches—was in many cases, to manure the land with them, and thus to waste that provident food which a bountiful Almighty has supplied us with, and destroy the natural food of the larger fish. To-day, I could astound this House if I were to tell—as I hope to be able to do before the Session closes—the amount and the value of these fish. I was going to say that they amounted to hundreds of thousands of dollars, but they certainly amount to an enormous sum, along the whole coast of the Bay of Miramichi, including Miramichi, Richibucto, Bathurst, Restigouche and other places. Before the Intercolonial Railway was built, these fish were not worth a cent, because we could not transport them to the markets of the world; but to-day we are

supplying the markets of Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York, and Boston, as well as the inland States of the Union, and the large cities of our own country. There is in store in the county from which I come, according to information which has been sent to the Department, something like 500 or 600 tons of these fish, awaiting the exigencies of the market, so that they may not overstock it, but regulate it in such a way that they may send them forward, as the calls of the market demand and, get prices to suit them. This is one of the most important interests which this House could deal with, and I am glad to have had the opportunity of bearing my testimony to the manner in which the affairs of the Department have been administered by its officers, as well as to the correctness and soundness of judgment which the hon. gentleman at the head of the Department has pursued, in relation to the question of protecting these fisheries; and when refusing requests made by gentleman like myself, who sometimes, in our enthusiasm to meet the wishes of our people, are perhaps apt to seek for concessions which, in his cooler judgment and knowing all the surrounding circumstances, he considers it would be unwise to grant.

Mr. ALLEN. As I am interested in the fisheries of Georgian Bay, I should like to know the name of the party who is extensively engaged in fisheries, who gave the information to the Minister.

Mr. McLELAN. His name is Mr. Gauthier.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before withdrawing the motion, I should like to be allowed to say one or two words. I think the House is indebted to me, to some extent at any rate, for having given them the opportunity of hearing the eloquent speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Marine; and I think the hon. gentleman is perhaps also indebted to me for having given him the opportunity of making it. I think I owe an apology to the hon. Minister for having, owing to want of knowledge of the procedure or rules of this House, happened to present that petition without having first shown it to him. I am sure he will believe me when I say that no discourtesy was intended. The fact is, that this matter was in the hands of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) before he was compelled to leave, and he handed it over to me and suggested the course of proceeding which I subsequently followed. I think the hon. Minister of Marine somewhat misrepresents my position on this question. He said that I, by no means, acquiesced in the prayer of the petition. What I did say was, that I thought the matter required investigation, because during the period that these 5 feet meshes have been in force, these fisheries have been almost destroyed. If the Government think it would not be in accordance with the practice of the Government to grant this motion, I, of course, accede to their request, and withdraw it. There was one statement made by the hon. Minister of Marine, which will be satisfactory to the fishermen concerned, and that is that they will be permitted for the present season to use the same sized meshes that they are at present using. The nets they are now using have been a long time in use, and if there is to be a change, there should be notice given of it, which is required not only by the fishermen, but by those who manufacture the nets. At the request of the hon. Minister, and believing that the Government will give the protection to the fishermen which I desire for them as much as any one else, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

#### COST OF PRINTING AND ADVERTISING.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for a return of all sums paid by the Government to the *Gazette* Publishing Company of Montreal, for printing, advertising or any work done or material furnished during the years 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882 and 1883, in detail.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to add after the word "Montreal," the words "and other newspapers of the Dominion," and also the years 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877, so that we shall have a complete statement for the past ten years.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection. I simply want to get information, and I am quite willing to consent to the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. Minister promise that that information will be brought down within the next year? Of a great many returns moved for last session, forty were not laid on the Table when the House met. If the hon. gentleman makes that addition with the intention of giving the information this Session, I am sure my hon. friend will be only too glad to get it. But if I know anything about the matter, it will occupy about a dozen clerks for the next six months.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt, it will occupy some clerks, but the hon. gentleman, I am sure, cannot object to getting the full information. I think it will be worth all the labour we shall give, and the hon. gentleman may be sure that we shall take all the pains and give all the despatch possible to prepare this return.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### SURVEYS CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved that the items of surveys chargeable to Capital Account in the Public Accounts for 1882, be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what description of surveys he refers to?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The items of Dominion Surveys chargeable to Capital Account, amounting to about \$560,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Land surveys in the North-West?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; that is the only item of surveys chargeable to Capital.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Statement showing, in separate columns, the names of the several principal officials in the service of the Government on the Intercolonial Railway; their ages, origin, place of residence, nature of employment, amount of present yearly salary, date of entering the service, and salary at date of appointment.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)

Return showing the number of days and the dates upon which the Intercolonial Board of Commissioners held sittings, from the 1st day of January, 1883, to the 31st day of January, 1884; the number of times each member was absent from meetings, the monthly allowances paid to each member, whether salary, travelling expenses or otherwise, and the total amount paid to each during the time above named; also dates upon which meetings were held outside of Ottawa, and where.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return of the number and names of the Immigration Agents employed during the year 1883, the dates of their appointment, the length of time served during the year, the salary paid, and the expenses allowed; also the number still employed, their salary and expenses.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 10:35, o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 15th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Traders' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of British America.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.) On division.

Bill (No. 94) to empower the Sovereign Fire Insurance Company to relinquish their charter and to provide for the winding up of their affairs.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 95) relating to the Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa.—(Mr. Tassé.)

## MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons:*

I acknowledge with thanks the Address you have loyally adopted in answer to the Speech with which I opened the Session, and I rely with confidence on the assurance that the important measures submitted to you will receive your careful and full consideration.

LANSDOWNE.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
OTTAWA, 13th February, 1884.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that from and after this day, the Order of the Day for the consideration of the Resolutions moved by Sir Charles Tupper, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, shall have precedence next after Routine Proceedings, and the disposal of Questions put by Members.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I trust the hon. gentleman does not propose to force this motion through. There are a good many motions still before the House for returns which the Opposition desires to have and which have not yet been brought down. Very important papers have been laid on the Table which are not printed and have not been put in the possession of hon. members generally, and the great importance of the question, I think, to all parties, ought to cause us to proceed with all reasonable deliberation and without attempting to interfere with the regular proceedings of Parliament. The Opposition have no desire to unduly protract or prolong this debate, but they think that certainly it should not be proceeded with until such information as has been asked for and ordered by the House is put in their hands. A very considerable number of motions moved by my hon. friend from West Durham, affecting matters of very considerable importance, have not, I believe, yet been laid on the Table. One important paper has just been laid on the Table, within the last few minutes, by the hon. Minister of Railways, which we would like to have printed and have in our hands, and have an opportunity of inspecting at our leisure before the later stages of this business are proceeded with. Does the hon. gentleman intend to force his motion through?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh yes; I think we must.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I shall be under the necessity of moving:

That all the words after "That" be struck out and the following be inserted:—"Full information on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway has not yet been laid before the House, and the great bulk of papers brought down are still unprinted, that the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as referred to in the gracious Speech from the Throne, is of vast importance and demands ample time for consideration and the most searching enquiry; and it is inexpedient that its discussion should at present be pressed forward in a way which would interfere with the ordinary course of the House, the rules regulating the conduct of public business, and the facilities for obtaining information required to reach a sound decision."

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison (Lennox),	Fleming,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	McMullen,
Auger,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Béchar, d,	Gunn,	Ray,
Sourassa,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Burpee (Sutbury),	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	King,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Cook,	Lister,	Vail,
Davies,	Livingstone,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Mackenzie,	Wilson,
Fisher,	McCraney,	Yeo.—51.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dundas,	McGreevy,
Bain (Stungles),	Dupont,	McLellan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	Massue,
Beaty,	Foster,	Méhot,
Bell,	Gagné,	Mitchell,
Belleau,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Banson,	Gordon,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Bergin,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Billy,	Guillet,	Riopol,
Bolduc,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Royal,
Bowell,	Hawkins,	Rykert,
Brecken,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Burnham,	Hickey,	Small,
Burns,	Hilliard,	Smyth,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Sproule,
Cameron (Victoria),	Houde,	Stairs,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Tasché,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tupper (Picton),
Costigan,	Kinney,	Tyrwhitt,
Cougulin,	Landry (Kent),	Vanasse,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (Albert),
Currin,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Guthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Daoust,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Williams,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Desjarlins,	Macmaster,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Woodworth,
Dodd,	McCallum,	Wright.—107.
Dugas,	McDougald,	

Mr. MACKENZIE. In order to avoid any further divisions and loss of time, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to make his motion read "from and after Tuesday." That would give him Wednesday and Thursday of next week, leaving Monday as one day for private business. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept the suggestion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot. As in 1881, in the discussion on the Pacific Railway charter, we propose to go on with this motion until it is finished. We will give every facility possible for private business, but I must stand by my motion, I have already postponed it two or three times.

Mr. WELDON moved, in amendment, "that the said motion be amended by inserting, after the word "precedence," the words on "Wednesdays and Thursdays."

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:		
Messieurs		
Allison (Lennox),	Fisher,	McIsaac,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	McMullen,
Anger,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Platt,
Béchar, d,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bernier,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Innes,	Scrivner,
Surpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Oasgrain,	Laurier,	Trow,
Catudal,	Lister,	Vail,
Charlton,	Livingstone,	Weldon,
Cook,	Mackenzie,	Wilson,
Davies,	McCraney,	Yeo.—53.
Fairbank	McIntyre,	

NAYS:		
Messieurs		
Allison (Hants),	Dundas,	McDougald,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McGreevy,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	McLelan,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McNeill,
Beaty,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bell,	Poster,	Méthot,
Belleau,	Gagné,	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Benson,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Berg-ron,	Gordon,	Paint,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Billy,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bourbeau,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hall,	Royal,
Brecken,	Hawkins,	Rykert,
Burnham,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Hickey,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hilliard,	Smyth,
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Sproule,
Carling,	Houde,	Stairs,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Ostigan,	Kilvert,	Tupper (Pictou),
Coughlin,	Kinney,	Tyrwhitt,
Coursol,	Landry (Kent),	Vanasse,
Curran,	Landry (Montigny),	Wallace (Albert),
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Dawson,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Williams,
Desjardins,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	Macmaster,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dodd,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Woodworth,
Dugas,	McCallum,	Wright.—168.

Main motion agreed to, on the same division reversed.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN.

The Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Charles Tupper, "that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions (page 84) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway," being read,

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker, if I do not open the remarks that I have to offer to this honourable House to-day with a lengthy apology, it is not because I am not fully convinced of my own inability adequately to deal with the important question that is now before this House. I presume, Sir, that it is customary, in the first place, to deal with the observations of the speaker who preceded, and in this case I should feel disposed to do so to some extent; but, Sir, I find myself relieved of that important duty by the esteem in which the remarks of the hon. gentleman who preceded me in this debate seem to be held by his own friends, if we judge from the comments upon his speech made by the leading organ of the Reform party in the Province of Quebec. I refer to the correspondent of the Montreal

*Daily Witness*, in which that gentleman, after having paid a high eulogy to the hon. member for Queen's, and a still higher compliment to the hon. member for King's, who took part in this debate, thus disposes of the hon. gentleman who has preceded me: "Unlike his two predecessors, he departed from the serious into the comicality." And now, Sir, as I have no pretension to be the comic member of this side of the House, I must certainly dispense with paying any attention to the comicalities of the hon. gentleman who has already taken part in this discussion. The question which is now before this House is one of momentous and of national importance. I have no pretension, Sir, to be able to cast new light upon this subject, after the exhaustive speeches that have been made by the hon. the Minister of Railways, by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, meeting him in this combat, and by the hon. member for Cardwell, (Mr. White), and other distinguished gentlemen who have spoken here since the opening of this discussion. My idea is to take, to some extent, at all events, a new departure. My idea is not to seek to enlighten those who are now doing me the honour to listen to me, from my own standpoint, but rather to place myself in the position of an outside observer, of a patriotic citizen, of a spectator of the battle that is now raging between the contending parties on this momentous issue. And, Sir, I think that in doing so, the one thing that must be more pleasant than another to any patriotic citizen, who has witnessed what has taken place in this debate since the opening, is the enthusiasm with which every assertion of patriotism has been received on this side, and also, I may say, the enthusiasm with which our friends on the other side have repelled the attacks that have been made upon their patriotism. But, Sir, I think this question of patriotism does come up in this debate; I think this question of patriotism has a great deal to do with this debate; therefore, I say, that taking the standpoint of an outsider I have taken, I am first of all struck, not by the words of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken here, but I am involuntarily impelled to go back to the history of parties, and to judge them by their acts. What has been the history of these two contending parties to this great contest? The enquirer will not have to go back very far to find that, once the horizon is cleared and the smoke has disappeared from the battles that were fought on mere Provincial issues, the first great question that came forward before the Parliament of Old Canada was that of giving assistance to the then national railway line of Canada; and, Sir, that proposition was supported and contended for by the Liberal Conservative party in the old Province of Canada, and that party in its noble fight were opposed by the predecessors of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who sought to crush in its infancy the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada just as they are now seeking to crush the Canadian Pacific Railway under the heap of opprobrium which they are seeking to cast upon it. If, Sir, without going over too many particulars we come to the next move that was made in the patriotic policy of the Liberal Conservative party of the country, if we look back to the time when the leaders of this party, desirous of giving position and standing to our country in the minds of the people on the other side of the Atlantic, by establishing a great steamship line that would place us in our proper position before the world, and give us that communication which we otherwise would have been deprived of, we shall find that the Conservative party were not afraid to come before the people and to shoulder the responsibility of giving that line the subsidy it required. And again, Sir, the so-called Liberal party, those who are now clamouring to have a monopoly of patriotism, were again found in opposition to this great scheme, and contended against the National Policy of building up this great country, just as they have been doing ever since. Then, Sir, when the great question

came up of laying the corner stone of this grand Confederation under which we are now living, who were the men who carried forward that great scheme to its consummation, if not the right hon. the leader of the present Government, and the predecessors of the party who now follow him? And still, Sir, at every step they were met and opposed by the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, who claimed to desire to build up this country, and to possess a noble and patriotic ambition. But, Sir, they fought, not to tear down the flag of the Dominion, but they fought to prevent that flag ever being raised, as the records of history will show. Take up the Confederation debates, and you will find, with one or two exceptions—and those exceptions very soon repented of their course—with what a slight amount of patriotism these gentlemen were inspired. Then again, Sir, if we look at the Intercolonial Railway, the next great step in the National Policy of the Liberal Conservative party, what do we find? We find them battling against that national line that was to link together Provinces that had been divided. They said that line ought never to be constructed, that it would not pay for the grease that would be used upon the car wheels, and they fought against a patriotic policy then as they are doing to-day. They fought against every movement for the consolidation of this Dominion. And again, Sir, when the people of this country were clamouring for a policy that would give Canada to the Canadians, these men were found fighting against the protective Tariff which has given prosperity to our country. They fought, not only against that measure, but, as the event proved, against the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country. And now, Sir, coming to this last great scheme which is to unite all the Provinces of this vast Dominion, and to give us a road from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and bring all the riches of the far West into the lap of the old Provinces of Canada, which is to build up this country by means of a continental line, which has been endorsed by all sections of this country. Again, Sir, we are met by these same hon. gentlemen who claim to be patriots, who are opposing this scheme in the manner that they have chosen to adopt. I say, Sir, that if we are to judge a tree by its fruits, the fruits the so-called Liberal party have produced have been nothing but discord and dissension, whilst the fruits of the Conservative party evince a desire and a determination to build up the great Dominion, and to give it the position it deserves amongst the nations of the earth. Now, Sir, to come to the consideration of this great question before us, I may say that I did not, even when I had heard the Ministerial explanations, consider myself fully confident to judge of the full bearing of this question. Sir, I have taken the opportunity of consulting those in whose judgment I have confidence. I went to the city of Montreal, and there I met the leading business men of that great city. I spoke, not to men of one creed, nor of one nationality, nor of one line of business, but I spoke to such men as James O'Brien, J. B. Rolland, Mr. Shorey, of that city, men who have business relations over the whole Dominion. I spoke to several others asking them what they thought of this particular line of policy, asking them what they deemed should be done with regard to the Resolutions now before this honourable House. Not only did I consult those gentlemen I have mentioned, but since that time I have had the opportunity of meeting the President of the Board of Trade of Montreal, and of meeting members of that Board, representing every great interest in the Dominion, especially the manufacturing, the commercial and the financial interests; and I am authorized to say on behalf of those to whom I could not speak, that not one man of all this deputation who have been here in the city of Ottawa, has not asserted in the most positive manner that the interests of this Dominion are bound up in the passing of these Resolutions. What was said, Sir, in connection with this matter? They

Mr. CURRAN.

asked me, have you considered what the investments are that have been made in consequence of the belief that this railway is to be finished within two years? Have you considered how trade has been pushed for the same reason; how immigration has been counted upon? Have you considered that in the event of this policy not being carried out, every rival interest, not only to the Canadian Pacific Railway but to the Dominion of Canada itself, will scatter abroad, not merely at the firesides of the homes of the people of England, Ireland and Scotland, as was eloquently pointed out by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), but every immigration agent, every steamship agent, every railway agent on the other side of the Atlantic, in England, Ireland and Scotland, in Germany and the whole of Europe, will say, not merely that the building of this railway has been postponed, and that the Company has to carry out the original contract and complete the road in 1891, but they will say that this railway, and not merely this railway, but the great North-West itself has collapsed, that it is a failure, and that failure will rebound upon the whole Dominion and bring a crisis and ruin upon us, I believe and they believe, which by the adoption of these Resolutions we may avert. I can, understand, Sir, thoroughly that it is altogether unnecessary for me at this particular moment to enter into the reasons which have already been given here. I can understand, and this House will thank me for not referring to the great advantages which must flow from the consummation of the present Resolution. My constituents, to whom I am responsible, wish no doubt to hear my own reasons, as well as the reasons of others whom I have consulted, for the position which I intend to take in this debate and in the vote that is to be given upon these Resolutions; I say they will expect me to give an account of my stewardship and state upon what basis I have proceeded. The arguments against this scheme have been, first, that we have no security; and, second, that Parliament if it has, will not enforce the terms of the agreement when the time comes. I contend that what we have to do now as regards the second objection which has been raised is simply this: It is our duty as representatives of the people in this Parliament and at this moment to pass a binding and strict bargain, one that cannot be overthrown by the Company no matter what ingenuity may be employed to overcome it. If we do our duty in this respect, if we make such a bargain as cannot be set aside and voided, we shall have performed our duty; let those who occupy our seats in Parliament at another time do theirs, as no doubt they will, patriotically. As regards the first point, that we have no security, this House will probably allow me to say a few words. What is our position and our security. We have brought the Company exactly to that position in which the people of Canada desire to see it; we have brought the Company out of the position which the enemies of Canada asserted it occupied. They said the Company was stronger than the Government, that it was overawing the Government, that it was the power behind the Throne, and was stronger than the power on the Throne itself. I say in this agreement we are bringing the Company exactly to that position in which we ought to see it, that is to say, within the power and in the strong hand of the people of this country. What is the security, then, they offer to us in this matter? Every asset of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been handed over to the Government. Not merely the work performed on the line which they contracted with the country to build in 1881, but a cash investment, in enterprises essential to the successful operation of the road after its final completion, of about \$25,000,000. What are these tributary enterprises? First, 269 miles of completed branch lines. Second, a lien on the extension from Callander to Brockville and Montreal. Third, a fleet of steel steamers unequalled on the lakes of the world.

Fourth, \$1,500,000 of South Eastern Railway bonds. Fifth, material on hand of the value of \$4,000,000. Sixth, real estate for termini, works, &c., over \$500,000. Seventh, rolling stock valued at \$8,000,000. Then we have the security of the line contracted for from Callander westward, 1,121 miles completed, worth \$23,000,000. We have the capital stock of the Company deposited with the Government, \$35,000,000, and we have the lands of the Company, one-half already earned, 21,000,000 acres. Now, Sir, of the proposed advance \$15,000,000 goes into the work and becomes at once a security for itself for this amount. No part of it is paid in advance of construction. The Company has to keep the work ahead of the loan and spend thereon the cost of the construction before they can claim one cent of that cost from the Government. Contrast this security with that of 1881, where we had \$1,000,000 cash and 5,000,000 acres of land for the completion and operation of the road. The security for the completion and operation of the road for five years, because the loan is not repayable until 1891, five years after the completion of the work, is \$23,000,000 on main line, 21,000,000 acres of land, 269 miles of branch lines, \$35,000,000 of stock, lien on extension to Montreal, steel steamers, equipment, real estate at termini, workshops and South Eastern Railway bonds. But we may be told we pay \$22,500,000 for that security. True; but the lands alone at \$1.50 per acre will secure us. In connection with the question of the land I will refer, not to the speeches of individual members of the Opposition, not for instance to the great speech of the leader of the Opposition at what was intended to be a grand indignation meeting of the citizens of Montreal against the first contract of 1881, at which the indignation was so great, but was so great on the wrong side, that its promoters had to admit the audience by ticket lest that indignation should express itself in a way not conformable to their taste. I do not intend to hold them responsible for the absurd statements made with respect to what were called the outrageous terms which were then given to the Canadian Pacific Railway; but I do hold them responsible one and all, for the manifesto which was issued by the Reform party in the city of Ottawa at that time. And in that manifesto it is contended that the land alone given to this Company was worth \$79,000,000, and that we were robbing the country by giving these lands. I say that if you refer to that manifesto, for which every member of the Reform party is responsible, you will find that statement made exactly as I have made it. The following is the quotation:—

"According to the valuation of Sir John A. Macdonald and the Department of the Interior the lands to be received by the Company are worth \$3.18 per acre, a sum less than the price realized by the railway companies of the United States. This will make the Government subsidy in land for the construction of the central section of the railway equal to \$59,625,000.

"The Eastern section of the road is to be aided by a grant in cash of \$10,000,000 and 6,250,000 acres of land, which at the Government valuation will be equal to \$19,725,000."

I think, Sir, that in the discussion of this question there have been some very fatal blunders made on the other side of the House. I regret extremely that the leader of the Opposition is not in his seat, because I have one or two observations to make in which he is interested, and I would prefer making them face to face with him. The most fatal of all his blunders was, I think, the reference which he made to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I am, Sir, now, as I was 22 years ago, when, at the request of the late lamented Sir George Cartier, I took my stand for the first time on the public hustings—I was then, and am now, a friend of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I say, Sir, that despite the reference made by the hon. gentleman to the Grand Trunk Railway, as a terrible example to this Parliament, despite the amplifica-

tion of that idea by my hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), who, I believe, knows as much of the history of the Grand Trunk Railway Company as I do about some railway in the heart of Prince Edward Island, of which I have never heard—I say, despite these remarks, the Grand Trunk Railway Company have done more in developing this country—supposing that they had never paid back a single dollar of the money which was handed to them out of the public Treasury—they have done more, one hundred fold, for the commerce and the interests of the country generally than the value of that money amounts to. But, Sir, in this connection I was brought back in imagination to my early days, when as a boy of nineteen, I first took part, perhaps prematurely, in the politics of this country. Those eloquent and well rounded periods of the hon. gentleman seemed to me to be very much like something I heard in those days, and it crossed my mind that his speech was not an original speech. I therefore sauntered into the library of this building, and I turned up the debates which took place on this very Grand Trunk Railway matter, in the month of May, 1855—a memorable occasion when the Grand Trunk Railway Company were asking the Province of Canada for the sum of £900,000. I found in the report of that debate in the *Montreal Gazette* of that time, something that really startled me, and something which I think will amuse and instruct this honourable House. I found that the objections which the hon. leader of the Opposition raised to the Canadian Pacific Railway, had been made as regards the Grand Trunk Railway, on the occasion to which I refer. If you remember the hon. gentleman said that he complained of the Company because they had failed of their engagements, that they were plundering the country, and were obliged to solicit aid. He objected in the second place to the recklessness of the expenditure which, he said, had characterized this terribly rapid Company. He protested against their investment in branch lines, and their amalgamations with other railways; and finally he turned round to you, Mr. Speaker, and he sneered at the position of the railway. Turning again to the Minister of Railways, with a bland smile on his face, he said, what a pitiful spectacle you present now, when making your present statement, compared with your tone of exultation last year. As most hon. members know, the late lamented John Sandfield Macdonald, then a member of the Reform party, was contending, in 1855, against the Grand Trunk, just as the leader of the Opposition is contending against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to-day. He said that the country was being gulled by speculators; he quoted the Hon. John Young as saying that "to give such a work into the hands of a company, would be to make the Company more powerful than the Government itself." He said: "The Company and contractors had bound themselves to build the works for certain advances from the Provinces. Had they fulfilled their contract? No." These are exactly the words of the leader of the Opposition to-day. He said further: "They entered into bad speculations with the money raised with which the Province had nothing to do, and now, having exhausted their means in this way, they asked the Province to grant them £900,000 of additional aid." Just as it is said to-day that this Company have exhausted every means in speculative enterprises, which were never contemplated, and now, having exhausted those means, they were asking for additional aid. He said further, that "besides these purchases and amalgamations, the money on the works had been expended in a most extravagant, profuse, and ill-regulated manner and with no regard to economy." This is just what the hon. gentleman said the other day. He said further, that "he believed that any further advances of money to be spent by these contractors would meet with universal condemnation out of doors." Exactly the words

of the leader of the Opposition, a few days ago. He said: "He believed that no satisfactory or thorough examination of the works had been made." Another statement which was repeated by the leader of the Opposition. That was his statement, when he complained that we had no examination of the works, that we had nothing before us, that we had merely the statement of two employes of the Government, whom he sneered at as being under the control of the Minister of the Department. He said he did not wish to throw any odium on these gentlemen, who were respectable men, but that no reliance could be placed on their statements. In the words of the Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald, he said that we had no satisfactory examination of the works before us; and the Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald then read an extract from the *Hamilton Spectator* describing the Grand Trunk as a complete swindle, just as the hon. gentleman described this as a swindle. He actually borrowed the sarcasm and the irony I spoke of when he turned around and addressed you, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway; he borrowed these words, which were spoken by the Hon. George Brown, in the same debate:

"The speaker must have been surprised at the change which had taken place between the tone of the last Parliament and the present debate. It was certainly not a little worthy of astonishment to call to mind all the stories which had been told of the wealth of these English capitalists—how they were to finish all the works of the Province by their unaided strength, and then to reflect upon this, as the miserable end."

Exactly the words of the hon. leader of the Opposition in addressing you, Mr. Speaker, the other night in this debate. Now, Sir, I feel that I know what is the ambition of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He would like, Sir, to see himself at the head of the young Canadian party. He would like to see himself at the head and front of all young Canada, and the noble and generous and patriotic men who are growing up in this Dominion; but if he ever wishes to succeed in that ambition, if he ever hopes to bring these young men to his standard, he must offer them some other livery than the tattered rags of defunct Gritism. But, Sir, has this Grand Trunk Railway actually done all this damage? Are these hon. gentlemen sincere when they hold this Company up to public disapprobation as they do? Have they no faith in the statement made by the managing director of the Grand Trunk Company, which was published in the *Montreal Gazette*, and which is summarized in the *Montreal Post* in the following words:—

"In a communication to the *Gazette* this morning, Mr. Joseph Hickson points out that the amount of the advances by the Government to lines which now comprise the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada was £3,111,500. The Company was compelled to construct, as a condition of securing this assistance, the Rivière du Loup line, which cost £1,180,000, the Three Rivers branch which cost £220,000, and to give to lines in Western Canada (now Ontario) £1,000,000. It lost the interest for twenty-four years on the money which it was compelled to expend on the Rivière du Loup and Three Rivers roads, in excess of the Government aid to these lines, about £400,000 at 6 per cent. for twenty-four years—£576,000. It worked these lines (and has one of them still on its hands) at an annual loss of probably £20,000 a year for twenty-two years—£440,000. It was also bound to build the Victoria bridge. Mr. Hickson says that the extent of the real aid secured can, from the above figures, be readily estimated, and concludes by expressing his opinion that it would have been very much better for the Company if it had never received a pound from the Government, considering the conditions on which the assistance was given."

Now, Sir, I have no mission here to settle these little difficulties between the Grand Trunk and the hon. gentlemen opposite who have been attacking it; but I have read the statement of Mr. Hickson, in order that public opinion may not be prejudiced against that institution through the attacks, I believe the slanderous attacks, that have been made upon it by the hon. leader of the Opposition and his followers in this debate. Now, Sir, after the very eloquent observations of the hon. leader of the Opposition, we had an outburst from the ex-Finance Minister of this Dominion. I was surprised to see that hon. gentleman rush in, knowing, as I do, Sir, that the financial record of that hon. gen-

Mr. CURRAN.

tleman as manager of the fiscal affairs of this Dominion is written in the tears of the wives and the children of the workingmen of this Dominion. I was surprised, Sir, at the audacity with which he rushed into this debate—not in ordinary language, not in the language, certainly, of a man who did not feel that he had been driven to the wall; he launched out in what way, Sir? He launched out, Sir, as no man having the slightest conception of statesmanship—or of statesmanship did I say?—No, Sir, but the slightest consideration for the feeling of the great mass of patriotic men in this Dominion—he launched out against the French Canadian representatives here of their race, and he told them, Sir, that they would be dragged through the mire provided they got dollar for dollar for every step they took. When I heard that statement made, I looked to the other side of the House to see if my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) was in his seat. I think I can call him my friend, and I believe him to be a true and honest and patriotic French Canadian, no matter what his political opinions may be. I looked to see if he was in his place, because I thought if he had been there, he would have raised his voice in protest against this scandalous, this unwarranted and unjustifiable attack on his fellow-countrymen, even though they differed from him in politics. He would have pointed out to that hon. gentleman the sacrifices which have been made by the Province of Quebec in the interests of the railway undertakings of the Dominion. He would have pointed out what the people of the Province of Quebec have done in the interest of this Dominion out of their own Provincial Treasury. He would have shown that his fellow-countrymen did not deserve this slander, for they have raised the name and fame of Canada, not merely in their own country and in the neighbouring Republic, but across the Atlantic, where their historians, their poets, their men of science, and their distinguished ladies, too, have inscribed the name of Canada on the records of every learned society, of every association of literature and art, and of every academy of science. But the hon. gentleman was unfortunately, Sir, not in his seat. The French Canadian members of this House have shown themselves to be patriotic and devoted to the interest of their country, and have followed the right hon. leader of this Government for years and years without bribe or sop or disgrace of any kind. It does not rest with the hon. member, it does not rest with the ex-Minister, of whom I have spoken, to cast this foul and unjustifiable slur upon them. I am not a French Canadian, but in my bosom there beats an Irish Canadian heart which throbs in sympathy with my French Canadian friend, not only in the Province of Quebec, but throughout the broad extent of the Dominion. I stand by the policy of the Government in this great undertaking, but I will stand equally side by side with them in pushing every just and honest claim they may have which they can substantiate; and I know that any such claim will be recognized. I know still more that I stand here behind a gentleman who has always taken care in the past that his Province was justly dealt with, and will see that she shall be justly dealt with in the future—the hon. Minister of Public Works, who sits here as a successor of the late Sir George Etienne Cartier—who will stand by his faith and his fatherland throughout all the emergencies that may arise. Feeling that assurance, knowing that justice will be done to the Province of Quebec and to all the other Provinces in any just demands that may be made, either now or in the future, I, as a member from the Province of Quebec, stand in unison with my friends with whom I have fought for twenty-two years from the days of my boyhood. I am satisfied that neither cajolment on the one side nor sneers, slanders or abuse on the other, will drive these men for one moment from their allegiance to the grand old party that has built up Canada, that has made this

country what it is, and will make this country a still greater nation in the days to come. We had still another exhibition from that hon. gentleman, the ex-Minister of Finance. Like all other Grits, when driven to bay, all he could exclaim was: "The Pacific Scandal." Why did he not look around this House? Did he forget the verdict of the people of this Dominion? Why did he not look around, and he would not have forgotten that the grand conspirator, the chief of the conspirators, the chief of the vilest conspiracy against the state that is on record since the days of Catiline—they may laugh, but where is that chief conspirator to-day? He is "far from the land," and the old hero he thought to bury beneath the ruins of his party is not asleep like the hero of the poem, but is alive to-day with a monument erected to him in the heart of every patriotic citizen of this Dominion. He is alive to-day doing battle as he did before, having the confidence and the support of the people of this Dominion. I will not say anything further on this subject, but will merely refer to one statement, perfectly true, which that gentleman made, and which I cannot pass, since it is true and since I have stigmatized those statements which are false and baseless. That statement was that during the ruinous reign of himself and his friends, the lands of the North-West were not worth more than 25 cents an acre. True they were not, nor would anything else in the country be worth 25 cents an acre had he and his friends remained in office. In conclusion of these observations which have been perhaps too long, I would say that viewing this matter as a spectator, weighing calmly all that has been said on both sides of the question, reviewing the history of the past, and witnessing the history of the present which is now being made, there is one reason which must determine every patriotic citizen to stand by this Government, and that is that in the hearts of the people there is the conviction that the right hon. gentleman who is the leader of this Government, who has founded this Confederation, who has carried it on to its present state of progress and prosperity, who has secured for himself the title of *Pater Patriæ*, would not allow, by one fell swoop, the result of the years of his toil to be swept away for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other company or organization. The people are assured in their heart of hearts that the hon. gentleman would not propose this measure unless he felt confident he was acting in the interests of the country he has served so well. The people have confidence in him, the majority of this House have confidence in him, I have confidence in his policy and his policy I shall support.

Mr. FISHER. In saying a few words upon this question of so great importance which is now before this honorable House, I shall not try to go into the history of the other Pacific projects which have been before the country at various times, but shall try to go as closely and as soon as possible to the question which is really before us. In saying this, I hope you will not think I am going to follow the example of my hon. friend from King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), who, the other night, after reproving various hon. members on this side for having spent an hour before they reached the question at issue, spent the first hour of his address in giving us a lecture on patriotism and the building up of a new nationality, and then devoted another hour at the end of his speech to delivering a tirade against an hon. gentleman who had preceded him in the debate. If I had ready to my hand a lecture on those questions which I had previously delivered, and was able to repeat on any occasion, I might possibly be tempted to follow the example of the hon. gentleman, but I trust I would remember the difference between a country school house audience which might be instructed and edified by those high sounding and rolling sentences and this honourable House, composed principally of business men

who wish to discuss in a practical way a question of importance to the public. If I had wished at the latter part of my address to give this honorable House a lesson in classical mythology, I think that, if I ventured to do so, I would, in describing the story of Cassandra, instead of stopping short before the consummation of that story, have gone on and showed that those prophecies of poor mad Cassandra which she delivered in the streets of Troy, jeered at by the rabble, came true, and that to-day Troy has been so destroyed, that even the scientists and the students have only within the last year or two, been able to find the site which once bore her proud walls. But I shall instead at once come to the question at issue upon which this country is waiting the decision of Parliament. And, Sir, in dealing with this question, I do not wish to mix it up in a maze of figures, millions on millions, such as has been thrown around it by a great many of the gentlemen who have addressed this House from the opposite benches. I confess, Sir, that, not being a business man, not being a man who has been in the habit of dealing with such enormous amounts, it somewhat staggers me to hear the light way in which hon. gentlemen use these enormous amounts in discussion. I think it will be better for the country at large, and perhaps it may be better too for some hon. members of this House, to try and discuss this question simply as to what is really before the House now. I will, too, only bring in the discussion upon the original contract with this present Pacific Railway Company in so far as that discussion and that contract may help to enlighten us as to the proposition which is now before us. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, in dealing with this question, take a great deal of pains to tell us that the Company is still in a position to fulfil its original contract, but, if we take a little precaution in examining the line of argument, in examining the general tone of the impression they wish to convey to this House, one would imagine that, instead of this being a question of the time in which our Pacific Railway shall be built, it is a question whether we shall ever have the railway or whether we shall have it within two years. There is another point too in this question which I think is of great importance, and I allude to the question of which party to this new bargain has proposed the present discussion. In reading the circular of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company issued last December, I find that, in that, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves propose that the road shall be finished within a period of two years. I also think it is evident, from the current of the discussion which has come to us from the other side of the House, that the proposition has really come from the Pacific Railway Company, and not from the Government. There is, then, this difference between the relative position of the parties to-day and their positions at the time when the original contract was entered into. At that time it was very clearly shown, not only from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, but also by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in that debate, that the Government were really forced into that contract for fault of a better. They had no recourse left them but to take the contract which the Syndicate were then in a position to offer them, or to fail of obtaining a contract at all for the building of the Pacific Railroad. This being the case, it is very easy to be seen that the Government were really in a position under the influence and in the power of the gentlemen with whom they were trying to form that contract. To-day we find that the Government is in exactly the reverse position. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down, from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), has told us distinctly that the Company to-day is in the hands of the Government. If that is the case, it is evident that the positions which these two contracting parties held at the time of the original contract are now reversed. We know

that, at the time of the original contract, the Government, being in that position, I almost might say, of subserviency to the Syndicate, could not make as good a bargain as they themselves would have wished to do. Hon. gentlemen of the opposite side of the House, on that occasion, themselves acknowledged this to be the fact, that the bargain was not all that they would have wished it to be, but that it was the best bargain which, under the circumstances, they would be able to bring to perfection. This being the case, and it being evident that, at that time, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or rather, as they were at that time, the Syndicate, used that power; certainly, when they now come in the form of suppliants to the Government, they might expect that the Government, in their turn, would exert the power which they have, and drive as hard a bargain as they could. Now, Sir, at the time that the original contract was made, a good deal was made out of the argument that we ought to deal generously with these gentlemen, so that they might be able to carry through their contract, so that there might be no question whatever but that they might be able to carry that contract to a satisfactory completion. To-day again, and in this debate, the hon. gentlemen who have conducted it from the opposite side of the House, especially my hon. friend the representative from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), have appealed to us to deal generously with the Company. The question immediately arises—how long are we to go on dealing generously with that Company? If we were then asked to deal generously with them, and are now again asked to deal generously with them, it is hardly unreasonable to ask whether, in a few years, we shall be again asked to deal generously with them. I think, however, that this, instead of being an occasion when we may be asked to deal generously with the Company, is really a business transaction. We have a Company, who are under an obligation to this Government to fulfil a certain contract, coming to ask from the Government—what? They ask, first, a loan of \$22,500,000, this loan to be repaid at the end of seven years. They ask, secondly, an advance of \$7,500,000, which is to be repaid at the end of five years. Now, what are we to obtain in return for this advance? As far as I can make out from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, as far as I can make out from the statement of the Minister of Railways, all that we, all that the country of Canada, are to obtain in return for this advance is that the Pacific Railroad is to be finished in two years instead of in six years. I think this is a plain and business-like statement of the question before us, and, this being the case, I think that we have only to consider whether it is worth the risk of this country to make this advance for the purpose of obtaining that advance in the period of the fulfilment of the contract. But, when the Government have the advantage to which I have alluded just now, and do not make use of it, I think the people in the country generally will ask why they did not make use of it, why it is that the Government have not made use of the advantage which they thus have evidently over the Company; and the reasons which the people in the country will advance to the Government for requiring of them the use of that advantage are, I think, in short, the following. In the first place, we will ask, who are these gentlemen who require this accommodation from the Government? They are gentlemen who have control of this Company, and who, in the inception of the original contract, issued certain stock and took that stock at a certain price. When the people throughout the country generally know that these gentlemen, after they put their \$10,000,000 into this Company, obtained stock to the value of \$25,000,000 for that \$10,000,000; when they know that that stock which they then took at an average of 40, is now worth 55 or more; when they reflect that in consequence of this operation in the original stock that the Company

Mr. FISHER.

had at that time, they have made an advance of 15 per cent. on the value of that stock, and that consequently since that stock amounted to \$25,000,000, the people, Sir, will see at a glance that those gentlemen have made in that transaction an enormous fortune. There are some other things which, if closely scrutinized, will show the position in which those gentlemen stand to-day—those gentlemen who are now asking accommodation at the hands of the country. During construction, on this stock on which these gentlemen gave 40 cents on the dollar, they have arranged with the Government that they should be paid 3 per cent. on the par value, that is to say, that they should be paid  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on the value of what money they have put into the Company. In addition to that they have been paying out of the capital which they put into the Company, an additional 2 per cent. during construction, or at the rate at which they took that stock of 40 cents on the dollar, they are getting 5 per cent. on their original investment, making, altogether, that these gentlemen are getting on their original investment, an amount of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. during construction. Most people in this country would be well satisfied with half this interest on their investments. I think the people of the country generally will be inclined to ask why it is that gentlemen who are making such large sums out of this contract should come here in *formâ pauperis* and ask the Government for additional assistance. There is, however, another matter which will more strongly impress the people, though their imagination, in this question—I mean this construction company which has been so inextricably mixed up in the construction of this road. So far as we can make out—and I regret to say that at the present stage of this debate we cannot fully understand all the circumstances relating to the construction company—however, so far as we can make out, it seems to be a fact that this construction company is composed, to a large extent, of gentlemen who are interested in the original contract for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and who are, therefore, parties to both sides of the bargain between the construction company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. In view of this fact it is but reasonable that people's suspicions should be aroused in regard to the bargain of this construction company, and in regard to everything connected with it—the more so that unfortunately, the Government has seen fit to refuse us, within a reasonable time, the information necessary to discuss this question reasonably and intelligently. But, Sir, we know enough to understand that by means of this construction company it must have been intended that the members of the company should obtain a very large fortune out of their contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. This construction company was to be paid a certain amount in cash for their contract, and a certain amount in stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. As I read the statement about their bargain, they were to be paid altogether, if they had been able to fulfil their contract, something like \$45,000,000 in stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Now, Sir, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that this stock was to have been issued to them in payment for their work. After this bargain was made with the construction company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company obtained from the Government of this country a guarantee of 3 per cent. dividend upon that stock. For what purpose, Sir, did they obtain this guarantee? It is distinctly stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, it is distinctly stated in the Speech from the Throne, and, I believe, it is generally understood and acknowledged, that they obtained this guarantee for the express purpose of raising the value of the stock. This stock was issued to the construction company at 60 cents on the dollar—it was called that in the bargain which they made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. After that

stock was issued to them at 60 cents on the dollar, after that bargain was made with the Company, this guarantee being expected to raise the value of that stock, it was very evident that by the rise in the value of the stock the construction company would receive a large advance upon their original bargain. The stock was issued to the construction company at 60 cents on the dollar, and we have the authority of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), for the supposition that it was expected the guarantee would raise the price of that stock to 75 cents on the dollar; but a very little sum in arithmetic will show you that by this means, on \$45,000,000 of stock, this company would obtain an advance of 15 per cent on their whole stock. In this way, Sir, we see that this construction company, not content with the actual profits which would accrue to them for the construction of a large portion of the railway, also wished and expected to make this additional profit on their stock. If, Sir, this had been a profit to be obtained by gentlemen who were entirely independent of the company with whom they were dealing, perhaps no great objection could have been urged to it; but when we find that a large number of the gentlemen composing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were also interested, pecuniarily, in this construction company, I confess it has, to my mind, a most suspicious appearance; and I believe, Sir, that in consequence of this circumstance the people in the country will regard this whole affair with additional suspicion and with additional repugnance. There is another thing, too, Sir, which will tend to cause the people to look with suspicion upon this whole affair. I think it was the hon. Minister of Railways who explained to us that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had been working in the stock of the North-West Land Company. As I understood the explanations, that amount of money was invested in the North-West Land Company for the purpose of keeping up the price of the stock of that company. This, Sir, notwithstanding the explanations of the Minister of Railways on that occasion, seems to me to have been undertaken by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company directly with the intention of deceiving the public. Evidently, if their stock were kept up in price by means of those who are particularly interested in that stock, who were particularly interested in bringing immigrants into that country, and who were particularly interested in procuring the sale of that stock—it is evident, I say, that it was done with the express and avowed object of deceiving the public and of speculating in the stocks. I must say, Sir, that all these things combined have a suspicious appearance, and will tend to cast discredit in the minds of the public on this new proposal of the Government. But there is another view of this question which I think it is fair and reasonable to take—I mean the view that was presented to us by the Government at the time the original contract was made, when they boasted so much of the individual wealth of the gentlemen who were concerned in the contract. At that time one of the strongest reasons which were advanced to us in favour of giving the contract to those gentlemen, and of securing an early completion of the road, was the alleged fact that those who were concerned in it were of such enormous personal wealth that there was no possibility of a failure. Sir, if at this time we find those same gentlemen not drawing on their personal wealth and resources to assist them when they are in difficulty but coming to the Government and asking the country to assist them, what good to us is the personal wealth and resources of the directors and managers of the Company? Surely one might suppose when a corporation got into difficulty they would exhaust their own resources before they would ask for a loan to assist them. But that is not the course which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have taken. We have no reason to suppose that those gentlemen have lost their personal

wealth, or that it has even diminished; on the contrary, from what I have said about transactions in stock and other speculations, we may fairly suppose that their personal wealth has very largely increased since the time when the original contract was entered into. Yet to-day instead of drawing on their personal wealth and resources, which were boasted of at the time the original contract was entered into, we find them applying to the Government, asking for assistance now that they are in difficulty. Any reasonable man, looking at this matter from a common sense point of view, will say that such is not the right course to pursue, and that they were bound to exhaust their own resources before asking the country to assist them out of their difficulty. I understand from the speech of the Minister of Railways, and other hon. members on that side of the House, that they insist that the Company is not only perfectly solvent, but is perfectly secure, and that it is able to present such a statement of its affairs as to show that the advance proposed will be a perfectly safe one. If that is the case, how is it that the Company are not able to obtain in the money market of the world the advance they seek? Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us it is on account of hostility on the part of other railway corporations, and of the denunciations which have been published against the Company by a certain part of the press in this country. Do hon. gentlemen opposite mean to say that financiers in the money market of the world are influenced by such considerations; that when a plain statement is put before them in which no flaw is found they will hesitate to risk their money in it? I do not believe it. If such a financial statement can be put before capitalists, showing beyond question that the security is perfectly good, then capital will flow to the Company without difficulty, and they will obtain the aid required without applying to the Government to assist them. There is another reason why this new proposal is very inadvisable on the part of the Government. At the time the original contract was entered into, one of the greatest advantages held out was that the Government would be freed from all responsibility in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway construction. We were then told that the question was taken out of the arena of partisan politics; that it would no longer interfere with the business of the House and the politics of the country. But not more than three years have elapsed before the question is again brought into the arena of partisan politics and we have again to discuss the question in all its bearings. And why? Simply because we are to gain by means of this new advance the building of the railway four years sooner than it would have been built under the original contract. In this connection, I wish to allude to a remark, which fell from the hon. member from Cardwell (Mr. White) in the course of his speech. The hon. member said that he had been through a political campaign immediately after the consummation of the original contract; that gentlemen differing with him in political opinions had been present during the campaign, and that this question had never arisen or been discussed. I believe, that we, on this side of the House and the country at large, believe that the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway construction was finished and done with. We did not suppose that it was again going to be brought forward and re-discussed, and we did not believe that the boasts of hon. gentlemen opposite were going to prove false so soon. The only reason why the question might have been discussed during the General Elections would have been to show the lack of business capacity on the part of those who entered into the contract on behalf of the country. There was no need in the election of the hon. member for Cardwell to have this question discussed, especially when other questions of immediate and equal importance were before the country. But if the Government

had decided to again open the whole question of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the contract entered into, why did they not take advantage of the position which the Company occupied to do something to relieve the objectionable monopolies in the original contract, to which so much objection was taken at the time of its ratification. Again, Sir, I shall have to allude to a remark dropped by the hon. member for Cardwell. He perhaps explained the reason why the Government have not done what I have suggested would be a wise act. The hon. gentleman told the House that the demands of the people of the North-West were unjustifiable, that it was simply absurd that people who had such advantages as they possessed should ask for more, and he made use of words, which I shall not attempt to quote from memory, comparing them with the disadvantages under which the early colonists of Ontario laboured. I presume, knowing the hon. gentleman's intimate relations with the Government, he gave the reason why the Government had not attempted, in entering into the new proposition, to relieve the North-West from the disabilities under which the people there have been labouring in consequence of the terms of the original contract. If that is the true reason for not having inserted such provisions in the new bargain, the people of the North-West will not feel that the Government have done justice to them, in not having taken advantage of the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, of which they might have reasonably taken advantage, to assist their supporters, friends, and the people at large in the North-West. But I wish briefly to look at the bargain from the point of view of the Company themselves. We have the Company taking this very serious obligation upon their shoulders that for the next four years they will pay interest at 5 per cent on some \$30,000,000; at the end of that time they will pay the Government \$7,500,000; and at the end of seven years they will pay the Government \$22,500,000. The resources of the Company from which this large amount of interest is to be obtained, are, as I understand, the net profits on their business, and the sales of their land. Judging, Sir, by the statements of their net profits, which have been laid before this House for the last year or so, I conceive that the greatest proportion of this payment of interest and principal, must be derived from the sales of their lands from which within the last three years—about two-thirds have been made to a Land Company, which will now be, therefore, directly rival to themselves, in the future sale of lands in the North-West—we can hardly believe that the sales of lands in that country will amount to such a figure as that which would be required to meet these obligations. But perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite may think that this difficulty of meeting obligations is a reason why we should deal generously with the Company. On the contrary, I think it is a reason why we should not deal at all with them,—a reason why we should not enter into this new liability towards this Company. If, Sir, it is answered, as seems to be implied by hon. gentlemen opposite, that in default of this arrangement, the Company will be obliged to rest for four or five years, and not go on with the work of construction, what will be the great loss to the country? The state of affairs which would result from that fact would be but the condition of things which the party on this side of the House, at the time of the original contract, argued, would be most beneficial to the country. At that time gentlemen who opposed the original contract argued that it would be very much better, instead of hurrying on the construction of the ends of the line—those portions which must necessarily be most expensive, and from which least revenue would be obtained—to postpone that portion of the work; and they proposed that in the meantime the Company should proceed with the construction of that portion of the line which was going really to develop and open up the North-West Territories and Mani-

Mr. FISHER.

toba, into which we might expect a large volume of immigration to flow, so that the country would immediately obtain the whole of the benefit which would ultimately be derived from the construction of the ends. But, Sir, if the present state of affairs were to continue for three or four years, if, instead of giving this advance to the Company, we were to allow the Company to rest during that period—supposing always that this is the alternative—would it be such an unmixed evil to the country as hon. gentlemen opposite have said?

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. FISHER. Since you left the Chair, a return has been placed in my hand; and the fact that it has thus been placed in my hands is of itself a sufficient rebuke to the vote which took place this afternoon upon this question. It is evident, when a return of such importance as this is placed on the Table, at such a stage of this debate as we are now in, that the vote was certainly, to use the least strong language that I can, a very inadvisable vote. To think that the Government should wish Parliament to discuss this question with so little information at our command, in comparison what we are assured must be in the hands or within the power of the Government—and that it is in their power, is shown by the fact that they have been able to give us this return—I say this is a proof conclusive that the vote which decided that this question should be pressed on to an immediate decision, is, to say the least, a very inadvisable vote. This return is made to an address of the House of Commons, for a statement in regard to the contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the construction company. I find in it a confirmation of what I alluded to shortly this afternoon. I was not then in possession of the full facts, and since then I have hardly had time to study this return, so as to enable me to speak upon it as I would like. But I find in it one or two things which I shall take the liberty of reading, so that hon. members may understand it as early as possible. First I will read a list of shareholders of the North-Western American Railroad Contracting Company, dated July 1st, 1883. We have the following names: Edward A. Adams, 70 shares; James O. Bloss, 1,955 shares; James H. Coe, 200 shares; J. C. Easton, 80; Peter Geddes, 25; Samuel Gwyn, in trust, 21,267; Charles Lanier, 70; Theodore Marrache, 122; Jeremiah Millbank, 41; Alex. Mitchell, 42; William Rockefeller, 100; A. S. Shaw, 245; Alber Simon, 100; Joseph F. Sweasy, 500; William Trotter, 48; Julius Wadsworth, 25; Edward Winslow, 15; Winslow, Lanier & Co., 95; a total of 25,000 shares. You will observe, Sir, that of these 25,000 shares, 21,267 were held in trust by Samuel Gwyn. Now, Sir, to explain that circumstance, I will refer to a letter which is dated at the office of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Montreal, February 12, 1884. After alluding to some other returns, the Secretary goes on to say:

"I also enclose a list of the shareholders of the North-American Contracting Company, as furnished to us by that Company. You will perceive that it appears by that return that Samuel Gwyn held in trust 21,267 shares. These shares were so held in trust for the entire constituency of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in proportion to the holding of each shareholder.

By reference to the number of shares held in the names of the various shareholders of the original \$25,000,000 of stock, we can see somewhat in what proportions and by whom this stock is held. Here again the government have failed to vouchsafe to us that information which I think it is necessary for this House and the country to have in order to come to a proper conclusion on this question. But so far as we do know, we know that the largest proportion of

the stock was held by these men. The letter goes on to say :

"But the object being to interest a number of leading financiers in the enterprise, the original holders of the stock transferred to such parties as the Company were desirous of obtaining, as participators in the enterprise, a proportional number of the shares of the Company at cost price."

We have no exact information showing to what extent these gentlemen were brought into the construction company; we only know, from the information at our command, that of the 25,000 shares held in the construction company the members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company held 21,267. And here, Sir, I think, is a very distinct proof of the suspicious circumstances to which I alluded before recess. There is another matter to which I wish to refer before proceeding with my argument in regard to the construction company, and that is, that, as I showed a little while ago, the construction company were to be paid not only in cash for their work on the railroad, but also in shares of the Company. The total amount of stock which they were to be paid for their two contracts was some \$45,000,000. Now, Sir, at the time this agreement was entered into between the construction company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the stock was taken on the basis of 60 cents on the dollar. After the guarantee of the Government was issued upon that stock, both the Government and the Pacific Railway Company themselves expected that this stock would rise to 75 cents on the dollar, an advance of 15 per cent. on 60, but an advance on the original value of the stock of 25 per cent. but as soon as it was found by experience that the guarantee of the Government failed to raise the price of the stock from 60 to 75, the contract between the construction company and the Pacific Railway Company was cancelled. In other words, those gentlemen who were so greatly interested in the construction company, when they found that they could not make a large profit out of their transaction, cancelled the contract and withdrew from the arrangement. I think, Sir, this is an additional reason, very clear and apparent to the people of the country, for asking the Government why they did not in this new arrangement make use of that advantage which they had over the Company to make as good a bargain as was possible in the interest of the country. Before going on, I wish very shortly to allude to some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me in this debate. I am sorry he is not present, but he will be able to read what I have to say. I was a little amused, as I dare say a great many other gentlemen were, when he alluded to the meeting in Montreal at which the hon. leader of the Opposition explained the policy of the Opposition in regard to the Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman tried to belittle that meeting; he tried to make out that it was packed by partizans of the Opposition. Sir, anybody who was present, as I myself had the good fortune to be, knows very well that on the platform at that meeting were leading gentlemen who supported the Government at the previous election. We know that the chairman of that meeting was a supporter of the Government even at that time, in their general policy, but he was too independent a man to approve of that contract. And every-body must remember the enthusiastic reception which was given on that occasion to the hon. leader of the Opposition—a reception which was never surpassed, and probably cannot be surpassed by any public reception which may be given in Montreal to any public man in the Dominion of Canada. At that meeting the hon. gentleman first explained the terms of the contract, and then declared the policy he and his party advocated on the floor of Parliament in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not wish, Sir, to follow the example of my hon. friend opposite, or I might, perhaps, in terms even more depreciatory than those he used, allude to the meeting held by the hon. Minister

of Railways a few nights afterwards in the city of Montreal. At that meeting, a very different state of affairs took place. I think however I need go no further than to simply allude to them, and anybody who remembers the two meetings will appreciate the contrast. There was another thing in the speech of the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Curran) which brought to my mind again the classical story; that the hon. member for King's, N. B., regaled us with the other night. The hon. gentleman quoted, as being the original of the speech, made the other night by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, a speech which the Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald made many years ago in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway. The hon. gentleman, in alluding to this speech, forgot that almost literally its words came true. He forgot that on that occasion, the Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald, too, was Cassandra—that, although they would not listen to his voice, although they would not heed his warning, still what he foretold took place, and I regret to think that the words of the hon. the leader of the Opposition will also probably come true in regard to the bargain now before us for ratification. The Government are now telling us what will be the result of the ratification of this bargain. They hold out to us a pleasing picture of the good it will effect to the country. They hold out to us a picture of the great benefit it will be to this country that within two years we shall have our railway across the continent. Now I confess, and in this I think I am but speaking the views of that party to which I have the honor to belong, that I do not think it is essential to the immediate prosperity of the Dominion that the portion of this railway north of Lake Superior and the portion through the Rocky Mountains should be pushed at all hazard and cost to a rapid completion. In 1880, when the original contract was entered into, the Liberal party took the ground that although it was of immediate necessity an would be of very great advantage to the country, that those fertile portions of our North-West Territory, over the prairie sections of the road should be immediately opened up and made available for immigration, still that it was not essential for the progress of our country that the portion of the line north of Lake Superior, or the portion through the Rocky Mountains, should, at a serious cost and loss, be advanced to an immediate completion. It is very easy to see why this ground was taken. The hon. Minister of Railways, the other night, gave us the benefit of a very extraordinary computation as to the numbers of bushels of wheat which might be raised in the North-West. The hon. member for King's, N. B., gave us very ordinary computation as to what might be done in the same way by the farmers of the North-West. I suppose these hon. gentlemen wished to declare, or at least to infer, that it was necessary for this production that the railway north of Lake Superior, should be immediately carried through to completion, and that unless these Resolutions passed, without this further contract with the Company was made, the happy picture which they drew of the possible production of the North-West could not come true. I cannot see why it is that with the facilities which we now have for opening up our North-West, with the advantages and the means now afforded for immigration into that country, the prospects of that country being ploughed and worked and brought under cultivation, are not as great as if the railway were pushed to completion within two years. I do not think these hon. gentlemen imagine for an instant that any very great amount of wheat is going to be raised in that portion of the country north of Lake Superior, or in the Rocky Mountains, or in the portion west of the prairie section. If we now have the railway through the fertile portion of the North-West and the facilities by means of our eastern railway system and water communication through Georgian Bay and Lakes Huron and Superior by which the immigrants, at the season in which immigrants

do come into that country, can be easily carried into the North-West through our own territory—and that is the point which the hon. gentleman wished to impress on us as absolutely necessary—if we now have those facilities, I do not see that this new bargain is going in any way to facilitate the fulfilment of that charming picture which these hon. gentlemen drew. In connection with this, I cannot help alluding, for a few moments, to the statement of the hon. the Minister of Railways in regard to the way in which our immigrants are going to be brought into the North-West. If it is essential this road should be built in order that our immigrants may be brought into the country through our own territory alone, how is it the hon. gentleman did not dissent from the proposition of his colleague, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, to bring those immigrants over the Erie Railway? This seems to me to show an extraordinary divergence of opinion between those two hon. gentlemen. If the proposition of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture is to be accepted, praised and acknowledged as good, it fairly may be said that it cuts away the ground from under the feet of the hon. Minister of Railways, in so far as this argument is concerned. But these hon. gentlemen have been, as I say, drawing a beautiful picture of what is going to be the result of this contract. I think we may fairly go back to their forecasts in 1880, and to the forecasts in 1880 of the hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the House, and see which have been fulfilled. Having done this, we may fairly judge their present forecasts by the result of their former ones. In 1880, the Government first of all foretold and insisted upon it, that the contract which had then been entered into was to be the last occasion on which the Pacific Railway should come into party politics—that this arrangement was a final one and that the introduction of this question into the arena of party politics should never again take place. We see to-day how that forecast was fulfilled. On that occasion the hon. member for West Durham argued that the contract did not secure finality. It is true that on that occasion neither he nor any other hon. gentleman on this side believed that the terms of the contract itself were at all likely to be opened up again, but they reflected and saw that, even with that contract entered into, finality was not secured because the Government were still obliged to work upon and to construct a large portion of the line. As things have turned out, not only have the forecasts of the Government proved to be untrue, but even the worst has happened that could possibly be imagined, for to-day we have the Government still working on those portions of the line which the country had to construct, and are plunged again into the expense and liability incurred in regard to the construction of the other part of the line. At that time, Sir, the Government, too, foretold that, in consequence of these gentlemen to whom that contract was given, being so rich and so powerful in a financial point of view, it was perfectly impossible that they should ever ask any further assistance; that it was quite evident, in consequence of their great wealth, that they would be able to carry out whatever they undertook to carry out. I have shown in the earlier part of my remarks that it is possible, if they did draw upon their personal wealth, that they might be able to carry out what they have undertaken, but they are not willing to do so, and, by the terms of the original contract, I confess they are not called upon to do so; but it seems to me that those boasts and prophecies in regard to their financial power are to-day shown to have been baseless and to have fallen to the ground. At that time, another syndicate was shown to be ready to undertake that contract. At that time accusations were levelled against the financial ability of that syndicate, and at the same time assertions in regard to the stability of the successful Syndicate were made, and their financial stability was contrasted with that of the other. Of course it is idle

Mr. FISHER.

for me to say what might have occurred had another syndicate undertaken this matter, but I believe truly that, if another syndicate had undertaken it, no such appeal as is now made could possibly have been entertained by the hon. gentlemen opposite. There was another thing which I will not say was foretold by hon. gentlemen opposite, but which was foretold most clearly and precisely by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) on the occasion of that discussion. He clearly pointed out the danger that there would be, in this matter, of a construction company. He pointed to the history of the Union Pacific Railway, and showed in what manner the Credit Mobilier Company, in connection with that company, occasioned not only scandalous financial arrangements, but had occasioned an enormous increase in the cost of that railway. Almost identically to-day we find his forecasts made true. We find to-day that there is a construction company so intimately connected with the Pacific Railway Company themselves, that it is impossible that we should not view their operations and their connection with that company with suspicion. That, too, on that occasion, was scouted by hon. gentlemen opposite as an unlikely proposition. Now it is shown to be true, and I think, on these grounds and for these reasons, we may fairly distrust the forecasts now given to us by the gentlemen who sit upon the Treasury benches and by their supporters. I have but a few words more to add, but before sitting down, I wish to make a few remarks in reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman who preceded me in regard to the Province of Quebec. That hon. gentlemen intimated that harsh language had been used on this side of the House in regard to the Province of Quebec and in regard to the demands which it was believed the Province of Quebec was about to make upon the Government, in consequence, and as a condition, of ratifying this agreement. The hon. gentleman accused parties on this side of intimating that those demands were being made, and of making those accusations. I hold in my hands a public print, which, perhaps, that hon. gentleman will acknowledge, has very little sympathy with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; I allude to *La Minerve*, a paper which anybody who is acquainted with the Bleu party of the Province of Quebec, will know has been, and is, their mouthpiece in political matters. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read a short extract from a leading article in this paper, dated the 11th February, 1884. The *Minerve* says:

“Quand nous aurons fini de payer pour le Pacifique le supplément que l'on nous demande cette année, la dette publique sera de plus de \$200,000,000. Si comme le fait prévoir le mouvement commercial des derniers mois, les affaires du pays diminuent, et si les recettes décroissent, le gouvernement fédéral lui-même sentira la gêne et peut-être les déficits, et il sera forcé de nous dire plus tard: “Je voudrais rencontrer vos vues; mais les moyens pécuniaires nous manquent.” La province de Québec ne demande rien d'exorbitant. On veut lui faire voter trente millions de plus pour le Pacifique. Comme elle ne veut pas rester indéfiniment pauvre, elle se contente de dire: Nous voterons peut-être tout cela, si nous avons les moyens de le payer; mais qu'on ne perde pas de vue que nous sommes las de toujours voter pour les autres et qu'avant même d'examiner s'il est juste de donner un montant aussi rond, nous voulons savoir ce qu'il nous restera pour nous-mêmes. Si la situation financière du pays ne permet pas de faire les deux, eh! bien, nous prétendons que le Pacifique n'a pas plus de droit que nous, et il attendra comme nous, ou il passera après nous.”

If the Province of Quebec has made such demands upon the country, if the hon. gentleman had read this, he could not certainly have accused our party of making false accusations against the hon. gentlemen opposite. This is the mouthpiece of the Conservative party of the Province of Quebec, and, if any such views have been advocated in that Province, it has not been by the Rouge party but by the Conservative party, and the gentlemen who have advanced them are the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. But the hon. gentlemen opposite, in all this argument, in all the discussions upon this question, have taken upon themselves more to abuse us on this side of the

House, more to abuse the press which supports us, than to defend the position in which they find themselves. The hon. gentlemen opposite have accused the *Globe* newspaper, in especial, of having decried the country, of having injured the country and having injured the Pacific Railroad at the same time. I will take upon myself to read here a short extract from another paper, a paper which is edited and issued by the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, a paper which is supposed to be the mouthpiece of that wing of the bleus of Province of Quebec which has for its official head the Secretary of State for the Dominion of Canada—I allude to *Le Monde*. This article appeared a few days ago, and it is a fair specimen of what they have been printing for the last week. I will read these remarks about the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the opinions which are given respecting this enormous subsidy:

LES SPECULATIONS DU PACIFIQUE.

“ Plus nous examinons les documents relatifs au Pacifique et les explications données, plus nous trouvons la mesure extraordinaire et injustifiable.”

What can be said stronger than this language?

“ L'incapacité de l'administration se révèle dans tous les chiffres donnés. Ces messieurs veulent absolument que le pays fasse leur fortune sans qu'ils aient à se déroiser les bras.”

I will go on and read one more sentence from this same paper:

“ On sait que le Pacifique n'est pas très scrupuleux sur l'exécution de ses obligations.”

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any greater accusation could possibly be made. I am quite sure that neither the *Globe* nor any other Liberal paper in this country has made such an accusation as that against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, namely, that this Company is not scrupulous in fulfilling its engagements. I think hon. gentlemen opposite, in accusing the Liberal press and the Liberal party of decrying this Company, and through decrying this Company casting discredit on our country, are thus shown to have been, at all events, stating what is not the fact. It is not the Liberal party only, or the Liberal press, that have spoken against this Company and against this proposition. Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite have been accusing us, or accusing the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me on this question, of having injured the stock of this Company in the money markets of the world. Sir, I do not imagine for a moment that any words of mine can possibly have any influence upon the money markets of the world, but if I did believe that such a thing could occur, I do not think that it would be right in me, I do not think that I would be justified, in keeping silent on such a question as this, simply out of regard to the effect my words might have upon the stock markets of the world. If hon. gentlemen opposite who are advocating this measure are influenced by such things, are actuated by such motives, then a new light has dawned upon me; I can now better appreciate the reasons for which they have advocated this measure, and for bringing down to Parliament such a resolution as this. But, Sir, I do not believe it is right, I believe it is contrary to the duty of any hon. gentleman, representing a Canadian constituency in this House, to be influenced by any such motives, or to allow his tongue to be tied by considerations as to what influence his words may have upon the stock markets of the world. I believe, Sir, that it is my duty, as it is the duty of every hon. gentleman in this house, to look upon this matter, to discuss it, and to decide it wholly and solely as it may influence, and as it may affect, the good of our common country. And, Sir, it is in a feeble endeavor to discharge this duty to my constituents and to the people of this country that I have said these words, and have tried to make plainer and a little more distinct the matter which is really at issue before us; and, Sir, it will be in trying to carry out that duty that I shall feel myself bound to vote against the resolutions which the hon. gentleman has laid before us.

Mr. GIROUARD. As a French member of this House, and as one of the representatives of the Province of Quebec, whose position upon the question now under consideration has been so much misrepresented, whose good name has been so often and so greatly slandered, I feel that I can no longer remain silent. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has quoted from two of the leading organs of the French Conservative party. Mr. Speaker, when this Parliament is in Session I do not consider that newspapers are the organs which ought to guide us.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. Hon. gentlemen may laugh; but I will quote in a moment from one of their own papers, and I am sure they will declare that that paper cannot be an organ of the Liberal party. But, Sir, I say that when we are sitting here as representatives of the people, we must not be influenced in our action by what the newspapers may say outside of this House. We are not the representatives of the newspapers, but of the people. That is the position I shall take with regard to that matter. I also wish to say that during this debate, in the House and out of it, the good name of the Province of Quebec has been grievously slandered. I much regretted the other evening to hear the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) say that, in order to induce the members of the Province of Quebec to vote for this measure, the Government of this country would be required to give dollar for dollar to that Province, or, perhaps, to the members of that Province—or words to that effect—in fact his language was rather uncertain and equivocal in that respect; but I presume he referred to the Province of Quebec as a body. Mr. Speaker, as one of the representatives of that Province I wish to say, with reference to the claims which has been laid before this Government by that Province, that the claims are not new, but that they were made last year. No later than to-day every member has received a printed memorandum, signed by the Prime Minister of that Province, and which was drawn up and presented to this Government about ten months ago. These claims of the Province of Quebec are already old, and have nothing at all to do with the subject under discussion. When these claims are brought before the House they will be discussed upon their merits. As one of the representatives of that Province, I am not at all willing to mix up the two questions. One of them is now being examined, and after we have decided it, if the claims of the Province of Quebec are brought forward, I will give to them my best attention. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be influenced in the vote I am going to give upon the present matter by any considerations of what this Government may be likely to do in regard to the other question. Sir, it is not only in this House that we have been slandered; and I want to bring to the notice of hon. gentlemen opposite, the statements of a newspaper which has always been considered as an organ of the Liberal party, but which, at the same time, I am prepared to admit, is also the organ of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That organ has recently gone so far as to insult the members from the Province of Quebec. It said: “ Here in Canada we are accustomed to hear politicians threaten and bully and make noisy declarations, which are usually the outcome of the whisky bottle rather than the calm language of the thoughtful public man.” The slander of this newspaper, I think, is known to all of us. You are acquainted with the French members from the Province of Quebec, and I think you have no reason to be ashamed of their behaviour. When we discussed the License Bill last Session, statistics were quoted showing that whereas wine is more generally used in the Province of Quebec than in the other Provinces, nevertheless the people of that Province are more temperate than those of any other Pro-

vince of the Dominion. It has been said that this slander, coming from the Montreal *Herald*, comes from the organ of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I am going to prove it. I want to show this in order to convince the House and the country, and my constituents in particular, that in the vote I am going to give I am not guided by any ill feeling but by the merits of the case. The present Resolutions were placed on the notice paper on the 30th January last. On 1st February, just two days afterwards, the Montreal *Herald*, the organ of the Liberal party—

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. GIROUARD. Is that paper not the organ of the Liberal party?

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. GIROUARD. You decline to recognize the Montreal *Herald*, because as representatives of the people you have a right to say that you represent the Liberal party of the Dominion; and we have the same right when we talk about *La Minerve* and *Le Monde*. I have been told that the Montreal *Herald* is not the organ of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Let us follow its conduct since these Resolutions were introduced. On 1st February, as I have said, just two days after the Resolutions were brought in—and in fact, I believe it was before any other paper in the country had published articles on the subject—the Montreal *Herald* (it has been always stated that Liberal papers are open to conviction), published four leading articles on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the proposed arrangement. In the first article, under the heading of “The Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway,” we read:

“The Government and the Canadian Pacific.—In another column will be found a copy of the resolutions which will be introduced to-day by the Premier, providing further aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. . . . That they provide ample security for the public interest involved will be conceded on all hands. The fact is, the country is not going to pay one dollar more for the railway than was originally contemplated.”

The second article in the same number has the heading: “Is it a failure?” The third article is headed: “An implacable enemy,” and is an answer to the charges of the Montreal *Witness*. The fourth article is headed: “The people's railway.”

“With Parliament expressing confidence in the Company, the railway and the resources on which security will be taken for the loan that is made, the popular mind will be set at rest and the spirit of the people will rise proportionately. It will be saying to the country and to the world: ‘This is an enterprise in which we have the utmost faith, a measure for the development of our country on which no doubt can rest. We regard it as essential to the country's prosperity, and we back it up with all that the credit and resources of a united country can do for it. It is essentially a Canadian enterprise in its inception and progress and management, and a Canadian Parliament will see it safely through.’ The action of Parliament, which will square with the people, will, we are confident, commend itself to the best judges of the situation, whether in or out of Canada. The Canadian Pacific is the people's railway, and the people's representatives will see that it shall not meet the fate which is befalling private railway enterprises in too many instances in these days of railway trouble.”

On 2nd February there appeared another leading article on the same subject, on 3rd February another, on the 4th another under the heading “The *Witness* and the Canadian Pacific Railway,” another on the 5th, under the heading “The *Globe* and the Canadian Pacific Railway.” There were two articles on the 7th under the heading of “The Only Way” and the “Unreliable *Witness*,” another on the 8th, two on the 9th, and a final one on the 13th, “Interesting Correspondence,” referring to the correspondence between this Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. If I were going to judge this question from personal feelings, seeing that that paper has more grossly insulted the French politicians of this country than any other paper or politician, I should feel inclined to vote against the railway Resolutions. But there is more involved. Is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a Con-

Mr. GIROUARD.

servative institution? Do we find a single Conservative in that Company? You find three or four business men whose political colour may be unknown, but at the same time you find that two of the leading spirits, Mr. Duncan McIntyre and Mr. Donald A. Smith, are perfectly well known as leading Liberals. That Company did not help us at the last general elections. We did not get from them even that support which we received from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which to-day stands before the House as an opponent of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What did that Company do with their patronage? Did they give their patronage to our friends? I am not aware that they did. Do you know, in fact, the reason why the Montreal *Herald*, the leading organ of the Liberal party in Quebec—

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. GIROUARD. Not only is it the leading organ of the Liberal party of the Province of Quebec for Provincial purposes but also for Federal purposes, except with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Do you know why the *Herald* supports the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

An hon. MEMBER. Because it is paid for doing so.

Mr. GIROUARD. Because it receives the largest portion of the printing patronage of that Company. The facts I mention show that in supporting the Resolutions before the House—I am speaking for myself—we members of Quebec are not going to be guided by personal feelings or by party considerations. I am going to vote for the Resolutions because I believe they are in the interest of the whole Dominion, and in the interest of the Province of Quebec in particular, which is likely to benefit in the greatest degree from the construction of the great trans-continental railway. I do not intend to repeat the arguments which have been adduced on this side of the House as to the value of the security offered by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the loan. I have two principal reasons which induce me to vote for the Resolutions. They are very plain to my mind, and I hope they will be understood by the House, and also by my constituents. I am in favour of the railway Resolutions, first, because they tend to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway by a private company; and, second, because that construction is to be finished within the shortest time possible. Suppose we do not pass those Resolutions. What will be the consequence? That is a question which every hon. member should ask himself. I think the natural consequence would be that the country would have to finish this road. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have to surrender their charter and contract to this country. Did we not consecrate the principle, at the very inception of this work, that it should be done by private enterprise, and not by the Dominion Government? In 1871, when this country undertook to build the road within a certain time, this House, on the motion of Sir George E. Cartier, decided:

“That the railway referred to in the Address of Her Majesty, concerning the agreement made with British Columbia, and adopted by this House, on Saturday, 1st April last, should be constructed and worked by private enterprise, and not by the Dominion Government.”

During the same Session, and during the same debate, Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion, then one of the leaders of the Opposition, in order that there might be no misunderstanding on the subject, moved that the following words should be added: “and not otherwise.” That is the policy which has been pledged by this country to the construction of the railway by private enterprise, and are we to-day to interfere with that policy by undertaking to finish the road ourselves? I say further that we cannot finish it as well or as cheaply. I had the good fortune to visit the North-West in 1882. I saw the portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway

which was then finished, to near Regina, in company with an engineer, who had been in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and had been dismissed, so that he had no good feeling towards the Company. He told me that that railway was a first class railway, whereas the Company was only bound to build a second class road. Taking the western section, the Thunder Bay section, and the Pembina Branch, and one hundred miles west of Winnipeg, and what do we find that they cost the country. We find that these sections, covering about 700 miles, cost \$28,000,000, or at the rate of about \$40,000 a mile; and with the exception of about 100 miles west of Winnipeg, this railway is constructed through the most difficult portion of the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Company have about 700 miles to construct in order to finish the railway, through a country which cannot be more difficult than the Thunder Bay or Kamloops sections. Taking the same rate of \$40,000 per mile—and we cannot suppose that the Company are going to spend more money than the Government—we will have those 700 miles constructed for \$28,000,000—the very sum with which they say they are in a position to finish the road. There is another reason why this contract should be left in the hands of the Company. I have just returned from a trip to Europe, having been through Italy, France, and some other portions of the Continent. I came in contact with some of the men who have stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I found that these men are the best immigration agents that the country can have. Their interest in the commercial success of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and their anxiety to obtain dividends, sooner or later, upon the stock of that Company, impel them to send as many immigrants as they can to the North-West. I have also been to the North-West, and for the sole purpose of ascertaining for myself whether that country justified the great expenditure we are making upon it. I returned perfectly charmed with that country. I have no doubt that in the course of years, for it is only a question of time, the North-West will be the greatest country in the world. The only thing we want is people, and these shareholders who are in different portions of Europe will send us these people, and we have only to provide for their safe arrival to our North-West territory. I now come to the second reason why we should adopt the Resolutions. I say we should finish the road in as short a time as possible, in order that the immigrants coming to this country should not have to stop at St. Paul, or Minneapolis, or other places in the United States, as I have myself seen them stop, while *en route* to the North-West. It is important, it is indispensable, that these immigrants should go through Canadian territory. It may be said that we will have steamers next year; but for more than five months in the year I doubt if we can reach Thunder Bay; I doubt if we can reach it sooner than the 15th of May, in consequence of ice in Lake Superior. The result is that for some months in the spring, when the immigrants are coming in *en masse*, they will have to go to Chicago and St. Paul over the old route, which has been the cause of our North-West not being populated as fast as if we had had a road in our own territory. For these reasons I am in favour of the Resolutions. Before resuming my seat I wish to say a word with regard to *La Minerve* and *Le Monde*. I think hon. gentlemen have understood me very well when I said that when the House is in Session the party is represented by its members in Parliament. But there is something more to be said. I was not surprised to read the statement of *Le Monde* which has been well known for the last twelve months to have been the organ, not of the Conservative party, but of one man and a few friends supporting him—I refer to Mr. L. A. Senecal, a speculator, one who is interested in railway matters, and connected with the Grand Trunk Railway Company who are offering all the opposition they can to the Canadian

Pacific Railway. But I was greatly surprised, I was pained, to read the articles of *La Minerve*—*La Minerve*, which has stood as the organ of the party for years and never made default—*La Minerve*, which reaches almost every elector in the Province of Quebec. I was more surprised when I considered that one of the members of this Government is, I believe, an important shareholder in that concern. I say I was greatly surprised, because if that member of the Government had been consulted before that article was written, it would not have appeared. Therefore, *La Minerve* has published that article, not as the organ of the Government, not as the organ of the party; but I am very sorry to say it has been inspired by the same source which inspires and dictates all the articles of *Le Monde*. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly with a great deal of regret that I have to make these statements. I know the consequences of making them. I know that I shall be personally assailed, perhaps persecuted before my constituents; but, Sir, I believe I owe it to them, to my Province and to the country to say that these articles are not inspired by the Conservative party or published in its interest, but that they are inspired by private interest. I know that I shall meet the same men before my electors; but, Sir, I know the intelligence and independence of those electors. I represent the richest rural constituency in the Province of Quebec, and there is no money that can bribe or prevent them from voting for the man of their choice. As I said before, I am very sorry to have to make this statement; but I am bound to do it in the interest of my Province, in the interest of my constituency, and in the interest of my country.

Mr. FLEMING. I do not intend to discuss the question of the political situation in the Province of Quebec, but I desire to glance for a moment at the important and weighty reasons which the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has given for his support to these resolutions. His first reason is that their passage will secure the construction of the Pacific Railway by a private company. I thought that that object had been reached when the contract was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in 1881. I do not know that it is proposed by anybody that the contract should be taken away from the Company. I do not understand the position of the Company to be that if this \$22,500,000 is not given, the contract will pass out of their hands. I understand from those who are said to represent the Company in this House that they do not come to us on bended knees—that they do not come because they need assistance, or because they are unable to finish their contract; and therefore, I do not see that there is any great weight in the first reason which induces the hon. gentleman to give his support to the resolutions. His second reason is that the passage of these resolutions will secure the early completion of the Railway. I do not understand either that the Railway Company put themselves in the position that their contract will not be completed until the year 1891 in case this grant is not made. They have stated, it is true, that the work of construction will be retarded, and that they will not go on with the same rapidity that has characterized their efforts in the past; but neither they nor any one for them have stated that they will take the full time to complete their contract unless this additional money is granted to them. But the hon. gentleman says that by passing these Resolutions we shall enable the large number of stockholders in this Company, who are scattered over Europe, to become active immigration agents for the settlement of the North-West. How many of the stockholders are scattered over Europe? From the papers laid before the House we have obtained some knowledge of where the stock is held. We have not all the knowledge that we should like to have, but we do not find that there

are any great number of stockholders scattered over the continent of Europe who are acting as immigration agents to promote the settlement of the North-West. It is said that the Liberal press and the Liberal party have been hostile to the project of the Pacific Railway, and that they have retarded its progress and prevented the Company from securing that financial assistance which they would have had in the absence of that hostility. What, Sir, was the original policy of both parties regarding this Canadian Pacific Railway? The hon. gentleman has said that both parties desired to construct the railway by means of a company. The original policy of both parties was to construct a Pacific Railway having its eastern point at Callander, and its western point on the Pacific Ocean. Why was Callander selected as the eastern point? Because it was unnecessary to have a Pacific Railway running farther east than Callander—because at that point it would form its connection with the already existing railway systems of the country. It was not the policy of either party at that time that the Pacific Railway Company should, in addition to constructing a road from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, also absorb all or nearly all the eastern connections of that road. It never was in the contemplation of either party, at the time of the making of this contract, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should, under the large powers given to them in their charter, enter into competition with the other great interests in the country, in order to absorb and gather up all the avenues of trade to the east. Well, that being the policy of both parties, in 1880, a contract was made with a syndicate of private gentlemen whose ample means were put forth as one of the principal reasons why they were sought out to undertake the construction of this important work. Sir, was any obstruction raised to the construction of a Pacific Railway, even at that time? Did the Liberal party at any time throw obstruction in the way of the completion of this road? No, but when the contract was entered into with the Syndicate, the position of the Liberal party was the same as it is to-day—that a contract was given to this Syndicate for the construction of a railway, and that a subvention was given them largely in excess of what was necessary. We find that the position which they took at that time is fortified by the figures which are laid before the House now by this Government. Upon the ratification of the contract by Parliament and the organization of the Company and the subscription of \$5,000,000 of stock, the original Syndicate passed out of view and in their stead the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, incorporated, entered the arena. Now if the members of the original Syndicate had passed out of actual existence, in connection with this thing, it would have been in the interests of the country. It is true these gentlemen had large interest in the stock of the Government, but at the same time they went to work, as private citizens, for the purpose of making the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a source of profit to themselves, irrespective of the interests of the Company and its shareholders. We find that they went to work and proceeded to buy up all the railways of the east. We find gentlemen occupying positions on the Board of the Canadian Pacific Railway, buying up, in their private capacity, the shares and the bonds of the Credit Valley Company at 30 and 35 cents on the dollar, and then arranging with their own Company to value them at 100 cents on the dollar. When we find transactions of this kind—when we find these men absorbing and gathering together the various railways of the Eastern Provinces, putting themselves in rivalry with the Grand Trunk Railway, we are not surprised that they find opposition in the money markets of the world. When we find these gentlemen who hold the controlling interests on the Board of the Canadian Pacific Railway, absorbing for their private interests all the feeders of the Grand Trunk Railway on which

Mr. FLEMING.

they can put their hands, we are not surprised that the latter should oppose them in the money markets of the world. In that condition of things, what is the next proposition this company makes? They came down to the Government in last November and said we are embarrassed, our stock which we have put on the market is not realizing as large a figure as we think its value demands; we are meeting with an opposition which, to a large extent, we ourselves invoked, and we find that the \$30,000,000 of stock we have put on the New York market has fallen down below 60, and we ask, therefore, the Government to give us a guarantee of 3 per cent. on the \$65,000,000 stock we have issued, in order that we may be put in funds. Is that a good reason? Would such a course put the Company in funds? The Company issued \$65,000,000 of stock; \$25,000,000 of it went into the hands of the original members of the Syndicate, and \$20,000,000 of this \$25,000,000 were taken by them at 25 cents on the dollar; \$30,000,000 were taken by the New York Syndicate, and we have not the names of the gentlemen who formed that Syndicate; and \$10,000,000 were pledged to secure a loan of \$5,000,000. This makes the whole \$65,000,000 of stock, and any enhanced value resulting from this guarantee which they asked the Government to give, would have gone into the hands of the stockholders. Any enhanced value the guarantee would give to the stock, if it had that effect, would have enabled these gentlemen of the Syndicate, who have passed out of legal existence as contractors, but who still keep such intimate connection with the Company, to sell the stock they had taken at 25 cents on the dollar, at such a figure as would have made them millionaires. The value at which the stock stands in the market of 56 cents, just nets these gentlemen a profit of \$9,000,000 on the \$25,000,000 stock taken by them at 25. But hon. gentlemen opposite will say that this stock cost them 40, because they took \$5,000,000 at par, and \$5,000,000 at par with the other \$20,000,000 at 25, averages 40 all around. But the \$5,000,000 which was taken at par was taken under the conditions of the original contract. It was one of the terms of the original charter. They could not have come into possession at all of this original contract and the Company could not have gone into operation until they had subscribed for \$5,000,000 at par, so that this \$5,000,000 forms a fund which the country has a right to say must be expended in the construction of the railway. The guarantee of 3 per cent upon the stock did not, however, have the desired effect of so booming the stock as to enable the members of the Syndicate and the holders of the \$20,000,000 stock to make what they thought was a sufficient profit on the transaction. Consequently, they now come down to Parliament and ask for \$22,500,000 of the country's money as a loan, until such time as the stock market shall be raised so as to enable them to make the profit which they think this transaction should enable them to make. Now, Sir, we hear, in the course of this debate, a great deal about patriotism. In fact, when the country is going to be plundered in any way, the cry of patriotism is the disguise that is adopted. Now, we will see where the patriotism comes in. We have the figures laid upon the Table of the House by the Pacific Railway Company themselves, that they have spent in the construction of the main line of the railway, that is, the contracted line, they have spent in pursuance of their contract, \$23,563,564. That is what they say they have spent. But, if I understand the position of things aright, they have not spent so much. If I understand what the hon. the Minister of Railways said the other day, they have only spent \$16,063,564, because I learn that there is \$7,500,000 of floating debt, and it is to enable them to pay this floating debt that an immediate payment is asked from the Government. Of the amount, then, that is put in construction on the main line or the contracted line of the railway, there is \$7,500,000 of work that they have

not paid for yet. According to what the hon. the Minister of Railways said, that not a dollar of the money that is asked from the country, not a dollar of the money that Parliament is asked to vote, is to go for any other purpose than the contracted line, then they have incurred this floating debt upon the \$23,000,000 odd, and that is to be paid for out of the money that Parliament is now asked to vote. Otherwise, that \$7,500,000 of floating debt represents a debt not on the contracted line, but on some of the collateral enterprises into which this Company has gone, and the money asked for from Parliament, instead of going for the contracted line, is to pay debts on those outside enterprises. But, Sir, even if they have spent \$23,500,000 upon the main line of the railway, they have got far more money than that from the country; they have got more money now from the country than they have expended on the line. There are \$4,000,000 of the original stock—\$1,000,000 being retained by the Government as security—\$4,000,000 of the original subscribed stock, which was subscribed as a condition of their contract, that the country had a right to say should go into the construction of the railway. They have, then, that \$4,000,000; they have received \$12,289,211 of a cash subsidy; they have received from the land subsidy, \$9,029,093, making a total of \$25,318,304. Deducting the amount which they say they have spent—the \$23,500,000,—leaves a balance of \$1,744,740 still in their hands, moneys of the country over and above all the money that they have put upon the construction of the main line of the railway. I say nothing about the earnings—some \$900,000—upon the constructed railway, that they have received, for which they give credit in their statements, because that may possibly be put, and may properly be put, against the interest upon the \$4,000,000 stock which I have claimed that the country has a right to have expended upon the construction of the railway. Now, Sir, what are their present necessities? If it is true that the country has advanced more money than they have expended in the construction of the railway, what are their present necessities? They say they require \$27,000,000 to complete the railway. They will receive, just as rapidly as they proceed with the construction, the balance of the cash subsidy, \$12,710,788. I think I may safely, after the glowing accounts which we have heard from the Minister of Railways and the gentlemen who succeeded him in support of these resolutions, say that the immigration into that territory during the next two years will very far exceed that of the past three years. I think I may very safely say that there will be hundreds, that there will be thousands of people seeking homes in the North-West in excess of what have been going in in the last two years; and yet we find, since this Company has been organized, since it has proceeded with the construction of the railway, that it has realized out of its lands some \$9,000,000; and it is not too much to say, with the impetus given to immigration, with the glowing hopes that are held out to us by the hon. the Minister of Railways of the future of that country, that, within the next two years, the Railway Company will be enabled to realize as much out of its land as it has done in the past. Add that to the balance of the cash subsidy, and there is a round sum of \$9,000,000 more. Then, the earnings of the Company during nine months were something over \$900,000. I presume that it is not estimating too much if we say that, during the next two years, the net earnings of the Company will be \$2,500,000. I do not think, if the net earnings during nine months were \$900,000, that it is estimating too much to say that \$2,500,000 will be the earnings during the next two years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FLEMING. I am glad the hon gentleman approves of that statement. Add that to the figures I have given,

with \$3,000,000 of postal earnings which the Government say they will earn during the next two years, and these sums, added altogether, amount to \$28,955,528, a sum \$1,455,528 in excess of what they say is necessary for the completion of the contract.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FLEMING. Now, if that is their position, why are they here asking for this loan of \$22,500,000? Because all these sums will come into their hands, the land subsidy and the sum I have given as sales of land, and the \$12,750,000 for the cash subsidy will come into their hands so soon as they construct the railway. They may construct it in one year, and all these sums will come into their hands. There is, therefore, no necessity on the part of the Company for coming to Parliament, and asking the money of the country to be advanced to them for the purposes of this construction. They had too good a thing in the original contract, and they are getting a much better thing now. All these sums that I have given are exclusive of a single dollar of the stock of the Company, except the original \$4,000,000 that were subscribed as a condition for receiving the contract. These patriotic gentlemen, whose energy and whose patriotism have been so much lauded in this House, these patriotic gentlemen whose example is held up to the admiration of this House and the country, are now asking that the people of Canada should advance further money for the construction of the main line of this railway, so as to enable them to devote all their private means to the acquisition of other lines outside the original contracted line altogether. Now, Sir, I think we may well ask, I think the people of this country will ask, and I am sure my constituents will ask, when they come to read these propositions—where is the wealth of the original members of the Syndicate? Why, we might as well have given our money to a pauper company. Anybody would be able to construct this railway from Callander to the Pacific on the subvention of the Government. People will ask where are the enormous sums the original contractors made? Where have these gentlemen put these enormous profits which they have made upon this transaction? And after they have made such great profits out of the construction of the railway, why do they not advance out of their enormous fortunes sufficient to carry on the contract as rapidly as possible? Sir, I am satisfied that my constituents will ask why these energetic gentlemen—I believe the term now is, patriotic gentlemen—who clear upon the present value of the stock \$9,000,000 upon their little investment of \$20,000,000 at 25 cents upon the dollar—I say I am satisfied that my constituents will ask why are these gentlemen now coming back for more assistance? I am sure they will ask why these gentlemen who are making these enormous profits out of the railway stocks, these gentlemen of the construction company that are also making fortunes in their arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, are asking for more money to construct this main line of railway when the enormous profits which they are making are being diverted to other purposes personal to themselves. Before I could see my way to support these resolutions, I would like to see the Canadian Pacific Railway Company put into the construction of the line they contracted to build for the country, the means which the country has placed at their disposal. Before I could support these Resolutions, I would also like to see the stock of the Company organized for the purpose of constructing a railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean used for the construction of that railway. Although I know that I am guilty of unpatriotic conduct in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite because I have a desire to see those who are profiting by this transaction give a reasonable return for their opportunities of making profits; still I must express my disapprobation of the

resolutions brought before the House until such time as there is a necessity shown by the Company for the additional subvention that is now being asked from Parliament. This cry of patriotism that we have heard *ad nauseam* seems to be the only thing which hon. gentlemen on the opposite side have to say. They rise one after another and say very little about the resolution before the House, but a great deal about the patriotism which envelops all the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. Why, Sir, we had the hon. gentleman from King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth) the other night for two or three hours dilating upon the patriotism of the Conservative party and the want of patriotism of the Liberal party. An hon. gentleman remarked that the want of ballast which he displayed in the long speech which he delivered on that occasion was due, no doubt, to the fact that he had disposed of his gravel pit. Then we have heard the hon. member from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) to-day, in a speech which, if it was not patriotic, was not very much of anything else, declaring that all the patriotic acts of the past were due to the great Liberal Conservative party, and that hon. gentlemen belonging to the Liberal party, both in this Parliament and in preceding Parliaments, had decried the country in various ways; that they were the opponents of Confederation and that the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House were its fathers and promoters. I have had the curiosity to look at some of the original documents in reference to Confederation, and I find, in the Session of 1864, when steps were being taken for the Confederation of the Provinces, a report of a select committee to which the question was referred, which was presented to the House by the hon. George Brown. For the information of the hon. member for Montreal Centre who, when he sauntered into the library in search of information, failed to hit upon this book, I will read this report:

"The Hon. Mr. Brown, from the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the important subject embraced in a despatch to the Colonial Minister, addressed to him on the 2nd February, 1859, by the Hon. George E. Cartier, the Hon. A. T. Galt, and the Hon. John Rose, then members of the Executive Council of this Province, while in London, acting on behalf of the Government of which they were members, in which they declared that very grave difficulties now present themselves in connecting the Government of Canada in such a manner as to show due regard to the wishes of its numerous population; that 'differences exist to an extent which prevents any perfect and complete assimilation of the views of the two sections'—that 'the progress of population has been more rapid in the western section, and claims are now made on behalf of its inhabitants for giving them representation in the Legislature in proportion to the numbers';—that 'the result is shown by an agitation brought with great danger to the peaceful and harmonious working of our constitutional system, and, consequently, detrimental to the progress of the Province'—and that 'the necessity of providing a remedy for a state of things that is yearly becoming worse, and of allaying feelings that are daily being aggravated by the contention of political parties, has impressed the advisers of Her Majesty's representatives in Canada with the importance of seeking for such a mode of dealing with these difficulties as may forever remove them';—and the best means of remedying the evils therein set forth, presented to the House the report of the said committee, which was read, as followeth:—

"That the Committee have held eight meetings, and have endeavoured to find some solution for existing difficulties likely to receive the assent of both sections of the Province.

"A strong feeling was found to exist among the members of the Committee in favour of changes in the direction of the Federative system, applied either to Canada alone or the whole British North American Provinces, and such progress has been made as to warrant the Committee in recommending that the subject be again referred to a Committee at the next Session of Parliament.

"The whole respectfully submitted.

"George Brown,  
Chairman."

It will be curious to hon. gentlemen opposite who may stumble on that document to find that the leader of the present Government on the division in the committee recorded his vote in this way. The committee divided on the adoption of the report, and among the three nays appears the name of John A. Macdonald. Upon the same day the report was presented to Parliament, the Government of the hon. gentleman who refused to accede to the

Mr. FLEMING.

views of the majority on that report in favour of a Federal system for Canada or for the Provinces was defeated; and upon the defeat of that Government, and on the same day, the hon. gentleman changed his views and coincided with the views of the majority of the committee, and organized a Government composed, among others, of the leader of the Liberal party, Mr. Brown, for the purpose of carrying out that Federal system against which he had voted in the committee. Hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of attacking hon. members on this side of the House as having opposed Confederation. The history of Confederation itself, and more than that the history of the agitation which led up to Confederation, show who were its friends and through whose instrumentality it was brought about. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) also said that the Liberal party has pursued a very unpatriotic course in opposing the views of the Conservative party on the great question of the National Policy. The history of the National Policy is not yet written, and when it is written and summed up, there will be hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House whose patriotism, I fear, will ooze out with the profits that the policy has enabled some people to make. I shall not detain the House longer, because I observe the hon. member for Wellington is so anxious to speak it would be a cruelty to prevent him. I have shown that the original contractors for the building of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway have departed from their contract. I have shown that they have, with the ample private means at their disposal and the ample means which their contract enabled them to procure, entered into rival projects and brought upon themselves the hostility of other institutions in this country which has, to some extent, embarrassed their financial position. I have shown that the leading members of that Company have, by means of the position which they held as controlling directors, been enabled by the use of the Company's charter, to make for themselves very large fortunes. I have shown that the stock which they have taken, even at the present market value, is such as enabled them to clear on the little transaction of \$20,000,000 a profit of \$9,000,000; and I think I have a right to ask that some of this money be put into the construction of the road before the country is called upon to loan the Company \$30,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise at this late stage of the debate for the purpose of inflicting a speech upon this House, but merely for the purpose of offering a few observations in justification of the course I intend to pursue upon these Resolutions. I shall offer no apologies to the House for doing so, for I think apologies are odious; I will simply throw myself entirely on the generosity of the House as a young member, and I hope to receive at the hands of hon. members such treatment as they have always accorded to young members. I have listened to the debate so far for the purpose of gathering information on this subject; and the question has been so thoroughly gone over and re-gone over, it has been ploughed, sub-soiled and harrowed to the extent that it is almost impossible to find a lump on which to rest your feet to make a speech. The historical position of the subject has been largely and thoroughly dealt with, the financial aspect has also been thoroughly treated, and it would be unjust and unfair to hon. members if I were to enter into figures, in order to inform the House, for I believe every member is as well informed on that subject as I am myself. What has struck me most forcibly in this debate is the absence of that word of—which the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) appeared to be so much afraid—that word patriotism. I have failed to find in the discussion on the Opposition benches the first sentiment of patriotism, or the first word of praise for our great North-West country. Those hon. gen-

tllemen have confined themselves to a mere verbal criticism of the speeches on the other side and have given long pages of figures for the purpose of showing something, and each and every one appeared to have a separate set of figures, and to draw separate conclusions therefrom. As I do not think anything is to be gained in the way of information or knowledge, by quoting figures here, I leave them entirely out of the question. Now, Sir, we have no right to doubt, nor do I desire to doubt, the individual patriotism of the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches; but, Sir, collectively, and as a party, their patriotism is exceedingly questionable, if the speeches I have heard from these hon. gentlemen since coming into this Parliament, are any criterion of their ideas on this subject. I think it would be well for this country if the leader of the Opposition and those who follow him, had the same patriotism which their illustrious predecessor, hon. George Brown had, in years gone by, when the subject of the Intercolonial Railway was before the Parliament of this country. The question of money was talked about, and his patriotism came to the front, when he said that he would rather build six Intercolonial Railways than jeopardize Confederation. That was a noble and a patriotic sentiment, and I wish hon. gentlemen would now come to the conclusion that they would rather build this road, even at a considerable cost, than jeopardize Confederation or the great future of this magnificent country. I think that representative men in this House should give expression to their patriotism, because their speeches, as they are recorded from day to day in *Hansard* and in the public press of the country, would go abroad and be read by people in foreign countries from which we are to draw our immigration. This is the place for every man to show his patriotism, and to express it freely. I desire, Sir, to say a few words on some observations of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming). He says that under the guise of patriotism we cloak up almost everything. Well, Sir, under the guise of what they call prevention of plunder, they oppose, in every conceivable way, the construction of this great railway. They pretend to say that the country is being plundered, though they have failed to show it, so that in that respect they are under a guise as much as we are; but there is a nobility in being under a guise of patriotism which is not to be found in the other. The whole of the hon. gentleman's argument went to show that the country is not running one iota of risk in making this loan, for he said the Company did not need the money, as they could realize sufficient from the lands and money grant to pay all expenses, &c. Now, Sir, if this latter statement be correct the country can run no risk, as every dollar so realized goes towards the payment of this loan of \$22,500,000; that is, if they get all the money they want from the sale of the lands within the two years he spoke about, every cent of the \$22,500,000 will have been repaid to this country. So that there can be no risk, and if the argument is good on one side it is certainly good on the other. The hon. gentleman says we might as well have given the money to a pauper company. All that statement needs is to be repeated in order that it may be contradicted. Sir, I say that the great enterprise that the Company has shown in the construction of the road has not been equalled by any company ever organized, since the early history of this or any other country of which we have any knowledge. Could a pauper company have gone into the markets of the world to the extent to which this Company has gone, and organized their affairs so as to have pushed that road as rapidly as they have pushed it? I think they have done wonders; they have done more and greater things in the construction of a railway than any other company or Government has ever done in the history of this world. I think that is a sufficient answer to the pauper company cry. The hon. gentleman who has just

spoken, went back to 1864, and spoke about the resolutions of the hon. George Brown with regard to Confederation. Well, Sir, I wish he had gone back to 1858, since he was relating the history of his party, for the further back he goes, the more inconsistency he will find. Let us stop for a moment at 1858. We find, that on the organization of that Government, in 1858, they betrayed and threw to the winds every profession they had ever made in public life. Was not "representation by population" posted on every tree and fence throughout this country, and yet, when the hon. George Brown formed that Cabinet, in 1858, he formed it with seven out of its thirteen Ministers opposed to the principle of representation by population. Consequently, they could not carry a Government measure, and forty-eight hours afterwards, because of their disregard of their former professions, they were quietly voted out of power. I think, Sir, the hon. gentleman might well have left out the previous history of the party to which he belongs. I would say with regard to this \$22,500,000, that if that sum of money was granted to the road as a bonus it is the duty of this Parliament, and of this country, to pay it. I say the interests of this country are so bound up with this great Canadian Pacific Railway and the North-West, that we cannot afford at the present time to either drop it or retard its progress. But in place of its being a bonus it is only a loan; and suppose the Company failed, and that the road should come back into the hands of this Government, how much worse off will the Government or the country be, than if they had built the road themselves. They will be better off, because they will have a road more cheaply constructed than any other road on this continent. Suppose it were given as a bonus; the total cost of the road would be only \$100,000,000, which would be equivalent to \$35,800 per mile. Now take the roads in Minnesota, which I think is a fair and just comparison to make, and we find that in 1880 there were 4,252 miles, including sidings, &c., in existence, costing \$235,251,147, or equal to \$55,300 per mile, as against \$35,800 for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Take next, Sir, the State of Kansas, about which we have heard so much, and we find that the average cost of the roads in that State, where they have no Rocky Mountains to cross, and no eastern section to build, is \$48,000 per mile. Indeed, if we take the whole of the western United States we will find that the average cost of their railways was \$46,700 per mile, whereas we would be getting this road at a cost of \$35,800 per mile, provided this sum was an actual bonus. But it is not, for it will be repaid, every cent of it, and we have absolute security, as I will endeavour to show before I conclude. Much has been said about the great North-West. It has been said to night, and very properly, by an hon. member who addressed the House on the Government side, that all we want there is the people. That is true, and we cannot get the people unless we build the railway. The history of colonization in the United States shows, if it shows anything, that railways must precede and go before either civilization or colonization. In this rapid age, when everybody is living rapidly, it is absolutely and positively necessary that railways should be built before you can get a population into a country. We find, Sir, in the State of Kansas—with its miasmatic fevers and the pestilence that follows, without a solitary drop of water that is fit to drink, without a solitary bit of material for the construction of buildings—in that State, which has, I am told, been lauded highly by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition in days gone by—in that State, where people have to live in dug-outs, the population has increased from 417,659 in 1870 to 1,080,000, in 1880. Take also the territory of Dakota, with a much inferior climate and soil to ours. All I need to do, to show its inferiority in these respects, is to point to the physical features of that country. The territory of Dakota is the water-shed of this continent.

The water runs northward and southward, and that watershed has been pouring its alluvial deposits into the valley of our Red River for centuries. Then, it is the great snow-belt of this continent. We have not half the quantity of snow that they have in Dakota; and it is colder than our country, because its altitude is greater. Yet, with all these drawbacks, the population of Dakota has increased from 14,181 in 1870, to no less than 135,137 in 1880. Why, it has almost multiplied its population by ten in the short period of ten years. Well, just apply these facts to our North-West Territories. Suppose that in ten years you will have 100,000 people there. It has been fairly estimated that each adult individual is worth \$1,000 to the country. Say that, out of that 100,000 people, you will have 25,000 who are adults, that population will bring us no less a sum than \$25,000,000, or, if you get 100,000 adults, they will enrich the country to the extent of \$100,000,000. So, I say, all that is necessary in order to make a country populous and prosperous, where you have so much land to cultivate, is to build railways. Now, the principle involved in this question is not the giving of aid to this railway at all. These people come here with good securities, and they ask for a loan of \$22,500,000. For what purpose? Not to enable them merely to fulfil their contract, but to enable them to do so within a period of five years instead of ten. Five years may not be a very long time, but in the history of an individual, or of a country, it is a very great deal; and if we should be as far ahead in 1885 as we should be in 1891, by granting \$22,500,000 as a bonus, the country would endorse such a step. Well, Sir, we possess a great advantage over the United States in peopling our North-West country. They had to bring their people from across the water. We have 55,000,000 to draw from on this side. I believe there will be a nice little immigration from the United States into that country within the next five or ten years. The hon. member for Queen's, New Brunswick, (Mr. Davies) said we do not want the road north of Lake Superior. I think it is one of the most important things in the construction of the railway to have that portion of it completed early, for several reasons. We could not, by the part water route he has talked about, move the harvests of the North-West until the following year, for the simple reason that the harvests are taken off in August, and would have to be marketed and taken to the lake shore for shipment in vessels before the close of navigation; and it would be utterly impossible to move that harvest each year out of the country by that amphibious route we have heard so much about. For five or six months in the year that route would be entirely useless to the people of the North-West. Besides, we all know that the people will not travel by a mixed route of that kind when they can go by an all-rail route. The present all-rail route to that country is through the United States. We have already heard so much of the danger of carrying immigrants through the United States, to our North-West, that it is needless for me to add anything further. We want to draw the trade of that North-West to our Eastern Provinces and to our Eastern ports? What has built up New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and all the other cities on the Atlantic Coast of the United States? Has it not been the trade of the great West? The population of these cities has been quadrupled in a short time. We want the trade of our North-West to build up Montreal and Quebec and Halifax and St. John, and to make flourishing cities of them.

An hon. MEMBER. And Louisburg.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know where that is, but I suppose it is down in the east somewhere. These large and populous and wealthy cities contribute largely to the wealth of the country. They are large consumers. They gather the wealth from foreign countries, and distribute it among our people, and the only way we can

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).

get them is by bringing our commerce down through our own territory, never letting it touch American soil, and delivering it to our own steamships, on our own coasts, in our own country. Hon. gentlemen say: Build the rail way as it is needed. Some say: Let it terminate at Winnipeg, and all that sort of thing. I will not reply to such statements, because they have no force, and do not deserve any contradiction at all. Hon. gentlemen talk about land monopolies and colonization companies in that country. Well, I suppose they are aware that all the Pacific Railway Companies in the United States—at least the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific—have sold their lands to colonization companies for the sake of securing them as immigration agents, and we find that the lands of these colonization companies are settled more quickly than they could be by Government immigration agents. That is easily to be understood. You appoint an immigration agent to act on behalf of the Government in a foreign country. He goes abroad, and feeling that he is appointed by a rich country, he takes his ease and has no interest beyond earning his money as easily as he can. But you get a colonization company, and the members of that company who have an interest in it go home, and they will get ten immigrants for the one that a Government agent would get. I would say build the road, complete it, and if it should fall into our hands, we would be no worse off than if we built it ourselves. On the contrary, we would be better off, because we would have a road more cheaply constructed than if we had undertaken to build it as a Government road. As far as security is concerned, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman this question: If the 21,000,000 acres of land which they are now offering to us, were given to the Company as good payment for \$21,000,000, why ought it not to be good security for a like amount of money now? In the land itself we have good security for the money we are loaning. I do not intend to further prolong this debate. I would only say, develop that North-West. I believe it is in the interest of the people of the older Provinces that it should be developed. It is in their interest that they should have in that country a consuming population for their manufactures and as contributors to the revenue of the country. If we get people in there, those people will develop that country and it will become filled with a hardy population, for it is well known that northern climes produce a better people, intellectually and physically, than do warmer and more genial ones. If you only bring in immigrants there, a people will be produced who will do credit and honour to this country. In conclusion, I believe that if the fetters and shackles of party were taken off the opponents of these resolutions, if they would look at this subject for one moment from the standpoint of patriotism, their objections would at once cease, but while it would be reasonable to expect this we can scarcely hope for it. Stamping ground for the next general elections must be prepared and it is now being prepared; for that object alone are they making their lengthy and laborious speeches. I would say this, that unless the opponents of these resolutions come out of their coverts and assume a more patriotic position, unless they can show some better means by which this road can be speedily constructed—I am not very familiar with the duties of an Opposition, but I conceive the duty of every hon. member of this House to be to further and advance legislation in the interest of the country to the best of his power and ability, and if hon. gentlemen on the opposite benches have any suggestion to make which is better in the interest of this country than those Resolutions, it is their duty to make them—until this is done, until something better than these Resolutions is presented, I deem it my duty to support the Resolutions before the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it would be no harm for us to take a brief view of the past history of the Canadian

Pacific Railway, and benefit, as much as possible, by the lessons therein to be found. In the first place, I consider that very great blunders have been committed in connection with the inception of this scheme. The Government of the day, at the outset, made a very great mistake, when they committed this country to the carrying out of such an enormous undertaking as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that within ten years. I claim, that, in the interest of the people, this was a very great mistake. The hon. Minister of Railways, in addressing the House upon this question, said, that when the American Pacific line was building, the world stood amazed at the idea of the people undertaking the construction of a road of such consequence and magnitude. In the case of Canada, also, he said, the world felt surprised to think that we had undertaken the construction of this great undertaking. No wonder they were surprised. I have no doubt that the idea of putting upon the people such an enormous cost, as will be entailed upon them by the construction of this road, and that without a survey, without any exploratory examination of the country through which it is to run, without any effort to see what the ultimate cost would be, without any information whatever, was an unjustifiable act on the part of the Government. After having done so, they began hunting around to see if they could get off their shoulders the responsibility which they had assumed. They tried to form a Syndicate, with Sir Hugh Allan as chief of that Syndicate, and in their anxiety to hold the position they now occupy and remain on the Treasury benches a little longer, they approached him in a manner that eventually resulted in their being obliged to leave office. That was the result of the attempt to form the first Syndicate. After they were driven from power, they admitted they were anxious to see the road completed, and there has been a great deal of talk here with regard to the want of patriotism on the part of the Reform party, because they were opposed to increasing the burdens of the people by the construction of that road. The Conservative party were very willing to aid the Reform party in carrying out this construction, simply because they had committed themselves to that policy, and they wished to get rid of the huge responsibility resting upon themselves. I hold that is the extent of their patriotism. Further, I consider that when they formed the last Syndicate and gave them all the powers they did, the powers they gave them were too great. I believe that they should have confined their powers absolutely to the construction of the road from Callander to Port Moody. I think it was an error, in the interest of the people of this country, that they should not only be permitted to construct the road, but that they should also be empowered to buy or lease or become possessed of, in any way they liked, any lines in this Dominion. I would have had no objection to give them power to build roads in any part of this Dominion, but it was and injustice to the people of the different Provinces when they were empowered to buy lines already built, and built for the purpose of securing to the people of those Provinces competition in railways, and by that power that competition has been very largely done away with. The company complain that, after they were formed, they found, when they entered the markets of Great Britain and other places, that they were met with a considerable amount of opposition. They complain that, through the influence of the American lines, they were prevented from placing their bonds on the market with the same advantage as perhaps they otherwise could have done. The Minister of Railways also, when he made his address, said they had opposition from within as well as from without. I believe that, and I do not wonder at it. If they had confined themselves strictly to the construction of the Pacific from Callander to Port Moody, it is not at all likely that they would have had the Grand Trunk Railway entering

into opposition to them; but, the moment they commenced buying up railways in the different Provinces and laying their hands upon these short lines, the Grand Trunk Railway, I presume in self-defence, found it was their duty to protect their own interest, and as a result of that, they commenced to secure for themselves what lines were important to them as feeders, if they had not done so they would probably have been taken up and run alone by the Canadian Pacific Railway. And then they come to the Government and to this House whining like a sick child saying: We have been unable to float our bonds; we have been unable to get, by the sale of stock, the money we anticipated; we have been unable to do everything which we thought we would be able to do. Why, Mr. Speaker, if there is any evidence of the folly which has attended the general transactions of this Company, it is the fact that they did not, it appears, count upon this opposition before they started. They must have thought that the people of the world who had money to invest would have run after them with their money wanting to buy their bonds, instead of their having to seek to get a sale for them. I consider that they are responsible to a large extent for the failure themselves—first, because they commenced to deal in railways. Why, there was a regular auction business in railways commenced after they started. Instead of keeping their funds together for the construction of the road, they were scattered in all directions up and down the country. When the Company was formed, were not the members of this House told, and was not the country told, that the Company was so wealthy and had such a large amount of money at its back that there was not danger that success would not attend its operations? Why was it that the other Company was rejected? Why was it that the Company, which offered to do the work for \$3,000,000 less, and 3,000,000 acres of land less, and to cut off all the monopoly clauses of the contract, was not taken? Was it not used as an argument that they had not the financial backbone to carry it through? And where is the financial backbone now? Where is the money now? We are called upon now to come and assist these people by granting them a loan of \$22,500,000, or rather \$30,000,000. I heard my hon. friend to my left say that, if it was a bonus instead of a loan, he would vote for it. I think it would be better to have it put that way, because I believe it will result in that way, and that, in the case of this road, as well as in the case of other roads in this Dominion, we will find, within a certain number of years, that it will be set behind bond after bond and mortgage after mortgage, and we will occupy the last joint in the tail of the Company's responsibilities, and that is the way our money will be represented. I was also surprised, when I listened to the address of the hon. the Minister of Railways, to hear him state that the Company had asked no change and the Government had asked no change. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Government did not ask a change in the terms upon which the contract was let. As I said before, in their earnest and anxious desire to accomplish what they had foolishly and imprudently undertaken—to accomplish what they had foolishly and imprudently committed this country to—they were willing to give any terms, they were willing to make any concession, they were willing to give any powers that the Company asked so long as they would build the Canadian Pacific Railway. They gave them the powers under which the people of the North-West now are groaning. They are calling meetings and declaring they must be relieved from the monopolies under which they are living, and I say, in the face of that, it looks very bad on the part of the Government of the day, knowing, as they do know, the feelings of those people and the representations which have been made, that they should not have used the opportunity they had of at least relieving them of some of the monopoly clauses under which they are

living. But they did not do that. It is just the same as before. Get the road built, no matter who suffers and who does not, so long as the road is built and we are relieved from the responsibility; that is all we expect and all we hope for. Now, I think the great question before this House is this: Is it prudent, under present circumstances, for this country, in its present straitened financial position, to grant this Company the loan of money they require? I think it is not. I think, when you take a view of the very rapid increase of the indebtedness of this country for the last ten or fifteen years, that any hon. gentleman who has the welfare and prosperity of this country at heart will come to the conclusion that it is wise, in the interests of the people in this country, that it is wise in the interests of the labouring classes and the tax-paying portion of the people of this Dominion, that we should very seriously consider this whole question before we put upon them an increased burden under which they will have to groan for many years. I do not think it is right that we should do it. The fact is, and I have been thinking somewhat since this discussion commenced and since this proposition has been brought down to Parliament, that it would be a very great advantage and a very great blessing in the interests of this country if the laws that permit the increase of indebtedness of this kind were subject to the same rules and the same restriction that our municipal laws are in the case of a municipality wanting to increase its debt. Those laws provide that, where it is increased beyond a certain amount which is necessary for the annual expenditure of the corporation, it must be submitted to a vote of the people. I would like most awfully well if the people of this Dominion had an opportunity on the present occasion of pronouncing on this gift, or loan as you may call it whether they are prepared to sanction the handing over of such a large amount of money to these people. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot claim that this question was brought before the electors at the last election. We never heard a word about it, and it is my conviction that, if it had been brought before the people, there are many men on the Treasury benches whose countenances would not be seen there to-night. The people would not have elected them, but would have elected men in opposition to granting this large amount of money and increasing the public debt so much by adding this to an already very large amount. Now, as has already been stated, the question before the House is not whether we are going to build the Canadian Pacific Railway or not. It is not whether the work will positively be stopped and the whole thing abandoned, but whether we are to permit the Company to have the full time for completing their work; whether we will allow them to take till 1891, if that is the year in which they are to finish, or give them this loan and help them to do it some three or four years before that time. Well, in the first place, as I have said, we made a mistake in making the time too short, and the result of that mistake was that we had to pay the people of British Columbia a large amount to get an extension of time. Sir, it will be increasing the debt of this country very seriously if we grant this loan, and it is the duty of the representatives of the people in this House carefully to consider whether it is wise for us to grant it or not. I think it is very much better that the Company should perform the work that we gave them to do, and that we should keep our money, because, from past experience, we know that all investments in railways have been unforunate investments, so far as repayment was concerned; and I do not think it is wise for us to make any more such investments. I notice, by the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways, and by others who have addressed the House, that very questionable speculations are made with the resources of that Company. The Minister of Railways entered into a calculation showing how many millions of acres it would take to grow so

Mr. McMULLEN.

many bushels of wheat, supposing it was not cut off with frost, supposing it was properly stacked, supposing it was sold, and supposing it was got to market; and in case of all these suppositions turning out correct, that the railway would reap a large annual profit in carrying that produce. Well, it is all very well to figure in that way. I hope and trust that the North-West is going to be a success, and contribute to the resources of this Dominion; I hope it will be every thing that we wish it to be. It has been said that we, on this side of the House are unpatriotic, that we decry the country, that we have done everything we could to injure it. I contend that is not so. I contend that the Reform party, and the Reform press, have done as much—yes, they have done more—in the interest of that country, that the Conservative party or press have done. I would like to know what journal in this country has called more loudly and more earnestly for the relief of the people of the North-West who are groaning under the heel of a monopoly, that the *Toronto Globe* has done. I would like the hon. gentlemen opposite to mention to me a single Conservative paper that has appealed to them in the interests of those people. I have not noticed any. I am sure they will not call that want of patriotism. Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the increase of debt in this Dominion by the operation of this loan. Now, I notice in looking over the Public Accounts that the debt of the Dominion has increased about \$32,000,000 within the last six years. If you add to that the increased amount that this loan will add to the public debt, you are going to augment it very seriously. We have a very large amount of money expended in railways already. The Intercolonial cost some \$38,000,000, out of which we did not receive one single cent toward the interest—it simply pays running expenses. Now, I say that if we can complete the road without making this advance; if the Company can go on and complete it as they ought to do, as they declared they would do, and as hon. gentlemen opposite declared they were able and willing to do, and gave them great privileges and subsidies in order to enable them to do it, why do not they go on and do it? I say they have no right, under present circumstances, to come back to the people of this country and ask the enormous aid they are now asking in the way of an additional grant. There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. There has been an estimate made with regard to the cost of what has yet to be done. That estimate has been handed to the hon. Minister of Railways, and he has told the House that an exact amount has been arrived at, representing what it is going to cost to complete the road. Now, so far as I can learn, the entire line is not absolutely located yet. The final surveys have not been made; the quantities have not been made up; the profile has not been made out. Now, until that is all done, it is impossible—and even when it is done, it is impossible—to tell the exact amount that road is going to cost until it is finished. And I hold that, even supposing the House and the country do make the advance that is now asked for, it is a very great question in my mind whether they will be able to go on and complete it with the amount they are asking, or whether they may not have to come back for more. They have shown such imprudence in the past, they have shown such recklessness in the past, that I question very much if they will be able to complete the road, even with the whole amount they are now asking. I know that they have got a considerable portion of it completed, but the worst portion and the hardest part of the road to build is yet to be done, and they may not have an adequate idea of what it will cost to complete the remaining portion. They do not know yet what it is going to cost. They have just reached the portion of the work that is going to be the most costly, and when they get there they may find after all that their calculations are at fault. I have had a little

experience myself of that kind, and there are no men in the world who will differ more with regard to the extent and actual cost of construction of a road, than engineers themselves. You cannot get two engineers on a piece of work who will make an estimate and return to you and tell you exactly the same amount, nor anything near it. They will all make different estimates. The estimates of the work remaining to be done on the Canadian Pacific Railway is only an approximate one, and the result may be that after they have invested the money that they are getting from us, it will not be found sufficient. The hon. Minister of Railways has said that the money to be voted is only to be paid *pro rata* as the work proceeds. Sir, I would like to know how he is going to apply the money in his calculation so exactly, as to say what sum of money is to be given to the Company for a certain piece of work. It is well known that engineers, as a general rule, will favour contractors, and unless he puts on a staff of engineers at the cost of this country, who will carefully and closely scrutinize the cost of every single foot of work that is done, I question very much if he will not find himself, after the lapse of a short time, in a very bad position. He will find that he has been imposed upon, and that this Company, by the certificates of their engineers, has taken money that they were not entitled to. What will he do in that case? I say, then, that the proposition he has presented to the House for paying the money. If he follows it out strictly is going to entail a large expense to the country, because it will be necessary for him to get a staff of engineers in order to see that it is properly applied. There was another thing he did in connection with this matter. He sent two of his men down to Montreal, apparently for the purpose of inspecting the books of the Company. Now, when he went so far in the way of testing the accuracy of the accounts of that Company, I think it would have been highly desirable, highly necessary, that he should have procured two sworn valuers to make a valuation of the entire plant and rolling stock that the Company claimed to have. They say that their stock west of Callander is worth \$6,100,000. I would like to see the entire rolling stock west of Callander valued; I would like to see two men, experienced men, who know the value of work, go along the road and make a sworn return to the Government of this country. I venture to predict that if they did, they would find that the money the Company have secured from the Government from the sale of the lands, and from the stock they have sold, has never been invested in the work west of Callander. I would like to see that done, and I think it is but right. It is but justice to the representatives of the people here that that should be done. I am sorry to think that we have to proceed so rapidly in the dark; that we are to vote these resolutions in the dark. The hon. leader of the Opposition has asked for several returns for the purpose of getting at the bottom of this whole transaction, and I have no doubt that the Government are doing their best to prepare those returns, and get them laid before the House. But after all, I think the Government ought to have consented at least to the suggestion of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) to wait until next Tuesday before rushing through these resolutions, to wait until these returns could be presented, as they could by that time, and at least meet the Opposition that far, in order to give what information they could furnish; but it appears they have proceeded with the determination that information would not be given—that we must take things as we find them. They proceeded on the ground that the majority is all-powerful, that they are bound to cram this proposal down the throats of the people without affording the information sought in a courteous way by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Montreal Centre has expressed regret at the absence of the leader of

the Opposition. He had evidently a severe castigation in store for the hon. gentleman. I do not know where the hon. gentleman is—I do not speak for him—but knowing that on the last occasion when the subject was before the House, the hon. member for Montreal Centre moved the adjournment of the Debate, and fearing least he should receive a drubbing, he in all probability, thought the best thing to do was to clear out. It is desirable to look at the amount of lands that must be sold by the Company to enable it to pay the interest on the loan. I hope the North-West country will be filled, and that very rapidly, by an industrious population. The hon. Minister of Railways has intimated that during the last three years 149,000 people have settled in that country, and I hope that number will be rapidly increased. In the interests of a tax-paying people of the Dominion as well as of the North-West, such a result is highly desirable. At the same time we must not forget that the only sources from which the Company will be able to pay interest will be the sale of land and the receipts from the operation of the road. The Company will require, in order to pay interest on the loan, to sell a tract of land about 300 miles long and 18 miles deep on each side of the track, each year. There are only sixteen sections in each township which belong to the Company, the balance belonging to the Government and the Hudson Bay Company. In order to pay interest, the Company will have to sell about 300 townships, and have an influx of about 26,000 actual farmers, who shall take up land, each year. I shall be glad if the Company are able to sell that quantity; at the same time, I shall not be surprised, notwithstanding the glowing accounts we have heard of the future prospects and resources of the Company, if they fail to meet the first year's interest, and we have the sorry exhibition next year of the Minister of Railways being obliged to report that the interest on the advance made to the country had not been met. I hope it may be otherwise; but that is just the way the trouble may commence. Some hon. members have said that if we get the road even on these amended terms, we shall have obtained it cheap enough. I do not want the country to get the road. I do not think it is in the interest of the country to have the road, but that it is better for the country for the Company to own it; but we should throw every possible protection round the grant of money made to it. I have very grave doubts indeed as to whether the taxpayers will ever see returned a farthing of the money advanced. The farming community have contributed every largely towards the construction of railways through the country, and I hold it is unfair and unjust that they should be subjected to increased taxation year after year in order to pay the indebtedness. Will any one pretend to say that our farmers are benefitted by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway? The farming community of Ontario and Quebec are not benefitted, but they will be injured. We shall have the same experience as the United States. Before railways were built into Kansas and the North-West, land in Illinois was worth more than it is to day. The same will take place here. When the farmers of the North-West grow wheat extensively and possess abundant facilities for carrying it to the markets of the world, the farmers in the old Provinces will be compelled to accept lower prices for their products, because of that enormous North-West yield. I was quite amused by the remarks of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) with respect to the leader of the present Government having been the originator and great champion of Confederation. That hon. member evidently reads with one eye shut and the other open; he searches the *Hansard* of the House and the newspapers of the country, with a desire to obtain something that might possibly reflect on the Reform party, while he

closes his eyes to anything that might reflect on his party, and particularly on his chief. If the hon. gentleman had read the entire proceedings connected with Confederation, he would have found that if there was one man occupying a prominent position in the country who opposed that measure, it was the leader of the present Government. It is unfair to bestow laurels on a man who is not entitled to wear them. The hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government had, of course, a perfect right to the opinions he then held; but the claim should not now be put forward that he was the originator of Confederation. The question of security was also mentioned, but we have not gone into the question of challenging the security, and I do not know where the hon. gentleman has got his information on that point. I have not heard anything on this side of the House upon that point; the whole question has been as to whether it is in the interest of the country that we should go on and make this grant, or whether we should withhold our hand. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down made a reference, as in fact everyone else on that side has made, to the want of patriotism on the part of the Reform party. He went back a considerable length of time, and tried to show that it has been a characteristic of the Reform party to be unpatriotic. Well it is dangerous to go too far back, and if the hon. gentleman had gone a little further back he would have found something which would have reflected on his own party. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who was it who burnt the Parliament Buildings in Montreal? Who was it stoned the Governor General? Who was it raised the black flag at Brockville? Who was it signed the manifesto? I do not think it was the Reform party. I was rather amused at the address delivered by the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth). He entered into a general fit of political kicking, which brought to my mind a story I once saw in a book by Mark Twain. The author went on in a humorous way to speak of the characteristics of the mule, and he said that while the head and the front of the animal displayed all the evidence of docility and good temper, there seemed to be an untamed wildness about his hind legs, which could not be accounted for, and which exhibited itself when it was least expected. I have not very much to say with regard to the speech of the hon. member for King's, but I think on some occasions he exhibits an awful amount of political wildness—he is not evenly turned. I remember that last year he got into a fit of anger, and he directed his venom against the leader of the Opposition in the first place, and afterwards against the hon. member for West Middlesex, who, I regret to say, is not now a member of this House, but whose constituency is worthily represented by a gentleman of the same political stripe. This Session the hon. member for King's delivered an address in which he exhibited an equal amount of political kicking. I think it is better that we should discuss those questions, which are of interest to the House and to the country; we should discuss them from the point of view of the country's interests, and we should not lend ourselves to discussions of another kind, because if hon. gentlemen indulge in them, they must expect that there will be a retort. I had a number of figures with regard to calculations in connection with this matter, but they have so fully gone into by other hon. members that I need not trouble the House by repeating them. I think the whole question dwindles down to this point, whether it is wise, or right, or judicious, for us to go on and make this advance. In my opinion, we are laying the foundation of what I hope will be a great nation; but I am much afraid that, owing to the reckless manner in which we are adding to the burdens of the people, in place of receiving thanks at the hands of those who are to follow us, in this hall, they will point to the acts of the men who have been the means of increasing the burdens of the people, with feelings of

Mr. McMULLEN.

disgust and contempt, on account of the enormous debt with which they will be called upon to labour and upon which they will have to pay annually a large amount of taxes. I say we should be careful—we should weigh quietly, carefully, and honestly, every proposition of this kind. We talk to-day as easily about millions as we used to talk a few years ago about thousands. I say there is no necessity of adding this to the other burdens with which the people have to labour. Let the Canadian Pacific Railway Company take the full time to construct the road; let them build it at the time they agreed to build it, and it will answer all ends so far as the interests of the country are concerned, and the people will not run the risk of losing \$22,500,000, which they will undoubtedly run the risk of losing, if these resolutions are adopted in their present state.

Mr. STAIRS. I wish to make a few observations upon some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I will endeavour to show how absurd and ridiculous many of his statements were. The hon. gentleman said that the Opposition had not challenged the security. In saying this the hon. member gave up the whole case entirely, as the whole question rests nearly altogether upon the consideration of whether the country has sufficient security for the loan we are about to make. The hon. gentleman dwelt upon the question of the large tract of land which the Company would have to sell yearly, in order to pay the interest, and he seemed to be afraid that they would not be able to accomplish it. I think on this point the hon. gentleman was answered by the hon. member for Peel, who endeavoured to show very clearly the large resources which the Company would have at their disposal during the next few years, in the sales of land and in the earnings of the Company themselves—showing us that there was ample—we can take their own words for it—in these resources to meet the interest. Besides, I think it is not amiss to point out that the interest this Company have in this great railroad, extending about 3,000 miles, is so great that this House need have very little fear but that the interest will be promptly met. I could not help feeling a little amused, Sir, at the point made by the hon. gentleman about his now leader. The hon. leader of the Opposition was afraid that the speech of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) would come on this afternoon, and on that account he cleared out. Sir, if report be correct, it would not be the first time that the hon. leader of the Opposition cleared out when he should have come to the scratch in debate or at public meetings. The hon. gentleman doubted whether the Company would be able to complete the railway with the sum they ask, \$27,500,000. Like many others of his remarks, this was mere assertion, nothing else. I think the House will be perfectly safe in taking the statement of engineers. Who are better able to judge than the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The hon. gentleman spoke of the general question of increasing the debt. For my part, I am willing to leave that matter in the hands of the hon. gentlemen who compose this Government, in whose hands I prefer to leave it than to some of the gentlemen I see on the other side of the House; and I think I may say it is absolutely certain that it will be so for many years to come. The hon. gentleman doubted whether it was wise to have the road completed before 1891. I think every man in Canada who takes a fair and impartial view of this question, will come to the conclusion that it is absolutely necessary in the interest of Canada that the road should be completed in the two years, as is now proposed. One very absurd remark the hon. member made, although it did not relate exactly to this case. He said he considered that any increase in the debt, beyond a certain fixed amount, should be submitted to a direct vote of the people. Did any hon. member ever hear a more

absurd and ridiculous statement? Does anyone suppose that the ordinary voters in the constituencies could clearly and fully comprehend a question of this kind? The hon. gentleman complains, like many other hon. members, that the funds of this Company have been used in all directions. I believe that the Pacific Railway Company have used these funds in the interest of Canada, and I say this, not only as a Canadian, but as a representative of the Maritime Provinces. Many of the hon. gentleman's observations relating to the old contract, I think, have been fully answered. I do not think there is any use of bringing these old issues before the House, when they were settled, in 1882, by the triumphant majority by which this Government was supported. The hon. gentleman said that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in their opposition to the Canadian Pacific Railway, will be obliged to protect their own interests. "There is no man in Canada, business or otherwise, who would object to the Grand Trunk protecting their interests, but they should do it by fair means; and I maintain that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have as good a right to protect their interests as the Grand Trunk. Now, I should like for a little while to refer to some of the speeches made in the earlier part of this debate. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in speaking on the question of monopoly, claimed that one advantage a Government railway possessed over a railway owned by a company was, that on a Government railway there could be no monopoly. I will just read his own words :

"As long as it is a Government railway it is the people's railway, and the people cannot have a monopoly in its own concern—not an offensive or objectionable monopoly—because the interest to be served is that of the commonalty that possesses the railway. Does any one suppose that rates too high for the good of a country could be charged by a Government having a railway?"

In answer to that, I think it is only necessary to point to the management of the Intercolonial Railway in 1874, I think, under the management of Mr. Mackenzie. And to show that the Tariff which they inaugurated on what they called commercial principles was really seriously felt in the Lower Provinces, I will, with the permission of the House, just read a short extract from a discussion of the Halifax Chamber of Commerce on the 8th of December, 1874. At that meeting it was resolved :

"That the Tariff lately established on the Intercolonial Railway is detrimental to the best interests of the Province, and that the Dominion Government be respectfully addressed and requested to reconsider the Tariff and reestablish that formerly in force."

On motion, the resolution was referred to the Standing Committee on Railways and Internal Trade, to report on to a meeting to be held on the 8th of January, 1875. I will give you a short extract from the report :

"The Committee on Internal Trade, Railways, etc., beg leave to report that they have given their careful attention to the Tariff now in force on the Intercolonial Railway in this Province, and after comparing the rates with those charged on other lines, and taking evidence from men of intelligence, directly and indirectly interested in the traffic at various points between Amherst and the city, find the sudden and large increase in charge for transit in leading items, not only greatly injurious to the trade in that part of the Province; but will effectually put a stop to several promising fields of enterprise."

And it goes on to particularize as to what industries would be affected. We know that that tariff was modified; but it was not put back to what it was previously, and the ill effects of that increased tariff were felt in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for many years. It was not until the advent of the present Government, and until the present Minister of Railways took charge of the Railway Department, that the tariff was put back to what it ought to be. I think this conclusively proves that it is quite possible, on a Government railway, to have a tariff of a very objectionable nature indeed. The only excuse the Government gave for that increase in the tariff was that they wanted to run the Intercolonial Railway on commercial principles, and I presume they did it also to make the two ends meet.

Every one in this House knows how far they came short of it. Every hon. member knows, that under the management of the present Government, the hon. Minister of Railways, even with the very large reduction in the tariff, has been able to make the two ends meet, a thing that was never accomplished under the objectionable tariff enforced by the late Government from 1874 to 1878. I was very much surprised in listening to the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, in reply to the hon. Minister of Railways, to hear a quotation which he put in the mouth of the latter, and I very much regret the hon. leader of the Opposition is not here, that his attention might be directed to it. With reference to the disallowance of the Manitoba charters, the hon. Minister of Railways said :

"When the line is constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve—that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, connecting it with American railways to the south."

This is the language he puts in the hon. Minister's mouth :

"That as soon as the railway is actually built, they will be able to review the question of reconsidering the policy, and they really think they will be able to stop oppressing Manitoba and violating the constitution at some period two or three years hence."

I mentioned this, because it struck me at the time that it was impossible the hon. Minister of Railways would ever, for a moment, acknowledge that the Government had been violating the Constitution, by the disallowance of the Manitoba charters. This may seem to be a point of very little consequence, because every hon. member who heard the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways, or read it, knows very well that he would not admit that the constitution was violated. But how is it through the country? There are many people, friends of the Opposition, who will read the speech of their leader and will not see that of the hon. Minister of Railways. No one will suppose that the hon. leader of the Opposition would misquote anyone, and when he attributes language to the hon. Minister of Railways, admitting that the disallowance of the Manitoba charters was a violation of the Constitution anyone would, unless he read the other side, naturally suppose that such an admission had been made. If this had come from a stump speaker, or some one not thoroughly posted, no attention would be paid to it; but coming from the leader of the Opposition, I cannot refrain from pointing it out as a most unfair and objectionable statement of the case. I could not at first account for it, but on looking over the debates since, I find an explanation made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition himself, which I think explains the reason of this misquotation. He said, speaking of the hon. Minister of Railways :

"I have told the hon. gentleman before, that my idea of party exigencies and party leadership entirely differ from his."

Every hon. gentleman in this House will conclude that the hon. gentleman's ideas of party exigencies differ very much indeed, from those of the hon. Minister of Railways, and from what is right and fair. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., asked how it was that if the North America Construction Company abandoned their contract of \$48,000,000, that same contract can now be completed at \$17,000,000 less? Did not the hon. gentleman know very well that the contract of \$48,000,000 was composed, to a very large amount, of the stock of the Company. Did he not know that the contract was for a large amount, because the Canadian Pacific Railway knew that it was impossible for the North America Construction Company to put the stock on the market at anything but a very small price? And they could not even do that. It was impossible for them to sell at all, and the contract had to be cancelled. I think that the way in which the country and the world looked at those utterances of the leader of the Opposition was such that they had no effect in hurting the credit of the Government, because those interested in Canadian

politics knew, to a large extent, that the utterances of the hon leader of the Opposition during the debate upon the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, were very largely made up for party and political purposes and they were consequently not taken as being the true expression of what he thought. But the same cannot be said of many of his utterances since, for they have had a great deal of effect in damaging the Company. I was a little amused at some of the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton, who gave us a long speech composed of many figures. After giving the House a large array of figures, he tells us in effect that the figures are beyond his comprehension. What can you think of any hon. gentleman who attempts to criticise a financial statement and in the middle of his speech admits he does not know what he is talking about? He made a great mistake in making this admission. Even if he could not comprehend it, he would have taken a wiser course had he kept his ignorance to himself. He divides this \$22,500,000 among all the members, and says that it is \$106,000 to every constituency. I would like to know what this has to do with the question before the House. This question is one of the most important that has ever come before this House, and to my mind the great point is whether the granting of this loan to the Company for about four years, in the construction of the railway, is going to be in the interests of Canada. I think anyone can argue here to the fullest extent that it is altogether in the interest of the whole Dominion, and consequently in that of the Eastern Provinces. I think, Sir, one of the reasons is that, if we have the railway constructed in 1886 instead of in 1891, the Government of Canada will be enabled, on account of the increased immigration which will take place through this early construction of the road, to sell so much more of their own land than they would otherwise be; that they will be able to repay the Company, to repay the people, to repay themselves, even if the Company were to make default, which I hold is impossible, the \$22,500,000 which their loan now proposes to give them; and they will, therefore, be financially in just as good a position in 1891 as they would have been had they allowed the contract to go on and had not loaned this money. I think this is a very important point indeed, and I will just quote a few figures to show the sales of land that have taken place during the last two or three years, and I can get them in a very short time from the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways:

"From the 1st of July, 1879, to the 31st December, 1883, we received \$3,572,636, and there is due during the next three years on the exemptions, since 1880, in addition to the \$3,572,836, received since the 1st of July, 1880, no less than \$4,393,070."

Now, that shows us the land sales in about three years to amount to about \$8,000,000, and we may expect, with the increased immigration going into that country, that by 1891, on account of the early completion of this road, we will be able to sell as much more as will recoup the country for the \$22,500,000 which is to be loaned, and, therefore, if we never got that money back, we would be in just as good a position as if we were to go on in the slow way which was originally proposed. In the Maritime Provinces, as well as in other parts of the country, we want the construction of this railway, and one reason among other things—and I am only attempting to mention a very few—is that we want the freight facilities. I know that there are great complaints, and that the sugar refineries and the iron works now find a great difficulty in sending goods out to the far West, because, when they go to Montreal, cheaply as they are transported over the Intercolonial Railway, they have not a through connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but are at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Railway; and I know, as a matter of fact, that we had to pay a much higher rate of freight upon goods from Nova Scotia to the North-West, from Montreal, on the Grand Trunk Rail-

Mr. STAIRS.

way, than we would have had to pay if we could have sent them over the Canadian Pacific Railway. But we could not, because there was not a suitable connection at Montreal, and they would have had to be hauled. I could not sit down without making some reference to the winter port. I think I may be allowed to urge the securing of a winter port in Canada as one reason why the road should be completed in 1886 instead of in 1891. If we allow the completion of that road to hang fire till 1891, where is the winter port for the Maritime Provinces to be till that time? Whereas, if it is completed as quickly as possible, we will have a very good chance—we have now, I feel sure—that we will secure, before the completion of the road in 1891, such through facilities from Montreal to some port or ports in the Maritime Provinces as will make one of those ports a winter port for the whole Dominion. I feel sure, and I think the Government will agree with me in this, that the people of the Lower Provinces have a right to ask this. Before I sit down, I would just like to say to the hon. gentlemen opposite that, if, when we go back to our constituents in the course of the next three or four years, we have to defend this measure, we intend to give them—I intend to give them in the Lower Provinces—as one of the principal reasons why this loan was necessary, the damage that is done to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the country generally by the unpatriotic utterances of the Opposition in this House and the Opposition press throughout the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, the first Pacific Railway Bill was passed in the House the Session before I had the honour of a seat here, and I think you will agree with me that, from that time until the present, we have had a great deal of discussion upon this very important subject. The Pacific Railway has called forth the noblest Parliamentary efforts of any subject that has been before Parliament since I have had the honour of a seat in the House. We have had it discussed over and over again. We have had it discussed under different phases, and under different aspects, and under different circumstances. The result of the discussion over the first Bill and the companies that were formed under that Bill is quite fresh in your mind, as it is fresh in mine. You will remember the consequences and the results of the negotiations that took place in reference to that Bill. You will remember also that, in 1874, another Pacific Railway Bill was introduced and carried through this House. You will remember the provisions of that Bill, as will also the gentlemen who were members of the House then, and are still members of the House; and you will remember that one of the provisions of the Bill, in reference to the land that the Government handed over to the parties who might construct the road, was that the Government should have a control in the price of the lands. That was considered one of the most vital principles of the Bill. It was considered a principle that was likely to secure the settlement and development of the great country we have in the North-West. Everything said in reference to the North-West by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and by gentlemen on that side of the House, in reference to the great future and the great prospects of that magnificent North-West Territory of ours, I echo to the full. I believe there is a great future for that country. I believe that, under wise rule, under prudent management, under proper land regulations, under proper railway regulations, there is a future for that country of which we, as Canadians, may all feel proud. Then let us, I say, Mr. Speaker, do nothing—let no act of ours do anything—that will imperil the great future of that country, or retard its settlement, or prevent the rapid and speedy development of that country about which we are all so anxious. I do not know why it is that hon. gentlemen will get up in this House, that one side will get up and charge

the other with lack of patriotism. I believe—I fully believe—that in this country there is no party that can claim a monopoly in that principle. I believe that all parties are true to the Queen, true to the Constitution, and that all sincerely desire the advancement and the development, welfare, and future of this country. I say that sincerely. I believe that sincerely. But we differ as to the mode in which the best interests of this country are to be secured. But, we hold ourselves second to no party in this country in our allegiance to the Queen, to the British Government, and to British connection. We are as devoted to the flag that floats over us as are any party to be found; although we do not parade our loyalty, we do not boast of our patriotism on every platform and on every stump. That is not the stock in trade of the party to which I have the honour to belong, and with whom I have been allied ever since I entered political life. Well, after this digression, I would take you back to the Pacific Railway Bill. One of the features of that Bill, as I said, was the public control of the land. If the land is beyond the control of the Government of the day, if it is allowed to be handed over to a Company to sell it at whatever price they please, I say that is calculated to establish in the North-West a system of landlordism such as they have in Ireland, such as disturbs the peace, and mars the tranquility, and happiness and prosperity of Ireland, and has done so for centuries. It is against that principle we have contended. Well, Mr. Speaker, some progress was made under the Act. A railway was constructed from Pembina to Winnipeg; exhaustive surveys of the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway were made by the Government that was led by the hon. and distinguished member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He entered upon the Government of this country under circumstances surrounded with the greatest and gravest difficulties. He entered upon the Government of this country when the past six years had seen an increase in the expenditure of about ten millions a year more than it was at the time of Confederation. The rapid increase of expenditure, the rapid increase of the national debt, had brought about a corresponding depression through the Dominion of Canada. He entered upon the Government of this country under the most unfavourable circumstances. It was a fortunate thing for the country, I say, that a gentleman so distinguished for his patriotism and for his qualities of economy and retrenchment, held the reins of power at that time. He held extravagance in check, he governed and conducted the country on the principles of economy and retrenchment, and he tided the nation through the gravest financial panic any country ever had to pass through, and with the least disastrous consequences to the State. Well, much was done in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway during his régime. Like a man of business, he entered upon the work by obtaining information, upon which he might be able to locate the road, and construct it in an intelligent manner. Having obtained the fullest information, he then proceeded to construct the road, or that portion of it which would most tend to develop and increase the prosperity of Manitoba and the North-West. Sir, it would have been well for the North-West, it would have been well for the Dominion of Canada, had the Bill that he brought forward, and had the views he held, prevailed in the Government of the country and in the building of this railway in the North-West. If the provisions of that Bill had been carried out, and if his policy had been carried out, Winnipeg to-day would have been a second Chicago in the Prairie Province; instead of Manitoba being so sparsely settled, instead of the North West having only a thin line of settlement, we would have seen that country thickly settled and well developed. But, under the present system, under the contract that was made with the Company by the present Government, the hon. Minister of Railways asked this House to grant 25,000,000 acres of

land in that Province, and to give \$25,000,000. We all remember the feeling that existed in this House and in the country at that time. People thought the undertaking was a great one, they thought, as the Minister of Railways expressed it, that it was a bold enterprise and one that would tax the ability and resources of the taxpayers of the country for many generations to come. The House accepted that contract, and why? The Minister of Railways, the First Minister and the supporters of the Government in the House, stated that the arrangement would secure the full and final completion of the railway to the North-West. The hopes of the country were raised, because, as the Minister of Railways then said, this was going to be a final and complete settlement of this question, that the people would never have to contribute another cent towards this line, or to assist this Company in any way. It is well known that another company offered to take the contract at a lower rate, but the Minister of Railways and his friends stated that this company was but a bogus one—that a company composed of men such as the Gurneys, the Gilmours, the Gooderhams, the Worts, and other distinguished men in this country, were but bogus men—although they were men who could buy out the Syndicate, root and branch. Yet the Minister of Railways and others taunted these gentlemen with being unsubstantial, with being men not representing capital sufficient to enter upon that great enterprise, and they said to the House and to the country: Why, a syndicate composed of men such as these to whom we propose to give the contract, are able to build the road themselves without any money from the exchequer of this country at all. Well, Mr. Speaker, what has been the policy of this Syndicate in constructing the road since they got it? In the first place, they sub-let the contract to an American firm. Under the policy of the Minister of Railways and the First Minister, Canada was to be for the Canadians. This was the boast of the National Policy, that it was to give Canada to the Canadians. Well, they let this contract to American contractors. I have not a word to say against the enterprise or ability of American contractors. They are enterprising. Well, they let it, and they did so in defiance of an important plank in the platform of the National Policy. It was a violation of their promise. They let this contract to American contractors, and what did they do? Sir, they employed American labour on it. They obtained our money for the construction of this great national undertaking, and we were told it should be constructed by the people of Canada. Is this the patriotism they are flaunting in our face? Is this the patriotism of which they are boasting to us every day—to let our national highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific to Yankee contractors, to be built by Yankee workmen! And after they get our money they deliberately go over into Dakota and Montana, and take up land, because the land regulations are more favourable to the settler there. Now, if this road had been built slowly, if it had been let to Canadian contractors, we would have had less reason to complain. I say, knowing full well what I am talking about, that in the construction of a great national enterprise the nation's sons should be engaged in it. I believe that sentiment will find an echo in the bosom of every patriotic man. It may not, perhaps, find echo in the breasts of those gentlemen who get up on every occasion and prate of their loyalty, and their patriotism, and all that sort of thing. But, I say that a national undertaking, begun by a great nation, and off-shoot of the British Empire, ought to have been completed with Canadian money and with Canadian labour. A little while ago what did we find? We found that in that work, most of the men employed were Americans and they left the country taking their money with them. If a different policy had been pursued, if the road, speaking in all candor and fairness, had been built more steadily, if the progress had been substantial, it would have allowed

our own sons from Ontario and Quebec and the Maritime Provinces to have had a share in constructing that great national undertaking. They would have sought out lands and settled on them. But the position is changed. The Americans brought in their men, also Swedes, and some of my friends from British Columbia say they brought in also Chinese. The consequence of this action was that Canadians were excluded. Let it be remembered that the contract was let to an American firm, which naturally employed Americans; that the General Manager of the road is an American, that the Chief Engineer is an American, that one of the directors of the Syndicate is an American—no doubt many of those now interested are Americans—and I should not wonder if, instead of the winter port being at Halifax, they found a winter port in the United States. The Government allow this great national enterprise—and no one glories over it more than I do, or is more anxious that the road should be constructed on economical and proper principles—to be built by Americans; but I want it to be constructed by Canadians, and I want them to take an interest in it, because it is a national undertaking. I hope the fallacy has been abandoned that this is not our own money which we are expending, but that it is money collected from the Americans. It is money collected from Canadians by the tariff which this Government has imposed. It is the money of our people which the Government, by these Resolutions, are asking us to hand over to the Company; it is the money of the farmers and all other classes which is being asked to be handed over for the building of the great national highway. It is important to consider what the effect will be on our people. We are told by the Minister of Railways that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are quite capable of building the road, and do not need this money, but it is necessary to give them \$30,000,000, or an equivalent, in order to have the road completed within two years. What will be the amount of settlement in that country if there is a delay of five years? The whole territory from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains will be thickly settled by that time. If it is built rapidly, the country will be but sparsely settled. This is the experience of every new country. If there was delay, settlement would rush out from Winnipeg, Brandon, Calgary and other places, and the country would become thickly and well settled. Adopting the other course, and handing over \$30,000,000 to the Company, settlement and prosperity will be alike retarded. The land regulations of which we have heard so much are also calculated to prevent settlement. I regret that those regulations are such as they are. During the past two years, a great many people from my county have gone to the North-West with the object of settling there. They searched through Manitoba and the North-West in order to find lands on which they might settle. Whenever they found an eligible location it proved to be owned by some company or speculator. I can tell the Minister the names of a good many farmers who searched through the North-West for a month, and being unable to find a suitable location went and settled in Dakota, and these were persons with large families. It was almost equal to taking your life in your hand to say anything against the First Minister to those people, but when they returned their tone had changed. It is sad to contemplate that so many of our people are leaving the country and settling in the United States. I should think it would make the hearts of hon. gentlemen opposite, who spoke so much of patriotism, bleed, to know that so many people were leaving. The Minister of Public Works has, it appears, a grand scheme for bringing back to this country those who have settled across the line. I wish success to his efforts and promise him, as an independent member, every assistance in carrying out his proposition. We have had a good deal of experience in Ontario with respect to railways, which have been largely aided. I have here a return

Mr. LANDERKIN.

brought down to the House which shows what has been contributed by the section from which I have the honour to come. The branches we have form a great national scheme, commenced in 1852—I mean the Grand Trunk. A Bill was introduced by Sir Francis Hincks, then Premier, and a good Reformer, in connection with the scheme, although it is claimed that this was a Conservative movement. \$15,000,000 were contributed by this country to the Grand Trunk, which owns 2,500 miles of road. Hon. members will recollect what a cry was raised on that account. What has been the result? The road built up the country very materially. In the early history of the Grand Trunk it was no doubt mismanaged, and I am glad to know that the *Globe* condemned that mismanagement, as it is ready to condemn mismanagement wherever it finds it. That is the policy of the Reform press of this country; no matter where wrongdoing exists that journal is ready and willing to condemn it. But the management of the Grand Trunk changed; the road became better managed, and there was nobody then readier than the *Globe* to congratulate them on the improvement in their management, and the *Globe* did so. That road was built and it tended to advance the prosperity of this country. But what was the condition of things before it was built? The country was thickly settled; industries sprang up; villages sprang up, and in course of time became towns; towns became cities, cities, all the way from Montreal to Windsor. It was found necessary to have feeders to this railway and to the Great Western. The first one was built, I think, in 1869. I refer to the Wellington, Grey and Bruce. We granted to that road a very large bonus. The municipalities along the line, in the Counties of Bruce and Wellington, granted \$682,000 to that railway. The country was well settled. It had been settled in 1850 and before—settled perhaps about thirty years. The road was found to be a great convenience, and after it was built a great many enterprises sprang up. It gave an impetus to farming, and to all the other industries. It was almost as good as the National Policy—perhaps a little better; but the consequence was, that it was found necessary to have a competing line. Then the Toronto, Grey and Bruce was built, and the people contributed, for the building of that road, \$929,000. That was also a great boon for that country; it tended to build up and develop the country. Nearly the whole country was settled by this time, and these railways went on. But it was found that one road was controlled by the Great Western; the other was an independent line. The people saw the necessity of building another line, to enter into competition with both, and the consequence was that the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron road was constructed; the people took an interest in that. They gave, of their own money, \$969,000 to build that road. It was supposed that that was going to pay them by way of competition, lower freights, &c. What was the result? It soon ceased to be an independent line; it became owned and controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway. We had very much advantage from that road entering into competition with the Great Western. In a short time we found that the people who had given, in one case over \$500,000, in another case nearly \$1,000,000, in the third case nearly \$1,000,000, to these roads, were still baffled. A fusion took place between the Grand Trunk and the Western, under the Government of the distinguished gentleman who presides over the destinies of the country at the present time. I believe that if the Government had stood firm, they could have prevented this amalgamation; but the consequence is that now we have the two roads run by the same Company, and although the money they gave may have been usefully spent they cannot get the return for it which they would have got if the Government had interfered in the interests of the people who had done so much to build up that country. One of the townships in

the riding from which I come, has given \$80,000; another, \$65,000; another, \$60,000; another, \$20,000; and the town has given \$32,000. These are very large bonuses, but they were nothing to the bonuses which the hon. gentleman is putting on these townships by these resolutions. I ask him to take \$30,000,000, divide it among the 211 members who compose this House, and it will give \$150,000 to each riding. I would ask the First Minister, with all the eloquence and the power and ability he has—and he possesses all these qualities in a very high degree—I ask him to submit a by-law to each riding for \$150,000, and let him go there with all his force and ability, and I will guarantee that, in my riding at least, he will not carry the by-law. I feel convinced from what I know of the people, that it would be an impossible thing to carry a by-law for any amount no matter how small. This is what the Minister of Railways is paying, and what for? Just to build the Canadian Pacific Railway two years sooner. During all that time, as I have said, the settlers were living in Western Ontario, in what was known as the Queen's Bush, and no Government came to their rescue; no money was expended for them. Now the old pioneers of that settlement are to be asked to come down and subscribe, and what for? To build the Canadian Pacific Railway two years sooner. I think the proposition is an iniquitous one. I think the measure is not conceived in the spirit of justice. I am willing to support any measure to develop the North-West, which is conceived in a spirit of justice and fair play; and while I ask for fair play for the Province from which I come, I want it for every other Province in the Dominion. I am willing to go in for that on every occasion. I ask nothing for the riding or the Province from which I come, but what I am willing to grant to those noble friends of ours in other parts of the Dominion. There is another matter which I wish to refer to in connection with our railways. We have a serious grievance. We have a serious indictment against the Minister of Railways, and his supporters in this House. In the heavy by-laws which we passed we had the advantage of having local directors on these roads who had a voice, to some extent, in charging freights, and the general regulation and management of roads. The people who contributed had a voice in these questions, but the Minister of Railways took away that privilege last Session, by claiming that roads which were Dominion lines, which had acquired branches built by Local Governments, should be under the control of the Dominion Government. Local control is taken away. If the Minister of Railways comes to our part of the country, and if he gets a warm reception, and I hope he will—I would help to give him such a reception—he must repeal that provision, or else, with all his amiability and agreeableness, he will have trouble. In his seriousness, I venture to hope that that distinguished gentleman will do this; I hope he will see that on those roads to which there have been local contributions, there shall be a local directorate. I think the movement was a great mistake. I opposed it in the House, knowing what the consequence would be to that country. The people in our section now find a great deal of convenience from the railways. They would find a great deal more if the Grand Trunk and the Great Western had not been allowed to amalgamate. But much as I desire to see the Canadian Pacific Railway built, I would not like to see anything done to cripple any of the great railways in this country, that have done so much for the early development of the country, and I would not lend my vote to do anything of that kind. If we find that the Government are attempting, by means of these resolutions, to interfere with the progress and development of these roads, which give markets to the people of the old Provinces of Canada, from one end to the other, it is but natural that the people should resent such action. I do not think it is proper that anything should be done to injure the railways that have done so much for this

country. Now, Sir, I have talked earnestly on this matter, because I have felt so. I do not know that I have gone over any ground that has been indicated by any hon. member of this House. I have my own course to take here. I am responsible to my constituents for the course I take, and for every utterance I make and every vote I give in this House; and during the time I am here, I want to vote for those measures which I believe to be conducive to the best interests of this country, I do not care whether they emanate from the Government or from the Opposition. I am not so tied down to party as not to support a good measure, no matter from which side it come. If this measure had the elements of fair play in it; if it were not likely to prove such an oppressive burden to the people of the country; if it were not, in my view, going to injure instead of benefiting the North-West, I would support it, but considering the difficulties that the pioneers of the section from which I come had to pass through for twenty or thirty years, I cannot support it. No Government ever gave them a single dollar for a railway until the Government of Ontario did so after 1867. These people taxed themselves in order to get railways, and they are now paying for these railways by-laws, and they are feeling that payment very seriously; and I say I would be recreant to the trust of those who sent me here if I did not speak, and speak as earnestly as I can, against the passage of these resolutions, and if I do not do all I can, by voice and vote, to prevent this burden being placed upon the people when they are already burdened so greatly. I have acted in this matter, at all events, honestly and without partisan bias, as one who thinks well of this country; for we have a great future before us. We have a great North-West and a great future for that country, and every word that is said in this House to the credit of that North-West, I echo to the fullest extent. I am a little surprised that some hon. gentlemen should have referred in this debate to the rapid development that has taken place in the United States, where they have such a bad climate, such a bad atmosphere, such miasmatic influences, and all that sort of thing. That is a wonder to me. They must have better regulations there than we have in the North-West. It is remarkable that under all these disadvantages, those countries should be settled up much more rapidly than our North-West. It shows that there must be something wrong in the Department of the Minister of the Interior. He is not here; I suppose he is getting up another pamphlet in the other House. I say that we ought to have the Minister of the Interior in this House, so that he could inform us of the regulations and the policy of the Government with regard to the public lands, one of the most important Departments of the Government. It is hardly to be expected that the Premier is able to manage that large Department, and to manage all these parties at the same time. And I think the hon. Minister of Railways has about as much in his hands now as he can manage. I do not know whether I should call him the Minister of Railways or the High Commissioner, for I do not want to call him out of his name; at any rate, he belongs to a noble profession—that is the only hope I have of the Government. It is one of the circumstances that would induce him to do right if he could. Thanking you, Sir, and the House, for the kind hearing which has been given me, and hoping to be pardoned for having trespassed on your time so long, I will resume my seat. I would not have spoken at such length, but I feel strongly, and as a Canadian born, and one who desires to promote the growth and development of Canada, I felt that it was my duty to my constituents to make my voice heard on this occasion, in opposition to this measure.

Mr. BRECKEN. Not only owing to the lateness of the hour, but to the very exhaustive speeches that have been delivered on both sides of the House, on this very

important question, it is almost unpardonable in me, or any other hon. member, very much longer to delay this House; for I take it, that it is utterly impossible for any hon. member to advance anything new, after all that has been said. There is one feature of this debate, which I have observed, has characterized the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches. Some of them have been very able, I will admit, from an Opposition stand-point, but one of the principal features is, that instead of directing their great abilities and experience to the soundness or unsoundness of the propositions contained in the Resolutions; instead of discussing the question as to whether it will be to the interests of the country that this House should adopt the Resolutions or not, they directed their attention to questions which had only an indirect bearing on the subject. I am not going into a history of this railway project, but I think the first time it was seriously contemplated in the Legislature—and I believe the late Sir George Cartier had something to do with it—it was then contemplated the road should be built in ten years. Had the contract then been undertaken, this work would have been completed to-day. My hon. colleague from Queen's made a long and ingenuous speech; but the impression it left on my mind was one of doubt as to whether he spoke as a Canadian or simply as a representative of one of the Eastern Provinces, which from its geographical position, cannot be supposed to take that direct interest in the completion of this work, which the other Provinces on the mainland take. Whenever he spoke of these \$23,000,000 to be loaned and the \$7,000,000 guarantee of dividend, he always combined the two, and alluded to them as an additional payment of \$30,000,000. That is, I think, a disingenuous statement. When the people of the Island read the hon. gentleman's speech—and no doubt it is on its way down there now—they cannot fail in coming to the conclusion that the proposition of the hon. Minister of Railways is not to lend \$23,000,000 on good and ample security, but it is to pay \$30,000,000 more. I appeal to the candor of my hon. colleague, if he will take up his speech and read it over again, to say, whether I have come to an unfair conclusion. This question is the most important one on which he or I have ever been called upon, or ever will be called upon to vote, and I ask him as a member of this House to play a broader role than that of the representative of a county. Here he is not only a representative of his county, but he is also a representative of the Dominion at large, and in dealing with this question he should deal with it as far as possible from a broad public stand-point, free from the prejudice of party. I know it is difficult for him to do that; I know it would be difficult for myself to attempt to practice what I have endeavoured to lay down, but I will endeavour, as far as I can, to let my practice be in accordance with my precept. I am not going to follow the hon. member for South Grey, because I really do not know how far he went. Like many other hon. gentlemen, he did not confine himself to the point at issue. Though a Free-trader, the burden of his song was that Mr. Van Horne had employed Swedes, Yankees and Chinese. I thought that a Free-trader was not only a Free-trader in manufactures of breadstuffs but in labour as well. In the name of common sense, what has the proposition in these Resolutions to do with the internal management of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Again, the hon. gentleman went into a history of the mismanagement of the Grand Trunk Railway and he spoke of the subsidies given by municipalities, towns and cities in Ontario. What has that got to do with the question under discussion? I intend to vote for these Resolutions and I am going to give my reasons for doing so. I know the tone of feeling in Prince Edward Island, and I am sorry to say that my hon. colleague is responsible, to a great extent, for educating the people to the point, at which they have now arrived on

Mr. BRECKEN.

this question. We live a long distance away; we are on the edge of Confederation. We do not follow out the development of the North-West, because it does not confer, directly, any benefit on us, but I hope it is not going to injure it. Some of our young men went to the North-West and no doubt this it was that gave my hon. colleague occasion to speak of the exodus, but a great many of them returned home, and they have found out that the fertile little island in the Gulf has land as productive, though the field may not be so large, and the scope for speculation be so great, as any in the great North-West. We enjoy many advantages not to be found in the North-West. We are nearer the coast, have a fertile soil, and a very salubrious climate. The best proof of those advantages is, that while we have no very great accumulation of individual wealth, take the people in the Island from one end to the other and they are in as comfortable circumstances as any to be found elsewhere. Now, Sir, as I said, I think that is an important point, and I think, when my hon. friend goes down to Prince Edward Island, he will correct that impression. If he looks through his speech he will see that, as I understand him, every time he mentioned the \$30,000,000, he spoke of it as \$30,000,000 in addition to the subvention that was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company when that contract was signed in 1881.

Mr. DAVIES. Just what it is.

Mr. BRECKEN. That is just the admission I wanted to get from my hon. friend.

Mr. DAVIES. It is not in subtraction from it.

Mr. BRECKEN. Then, I did not read the hon. member's speech wrongly. Let us see whether it is or not. I need not go into a lot of figures to prove it. The Government, when they entered into this contract in 1881, gave, I think, some \$28,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway; they gave them \$25,000,000, and 25,000,000 of acres of land. The Company have purchased east of Callander these railways that are spoken of, and great fault has been found with the Company by the Opposition for doing so, on the ground, I suppose, that these railways have been purchased out of the subvention that came from the Government. Well, my hon. friend says that the hon. Minister of Railways, by his proposition, is advancing \$30,000,000 extra. What is the fact? They ask for \$23,000,000, and \$7,000,000 for the guarantee—call it \$30,000,000. Every particle of that railway, the \$23,000,000 of work performed by the Government, am I right in saying the 1,100 miles built by the Company, and the 21,000,000 of acres of land, the railways purchased east of Callander, their stock, their tools, their implements, their everything, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$45,000,000, is to be handed over—the Government are to have a first lien and security upon it, save and except some \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 which I think they are liable to for some of these railway companies, and my hon. friend has the coolness to turn round and say this \$30,000,000 is in addition to this subvention. Why, how short his memory is. He had not the honour of a seat in the House when this contract was made. What was the cry which I have heard my hon. friend raise in Prince Edward Island? That these valuable lands were given to this Company, that they had a monopoly of the lands of the country, that they were highly favoured, that it was a monstrous bargain, that the interests of the country were sacrificed, that they were given a great deal more than ought to have been granted to them, and that the Government ought to have constructed the road, and would have constructed it at a much lower rate; and yet this magnificent subvention, this 21,000,000 acres of valuable land, and everything that made the terms splendid to them, are offered to the Government in security for this loan; and we have had the assurance from the hon. the Minister of Railways that one condition of that contract is that that work is to be completed by the

end of 1885, and, if one year's default is made in the payment of the interest, the Government are in a position to foreclose the whole matter. Now, what becomes of the denunciations that were hurled at the Government for highly favouring the Syndicate? I remember well when the hon. leader of the Opposition came in with his proposition for the second syndicate. I have heard it called a bogus syndicate, but I will not apply that term to it, as I do not know any of the gentlemen who composed it. But the charge then was that we were giving away this valuable land. What was the value put upon it by the leader of the Opposition? Something like \$2.36 an acre? And yet my hon. friend says, in the face of these Resolutions, in the face of the assurance given us by the Minister of Railways, that the \$30,000,000 are to be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway in addition to the subvention they have already received. It has already been said, and I believe it, that some \$36,000,000 has already been expended by the Company. A great deal has been said as to how this was expended, and what they have done with their stocks. Mr. Speaker, what have we to do with that? What is that to this House, and what is that to this country? The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), the other day, made the admission, that we all knew to be the case, that both sides of the House were committed to this great work. I believe the hon. member who represents East York (Mr. Mackenzie) bent his best energies, and, I believe, with the assistance of the hon. member for South Huron, and with his supporters and coadjutors at his back, he and his Government were devising, and—I do not say it disparagingly—were puzzling their brains to find the best means to build this great railway, to develop this country. Various propositions have been brought down, but, when this proposition was submitted by the Minister of Railways, we were told by the Opposition that he was sacrificing the interests of the country, that he was too generous in his offer; and now this magnificent property which he placed in their hands my hon. colleague says is not worth anything as security for the money which is to be loaned. We have heard of patriotism. I never like to parade the word, because very often the man who is loudest in talking about patriotism is the least in his patriotic principles. I know the definition given, I think, in Johnson's dictionary. I have no hon. gentleman in my eye when I say it, but I think the old lexicographer defines patriotism as the last refuge of a scoundrel. That is the open-mouthed patriot, the man who is always talking about his patriotism, as I have heard the Opposition do over and over again. But I say seriously that the Opposition have been persistent in their opposition to the Government. From the time this contract was entered into down to the present moment, they have persistently opposed it, and I will give them credit for a good deal of ability and a good deal of ingenuity in the way they have raked and scraped up their objections to it; but I believe, in their inner consciousness, that the feeling which troubles them most is not that that magnificent policy which has been carried out so ably by the hon. the Minister of Railways is not going to benefit the country, as a country, but that it is not going to benefit the Grit-Reform party, as a party. I am not making use of a biased or prejudiced expression, for, if you look at their very ablest utterances, from the time the Minister of Railways came down with his proposition to the present day, strange to say, there is not a feature, not a trivial feature, in the whole transaction that has met with the approval of hon. members of the Opposition. I know that men are frail, and that no man is perfectly wise, and that in the greatest schemes that have ever been propounded there will be defects and flaws, but it is a curious thing that the hon. the Minister of Railways should, in the estimation of my hon. friends of the

Opposition, be wrong from beginning to end. When he brought in his contract in 1881, he was wrong; he sacrificed the interests of the country; a warning finger was pointed at the hon. gentleman and, with a gleam of satisfaction on the countenances of these—I will not call them his traducers but his opponents—he was told, and the leader of the Government was told, that the time was coming, and was not far distant, when they would have to appeal to the people, and this extravagant Government, this unpatriotic conduct of the Government in refusing the second syndicate, would be condemned by an indignant people, as soon as they found they had been betrayed by the Government of the right hon. gentleman to whom they had entrusted the conduct of public affairs. My hon. friend was promised that in September of 1873 he would be hurled from power, that an exchange would take place of seats in this House, that the moment the people had an opportunity of passing their verdict, he would be found guilty and condemned. But what was the result? The right hon. gentleman went to the people, and this contract and the whole transaction, were explained to them, aye, there was more than that explained to them; the conduct and policy of the Government were misrepresented and traduced. But, thank God! the school-master is abroad; people read and think for themselves, and with an unerring verdict the people placed these public men in power again. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if this transaction is confirmed and this contract is completed in two years, the people of Canada, as a body, will confirm and endorse the policy of the Government. I need not go into the question of security—I think I have put that plain enough. But it has been said that the members of the Syndicate have not put their personal property into this undertaking. I do not know whether they have or not. But, oh! says the hon. member, when this contract was entered into in 1881, it was to be completed in ten years. So it was, and it was considered then the greatest boon that could be conferred on Canada. We were told by the hon. leader of the Opposition, as has been very ably remarked by the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick, that he apprehended this work would not go on. But I venture to say that the performance of this contract has been characterized by speed and rapidity that is not to be found in the history of railway building in any part of the world. Now, as to the effect of refusing this loan. It has been published throughout Europe that the Pacific Railway is likely to be built in two years, and that fact, Sir, is known to every country that has an overcrowded population, whose inhabitants are looking for a home in the New World. We have heard of the wonderful capabilities of that country, for producing purposes. I think the hon. Minister of Railways stated that from the year 1871 to 1880, the immigration to that country was 64,755, and since the contract has been in existence, from 1881 to 1883, it has been 149,560. Now, Sir, is it a matter of no consequence to this country that these Resolutions should be rejected and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should no longer be in a position to execute their contract within the time promised? Is it no injury to this country that the tide of immigration should be checked for that reason? Is it no injury to this country, Sir, that the great national capabilities of the North-West should remain undeveloped? Now, in view of the peculiar state of affairs in the old country, now that very recent representations have been made by the Minister of Railways, acting in the capacity of diplomatic representative of the Dominion, and in view of the valuable and kind efforts that are now being made by our late Governor General, Lord Lorne, and now that an amount of attention is being directed towards the Dominion such as has never been directed to this country since it came under the British flag—in view of all these circumstances, is it of no consequence to this country

that the multitude of people in the old World who have been looking to the North-West as their future home, as the home of their children and grandchildren, should be told that this great project, which has been represented to them as likely to be completed in two years, is to be arrested, and that the opening up of that country is to be checked for a number of years to come? Is it no injury to the country to have these intending immigrants discouraged from coming here? Is it no injury to this country that the hopes of our own people should be blasted, and that their anticipations of the rapid development of that great country should fail to be realized? Is it no injury to this country, I repeat, that the people of Great Britain and Ireland, of Germany, and of the continent of Europe generally, who have had recently brought to their attention the great advantages which this country offers to the new settler, should be turned back from their intention of coming here, and that this great tide of immigration should be checked? Now, that the ardour of these people to come to this country is so strong, is it wise for us to take such means as will discourage them? And for what purpose? Because we refuse, as my hon. friend puts it, to assent to the proposition of the Minister of Railways to give \$30,000,000 to the Syndicate in addition to the subvention; and because he proposes to this Parliament that a certain sum of money should be advanced—not equal in value, if the representations of hon. members on both sides of this House are to be taken as a guide—to the land alone that they offer as a guarantee. My hon. friend said the Government of Canada ought not to demean itself by becoming a loan company. I do not know any more praiseworthy, any more statesmanlike direction, towards which the funds of the Exchequer of a country can be expended, than in developing its resources and increasing its population. The hon. member for Welland, in the admirable speech he made to-night, spoke of the value of the immigrants. He said that every stalwart immigrant that went into a country was worth a thousand dollars, and he was quite right. Why, Sir, I was astounded when I heard the calculation made by the hon. Minister of Railways as to the capabilities of the North-West, and the quantity of grain that could be raised there per acre——

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRECKEN. Hon. members may laugh, but I am sure that, when all things are considered, there is precious little honest merriment to be got out of the present condition of affairs. The laughter sounds hollow. I was astonished at the capabilities of the country when I heard him speak of these millions of bushels, but I did not discredit his statement. I was even astonished at the much more moderate calculation that was made by the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster). I must say that, if my memory serves me right, I have heard very little from my hon. friends on the Opposition side of the House as to the great capabilities of that country. Whether they properly appreciate it or not, I do not know, but as members of this House I have heard very little from them in praise of the North-West. I, myself, Mr. Speaker, am a strong believer in party government. I believe that, as long as we have representative institutions in the country, we must have party government. I also have had some experience in political life. I have been two or three times in the Government, and more frequently in Opposition. I know that, very often, the duties of an Opposition are confined to opposing everything, and proposing nothing. Looking at the bitterness which has characterized the utterances and the conduct of the public men in this country in regard to this Pacific Railway question, it is hardly to be expected that hon. members on the Opposition benches will deal less frankly with this question as those on the Government side of the House. As a member coming from Prince

Mr. BRECKEN.

Edward Island, from a Province which will not be benefited by this undertaking, my vote may be looked upon as an independent vote in an equal degree with any which will be given in this House. It may not perhaps, at the first blush, please some of my constituents. They may think that some of the \$23,000,000 might be very advantageously expended in Prince Edward Island, and I should not be sorry to see it done. Still, I think in all seriousness that when we look at the importance of this question, how far this country has been committed to it by both political parties, the fact that all politicians have desired that it should be in the hands of a private company and not in the hands of the Government, the necessity of going forward and completing the road is obvious. When the term of ten years was fixed for the construction of the road, the hon. Minister of Railways would have been laughed at if he had announced that it would be built in five years, and now that we have the work so far advanced that only 650 miles require to be completed, and now that we have a Company which has already invested \$36,000,000 in the enterprise, the House will feel the importance of adopting the Resolutions. What has given the the North-West land their value? The construction of the railway. In view of the fact that the advantages of Carleton to the over-populated countries of Europe has been forcibly presented, that the capabilities of the country to afford happy homes to the hard-working but poor people of the old countries, increases the difficulty of declining to advance to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company money to complete the work, it has been suggested that default may be made. If the work has to be taken from the hands of the Company, the Government may do so with \$36,000,000 already expended on it. My hon. colleague from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) alluded to the colonization companies in the North-West, and spoke feelingly of the system of absentee landlordism in Prince Edward Island, declaring that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were going to perpetuate that system in the North-West. That was an ill-considered statement. The facts about Prince Edward Island were these: The lands were leased by absentee proprietors to tenants for 999 years, at a moderate rental. They were forest lands, and those who went on them cleared only an acre or two the first year. The rental was allowed to accumulate, and after a man had toiled and spent a lifetime on his small farm, and laid his head on his dying pillow, he did not know but that the landlord would step in and take the property. That was our grievance. I was in the Local Legislature, and introduced the Bill which remedied this grievance, and in passing that measure I received valuable aid from my colleague, who is always, however, opposed to me politically. What is a colonization company in the North-West? It is an aid to the settlement of the country, and the hon. gentleman should have considered the matter a little more before he expressed so much virtuous indignation in regard to these organizations. The even-numbered sections are held for free settlement, while the odd numbered sections are sold to the company at \$2 per acre, a rebate of one-half being allowed if the settlement conditions are fulfilled. The colonization companies sell the lands outright, and there is no question of tenancy. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company also sell their lands and do not rent them. I was going to read to the House some of the hon. gentleman's utterances in Prince Edward Island, but I will refrain——

Mr. DAVIES. Let us have them.

Mr. BRECKEN. I will let the hon. gentleman have one, because when he talks of patriotism his remarks appear to be somewhat inconsistent. The hon. gentleman is acknowledged to be leader of the Liberal party on the Island, and when the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was entered into, he held meetings throughout its length and breadth. I

congratulate him upon the moderate tone of his speech in the House the other day; he has wonderfully improved, and two years hence, when the railway has been completed and the North-West settled by happy and prosperous farmers, who will share taxation with the inhabitants of the other Provinces, I shall expect him to disavow the sentiments which I will now read. The hon. gentleman stated that the only course open for the country would be to cast in its fortunes with the United States. This, he said, is an escape which no politician likes to talk about, but it will come one day, and when it comes we must take our chances to make the best bargain we can. I am sure we are all disposed to make every possible allowance for the hon. gentleman's utterance the other night; but is it not a matter of great congratulation that he should have toned down in so short a time? My hon. friend said, in speaking of what would have been the result of these Resolutions, if they were not carried, that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), had indicated three such results. The first was that the work would be stopped; the second, that 9,000 men would be thrown out of employment; and the third, that the Conservative party would be injured. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe made a very able speech, well constructed and brimfull of information on that point. My hon. friend spoke of him, in a fit of generosity, as holding a brief for the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am sure my hon. colleague under-rated my hon. friend on that occasion, and if he will turn to the pages of *Hansard*, and read one or two of the able speeches made by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, he will find some able and original calculations on that subject. The question of the consequences to the Conservative party is not one which, I think, should be considered in this matter, though I am sure that the question of whether it will benefit or injure the Reform party has received a good deal of attention on the other side. The Conservative party do not deserve to be taunted in that way. The contract was entered into fairly and openly; it was thoroughly discussed here, and the leader of the Government hastened on the elections sooner than the Constitution required, in order to obtain the people's verdict upon it. I have always believed—though I know that party names are often political nicknames—in the soundness of public opinion; and I always thought it was the proud boast of the party which flaunted the flag of Liberalism, that they bowed to the voice of the people. But this contract was introduced in the Session of 1881, and I willingly give my hon. friends all credit for the energy and industry which they displayed, for there was not a nook or a corner of the country, not a hamlet in the Dominion which was not crammed—I will not say with Grit—but with Reform literature on this question; but the people rejected them. Hon. gentlemen come here as the people's representatives, and the people's friends and reflectors. We have heard them, time and again, when they were getting the worst of an argument, taunt their political opponents with being Tories. The people had considered this matter for twelve months, and they came to the deliberate conclusion that the contract was a good one. Another remarkable feature of the election was the fact that some of the leading men on the Opposition benches—men of acknowledged and exalted ability, who denounced the conduct of the Minister of Railways—left the House and they have never been able to find their way here since. I say that hon. gentlemen who call themselves Liberals—reflectors of public opinion—should accept that verdict. They should not taunt my hon. friend with stealing a march on the people, or squandering the people's money. In the name of common sense, what object has the leader of the Government, or the Minister of Railways, in giving the Company these magnificent subventions? Personally, I am acquainted with but one member of the Company, but I am given to understand that when these men were in politics,

they saw eye to eye, with hon. gentlemen opposite—they belonged to the great Reform party. I have been listening, and I expected to hear that they had influenced the elections in 1882. I do not know that there is one of them in sympathy with the Government, but I believe that they are high-minded, energetic and thoroughly business men, and the work they have done is a credit to them. When the contract was made in 1881, I thought there was the possibility of finality about it, but that point has been amply explained. I think, however, it would have been better if my hon. friends, instead of taking up such issues, had directed their attention to one important point mentioned by the Minister of Railways, and that is the hostility of American railways—the dread of competition, by our trans-continental road, the “bearing” and depreciating of the stocks—thereby piling up obstacles in the way of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and preventing them from realizing from their stock, as they had a right to expect they would realize. Circumstances occurred which could not be controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or by the Dominion Government or by Parliament. And it would have been a more patriotic course—one which would have been more fully appreciated by every independent elector in the Dominion—if my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House had recognized the difficulties with which the Canadian Pacific Railway had to contend, and for which they were in no way responsible—difficulties which are liable to arise under the best managers, and in all public works; it would have been better if, recognizing the crisis which took place in the stock market, they had come forward and said, we believe this is a great property, and that we should, as sometimes happens in the Mother Country, when the honour, the territories, or the interests of Great Britain are invaded, drop the petty arms of petty warfare and stand shoulder to shoulder to save the country. This is a commercial warfare against the best interests of the country, and we would not prove to be the true friends of Canada, if in this particular instance, no matter how much on other questions we may differ from the First Minister, we did not help to tide the Dominion over this little crisis. I say that two years hence every man whose heart beats true to Canada will feel proud of raising his voice in favour of and giving his support to a measure which will tend more to benefit the country than all the measures which have accumulated on the Statute Book for the last ten years.

Mr. LISTER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

THOMAS TEMPLE, Esq., Member to represent the Electoral District of the County of York (New Brunswick) having previously taken the oath, according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, was introduced by Sir Leonard Tilley and the hon. John Costigan, and took his seat in the House.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:10 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 18th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### METHODIST CHURCH UNION.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I beg to move that the petition of the Rev. Emerson Bristol, and others; of the Rev.

J. F. Durkee, and others, and of James Hawkins, and others, presented this day, be now read and received. The reason for this motion is that the Committee to whom the question of incorporating the union of the Methodist Churches is referred meets to-morrow, and I believe takes up the question. These petitions are in the same category as those already presented, with one exception, that of the Rev. Emerson Bristol and others, who state in detail the nature of their objection to the union. They desire to be heard on the subject before the Committee, and the reference of their objections to the Committee under the motion I propose will obviate the necessity for my asking for the delay of the Bill, in order that their statement may be heard.

Motion agreed to ; and petition read and received

#### MOUNTED POLICE FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) enquired, Is it the intention of the Government, owing to the recent troubles with the Indians at Metlakatla and the near approach of the Canadian Pacific Railway, through the Rocky Mountains, into British Columbia, to detail a troop or squad of Mounted Police for service in that western section of the Dominion? If so, how soon? And of how many would such troop or squad consist?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the present law, the functions of the Mounted Police are confined to the North-West, and, without an alteration of the law, no portion of that force can be used or compelled to go to any portion of British Columbia or any other Province of the Dominion.

#### EMIGRANT SHEDS AT VICTORIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to erect emigrant sheds in Victoria for the temporary accommodation of the increased number of immigrants who will arrive there this spring, consequent upon railway construction, the prosecution of the public works, and the throwing open of railway lands to settlement?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention of the Government.

#### DUTIES OF IMMIGRATION AGENT AND QUARANTINE OFFICER ON VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) enquired, What instructions have been issued to the immigration agent, and the quarantine officer on Vancouver Island, in regard to their respective duties, other than the usual printed regulations?

Mr. POPE. No instructions have been given to the immigration agent there, except those of December last, defining his duties and desiring him to give all the information in his power to enquirers from abroad. The same remarks apply to the quarantine officer, whose duties, besides the printed regulations, were defined in the letter of instructions of the 12th December last.

#### SALARIES OF IMMIGRATION AGENT AND QUARANTINE OFFICER ON VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) enquired, What are the dates respectively of the appointments of the immigration agent and quarantine officer on Vancouver Island, what salary and allowance have been authorized by the Department, and what occasioned the delay in making said appointments after the Estimates were passed by Parliament, to take effect from 1st July, 1883?

Mr. POPE. The immigration agent was appointed by Order in Council of the 4th December last, at \$1,000 a year, Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

and any ordinary expenditure will be met by the vote of contingencies for Canadian agencies. The quarantine officer was appointed by Order in Council of the 18th August, at a salary of \$1,800, and the Estimates provide \$500 for his contingencies.

#### WELLINGTON LIFEBOAT HOUSE.

Mr. PLATT enquired, By what person or persons were plans and specifications for life-boat house at Wellington, Ontario, submitted to the Government, and whose plan was accepted? Were tenders for construction of said building invited by public advertisement or otherwise? How many tenders were received, and what is the name and amount in case of the highest, the lowest and the accepted tender?

Mr. McLELAN. I visited the locality during the past season in company with Mr. McCuaig. I ascertained what would be necessary for the repair of the boat, and directed the officer to ascertain the price of material necessary to build a small boat-house. He sent forward an estimate of the quantities and prices. These were submitted to the engineer of my Department and approved by him, and the work was carried out upon that approval.

#### RANGE LIGHTS AT WELLER'S BAY.

Mr. PLATT enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to make any change either as to relative position or dimensions in what is known as the Range Lights at Weller's Bay, Ontario?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not so decided.

#### THE TARIFF ON GRAIN.

Mr. WHEELER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to readjust the Tariff on grain, so as to allow four and a-half bushels of wheat, the quantity required to make a barrel of flour, to be imported at the same duty as that charged on a barrel of flour?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The intentions of the Government will be communicated to the House when I make my financial statement, on this subject, as well as on others relating to the Tariff.

#### LANSDOWNE POST OFFICE.

Mr. JACKSON enquired, has the Government acted on the petition of C. C. Olds and others, of the township of Woodhouse, in the county of Norfolk, Province of Ontario, asking for a post office in said township, to be called Lansdowne? If so, have they decided to grant such petition? If so, has the postmaster been appointed for said office? What is his name? When will the office be opened for the transmission of mails? Does the Government intend to furnish a daily, tri-weekly, semi-weekly or weekly mail for the convenience of the people in that vicinity?

Mr. CARLING. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the matter is now under consideration.

#### THE EXCHANGE BANK.

Mr. HOLTON enquired, 1. Has the Minister of Finance, since the suspension of the Exchange Bank of Canada, demanded or obtained any security for the repayment of the \$100,000 advanced to that institution upon the strength of the hon. A. W. Ogilvie's letter of guarantee, and if so, what security? 2. If the Minister of Finance has obtained no such security, has he caused any legal proceedings to be taken for the recovery of the said sum of \$100,000, and if so, what are they? 3. If no such security has been obtained

and if no legal proceedings have been taken for the recovery of the amount of said advance, is it the intention of the Government to institute such proceedings, and if so, against whom, and when?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No additional security has been taken from Mr. Ogilvie. I am advised by the Minister of Justice that the debt due to the Crown is entitled by law to precede other debts of the same degree. Instructions have been already given to seek to enforce this right as against the assets in the bank. Should the Government not be able to realize the full amount of the claim in this way, Mr. Ogilvie will be called upon to make good the deficiency.

#### PAYMENT OF LIQUOR LICENSE INSPECTORS.

Mr. IRVINE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision for paying the inspectors appointed or to be appointed under the Liquor License Act of 1883, in counties which have adopted the Canada Temperance Act or the Dunkin Act, and whether by salary or otherwise?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the intention of the Government so to provide by a pecuniary allowance.

#### MEASUREMENT OF LOGS AND LUMBER.

Mr. HALL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps to establish a uniform standard rule for the measurement of logs and lumber?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not the intention to make any change in the present system of measuring logs and lumber.

#### THE HON. HECTOR FABRE.

Mr. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to retain the hon. Hector Fabre in the position he now occupies in Paris? Whether that gentleman has made out the reports required of him respecting his labours and their results? When did he do so? What is the salary and the disbursements, and expenditure on contingencies connected with his office? Whether that gentleman receives in addition any remuneration from the Province of Quebec for doing the same duties?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. Hector Fabre is an officer of the Quebec Government, and was appointed by them. With the consent of that Government, Mr. Fabre performs certain duties connected with the office of High Commissioner, and certain duties connected with emigration. For that he receives \$2,000 a year. His appointment is for three years, and is to end next year. He has made certain reports respecting his labours and their results; and if the hon. gentleman will move for the papers they will be brought down.

#### BENEFIT MUTUAL INSURANCE SOCIETIES.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to introduce legislation affecting in any way Benefit Mutual Insurance Societies, now doing business in Canada?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may state to the hon. gentleman that it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill referring to this subject during the present Session.

#### FUNDED DEBT, 1883, CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) enquired, Is the sum of \$14,951,863, 4 per cent. funded debt, 1883, Canadian Pacific

Railway, mentioned in the 5th page of the Estimates of 1884-85, recently laid upon the Table, a new loan, and if so, when was it contracted and where, and at what date is it repayable?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is interest on the guarantee to the Canadian Pacific Railway. On the 17th of August, 1884, \$305,729.06 will be due; on the 17th of February, 1885, \$292,344.56 must be paid, making \$593,074.52 to be paid during the next year.

#### MONTCALM CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to announce to the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada the judgment of the said Court in the matter of the Controverted Election of the Electoral District of Montcalm, by which said judgment the sitting member is declared duly elected and returned.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

The Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Charles Tupper, "That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider certain proposed Resolutions (page 84) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway," being read,

Mr. LISTER. In rising to make a few observations on the question now before the House, I am conscious, Sir, that at this late stage of the debate it will be possible for me to add but little to what has already been urged against the passing of these Resolutions. But, Sir, I feel that I would be faithless to my constituents who sent me here, I would be unmindful of my own convictions, did I fail to stand up in my place in Parliament and protest against the passing of these Resolutions. Before I enter into the merits of the questions, I desire, for a few moments, to advert to the speech of an hon. gentleman who preceded me, I refer to the hon. member from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). In that speech he undertook to criticize the speech delivered by the hon. member from East Lambton (Mr. Fairbank), and in doing so he used these words:

"I presume, Sir, that it is customary, in the first place, to deal with the observations of the speaker who preceded, and in this case I should feel disposed to do so to some extent; but, Sir, I find myself relieved of that important duty by the esteem in which the remarks of the hon. gentleman who preceded me in this debate, seem to be held by his own friends, if we judge from the comments upon his speech made by the leading organ of the Reform party in the Province of Quebec. I refer to the correspondent of the Montreal *Daily Witness*, who, after having paid a high eulogy to the hon. member for Queen's, and a still higher compliment to the hon. member for King's who took part in this debate, thus disposes of the hon. gentleman who has preceded me: 'Unlike his two predecessors, he departed from the serious into the comicality.' And now, Sir, as I have no pretension to be the comic member for this side of the House, I must certainly dispense with paying any attention to the comicalities of the hon. gentleman who has already taken part in this discussion."

In criticising the speech of the hon. member for East Lambton, the hon. gentleman felt that it was consistent with his dignity and self-respect as a member of this honourable House, to quote only a portion of the report in that paper concerning the speech made by the hon. gentleman for East Lambton. I propose, Sir, to read what that newspaper really said:

"Mr. Foster made a very favourable impression, and was loudly applauded on concluding. Mr. Fairbank, unlike his two predecessors, departed from the serious into comicality. He here put out his statistical arguments in opposition to the Resolutions in a happy way, and they had telling effects."

Sir, it has been a matter of surprise to me that an hon. gentleman occupying a position in this honourable House should, for the purpose of securing a brief victory, as it were, undertake to misquote, or only partially quote, what has appeared in the newspapers. Well, after the hon. member has criticised the speech of the hon. member for East Lambton,

and read from a report in the newspapers, I suppose, Sir, I may also be permitted to criticise his speech by reading a report of it in the *Toronto News*, an independent paper, but I shall differ with him in this, that I shall read the whole of what is there stated instead of a part. Sir, that paper; on the 16th of February, referring to the speech of the hon. member for Montreal, says :

"When, however, Curran rose in his place and commenced to shout his patriotism to the dome, it was apparent that he was about to clothe his actions in the garment of hypocritical cant, and support the Government as usual. It was rather hard lines that the noisy and self-complacent advocate was being ground between the upper and nether millstones of the power of two corporations, and if the interests of Canada were not being considered it should be reckoned meritorious that he chose party rather than corporate selfishness. But the speech itself was a hollow screaming of patriotism, and a redaubing of the Grand Trunk Railway with taffy, which doubtless was intended to excuse his actions to his constituents. Not satisfied that this amount of demagoguism would lift him over these 500 votes he turned and slobbered over the French Canadians, and then striking with his hand the neighbourhood of his liver, he roared: 'There beats in this breast a loyal and patriotic Irish Canadian heart.' Thus the blatant professional patriot gave oratorical taffy to the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the ordinary Canadian, the French Canadian, the Irish Canadian and French Canadian. Though he tore passion to tatters, and ranted and roared through the most absurd speech delivered in Parliament this Session, he utterly failed to score a point. He said he would not deign to notice the speech of Fairbank, of Lambton, but in one sentence of that speech there was more sense than Curran talked in half an hour."

Sir, as the hon. gentleman is not here in his place to-day, I do not propose, in his absence, to do any more than he did regarding the popular member for East Lambton. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have observed, on more than one occasion, that hon. gentlemen, in quoting former speeches of hon. members of this House, have apparently not had the courage to quote them in full. I think it is unfortunate and unworthy of any hon. member to resort to such a device, for the purpose of securing temporary victory. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, as well as hon. members on this side, have referred to the question before the House as one of momentous importance. I can agree with what hon. gentlemen have said in that regard. I feel there has not been since this Parliament commenced a question so important and possibly so far-reaching in its effects upon Canada, and I believe during the present Parliament no question of anything like equal magnitude will have to be considered by this House. In considering this question I propose to go back in the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway for a few years. I was not in Parliament in 1872, and I am not here for the purpose of discussing what took place at that time; but I am here for the purpose of discussing this question before the House and this question only. We know that after the defeat of the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite at once set about the task of having the Canadian Pacific Railway built by a private company. It is a matter of history that in 1880 the hon. leader of the Government went to England for the purpose, as was then stated, of having a company organized to carry out this great work. We know also that in the fall of that year the leader of the Government returned to this country, and that he was met at Hochelaga by a deputation from the Jacques Cartier Club of Montreal. We know that the hon. gentleman made a speech to those young gentlemen in which he announced to them and the country at large that he had succeeded in forming a company, and that he had succeeded in making a fast contract with capitalists in England for the construction of that railway. The country believed he had done so. Sir, the country believed the hon. gentleman had made a contract which was in the interest of the country; but he did not deign to state to the deputation what the terms were. The hon. gentleman, however, stated to them that he was an old man, and that it was unlikely, in the natural course of

Mr. LISTER.

events, that he would live to see the contract completed, but he expressed the hope that when in another sphere he would look down on those young gentlemen and see them speeding over the Canadian Pacific Railway at a rate of 25 miles per hour. I sincerely hope that when the hon. gentleman leaves this sphere, he will go to one where he will have an opportunity of looking down; but I venture to predict that when he reaches that happy place, instead of looking down at young men of the Jacques Cartier Club speeding over that railway at 25 miles an hour, he will have some more interesting occupation. Sir, the country believed that the hon. gentleman had entered into a contract, that a fast contract had been made, that English capitalists of unbounded wealth had been secured for the purpose of carrying out the great national undertaking of which the Minister of Railways talked so much. Parliament was summoned early, ostensibly for the purpose of ratifying the contract which the hon. gentleman had made; but when Parliament met, it was found that no contract had been made in England, but that a contract had been entered into on this side of the Atlantic with men living in Canada who professed to be capitalists, and the statement made by the hon. gentleman at Hochelaga was in fact not true. The contract which was laid on the Table of the House contained the most extraordinary provisions of any contract ever laid before Parliament. It proposed to give and did give to the Company a fabulous sum of money for the construction of the railway, and conferred on them monopolies and rights which had never been granted by any free country to any corporation in the last five hundred years, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to produce a single instance. Although the Opposition on that occasion took a patriotic stand and made a noble fight against the iniquitous provisions of the contract, it was hurried through Parliament and became the law of the land. We had reason to believe at that time, after the contract was executed, that there would be no more trouble about it, although the leader of the Opposition took occasion more than once to point out to the Government the liability there was for the contractors coming back again and asking for more money, whereupon he was assured over and over again by the hon. Minister of Railways, by the hon. Minister of Public Works and by the hon. leader of the Government, that no such event could possibly take place. Sir, in order to verify what I have stated, I will take the liberty of reading extracts from speeches made by the hon. gentlemen whom I have mentioned. The Premier, Sir John Macdonald, in his remarks in reply to Mr. Blake's criticism of the Speech at the opening of Parliament, on the 10th of December, 1880, said :

"The contract with the Syndicate would be received by the whole country 'as a relief from the apprehension that the country was going to be plunged into an unlimited expense.' Further, that 'the Syndicate are resolved to build this road, and they are able to do so' and in doing so, they will relieve this country of the immediate responsibility of expenditure in building the road."

Sir Charles Tupper, in moving the House into Committee on the contract, December 14th, said :

"We are in a position to state not only that the entire construction (of the Canadian Pacific Railway) from end to end, but that the responsibility of operating it hereafter, is to be taken off the shoulders of the country, and that she will be relieved from the expenditure of a single dollar in connection with the construction or operation of this railway. I say that this company embraces capitalists both of our own and other countries, whose names are the best guarantees that could be offered the people of Canada that any enterprise they may undertake will be successful; that no greater injury could have been inflicted on the people of Canada than to have made the conditions of the agreement so onerous that instead of ensuring their successful fulfillment they would have led to failure. And I would ask this House whether this contract is one to sit down and cavil over and to drive the most difficult bargain that could be driven and perhaps lead to what occurred when we made the contract in 1873."

Further on Sir Charles said :

"Under this arrangement we have the best guarantee that the work will be pushed rapidly to completion under the contract as now proposed. There were two things we had to consider. One was to make the best bargain we could for Canada—the other was not to impose terms that would be likely to lead to disaster in the money markets of the world when the proposition was placed on them."

The Minister of Public Works referring to Mr. Blake's objections, said :

"What does he want? Does he want to drive a hard bargain with these gentlemen? What sense would there be in attempting to cut them down to make a poor company. It was to our interest, and to the interest of the country that the company should be able to construct the railway, and work it afterwards, so that they should not come back to us year after year, and ask us for new terms."

Sir Hector continuing, said :

"We want once for all, to settle the whole question, so as to say to the company, this is the settlement—you build that railway for that amount of money and land and work it."

Sir Hector further said :

"If we starve them now by giving them a small subsidy, in land and money, the result would be that they will come to us afterwards and say—We cannot go on. We do not want that; we want a good and great railway, and also to put it on a proper footing, so as to prevent its owners coming back to us and saying, 'you starve us to death, and we want more money.'"

Sir Hector further said :

"We have the guarantee, no doubt; but perhaps the hon. gentleman would prefer to see them come to ask for better terms. I am not of that opinion, nor is the Government."

These are extracts from speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite when it was pointed out to them that, fabulous though the contract price was, there was a probability that, before many months or years had elapsed, the Company would come back to Parliament and ask further aid. The predictions of the leader of the Opposition have been fulfilled within the short period of three years, for the Company have come back to the Government, and they are saying, "We cannot complete this contract unless you provide us with further funds." That is the real position of the matter; for although the Government may say that the Company are able to build this railway, that their means are quite sufficient for that purpose, we know that it is the fact, according to the statements which have been laid on the Table of this House, according to the facts which have come to the knowledge of this House, the Company are not able to construct the road without further assistance. And of course, to justify the advance, or the loan, which the Government proposes to make to this Company, it is necessary for the Government to say that there is some consideration moving them from the Company; and they tell us that if the advance is made the road will be constructed within two years, but, if not, it will not be completed before 1891. Let us examine for a few moments the particulars connected with the guarantee, and the circumstances which surround that somewhat shady transaction. We find that the Government of this country, the trustees of the public funds, without any authority of law, without any authority at all except dependence on their majority in Parliament, entered into a secret agreement with the Company and guaranteed the stock of the Company to the extent of \$65,000,000 at 3 per cent. That agreement was an illegal agreement, one which the Government should never have entered into. But the worst fact in connection with it is, that the first intimation that the country had that such an arrangement had been entered into, was a telegram from the other side of the water. It is a somewhat significant and suspicious circumstance that at the time that telegram was received gentlemen occupying high positions in the country, occupying confidential relations to the Government, who must have known of such an agreement, were in the city of New York. It was perfectly well known—the merest novice in finance must have known—that the effect of such

an announcement in New York would be to "bull" the stock—to temporarily advance it; and that was exactly what happened. Sir, there is a suspicion in the country that the men to whom I have referred, have made large sums on the stock boards by their operations in Canadian Pacific Railway stock; but, true or not, it is, as I said, a significant fact that these gentlemen were in New York at that time, and it is equally well known that during the few days the stock was in the market, it advanced from 50 to 62 cents. That, Sir, was an improper transaction, one which this Government had no right to enter into. The Government has no right to interfere with the stock market of this or any other country, or to do anything by which the stock brokers can make money out of the acts of the Government. But bad as that transaction was, we did not suspect, the people of the country did not suspect, that this Company would come to the Government again, and ask them to advance them \$22,500,000 by way of a loan. But, Sir, when Parliament assembled, we find that the Minister of Railways laid on the Table a proposition to lend this Company that amount, and to assume a further liability of \$7,500,000, making in all \$30,000,000. The hon. gentleman has argued in favour of that proposition in very eloquent strains; he has put the case on the part of the Company and the Government in the strongest possible light; he has urged every argument which it was possible for ingenuity to urge, to justify this extraordinary transaction. Allow me for a few moments to enquire into the position of this Company when the work is completed and its present position, and to ask the House and the country if, under those circumstances, the Government is justified in advancing or lending the Company this amount, or guaranteeing them any sum whatever. The length of the railway is 2,550 miles, and the work done by the Company is upon the line from Callander to Thunder Bay, and from Red River to Kamloops, or 1,910 miles altogether. The Company is to receive for this amount of work, a cash subsidy of \$25,000,000 and a land grant subsidy of 25,000,000 acres, equal to \$75,000,000 in all. They receive in addition to cash and land grant subsidies, 711 miles of road, completed and to be completed by the Government, namely, from Thunder Bay to Red River, from Fort Moody to Kamloops and the Pembina Branch, making 711 miles, at a cost to the Government of \$38,000,000; so that the Company, for constructing 1,910 miles are to receive \$103,000,000, not including the cost of surveys, which amounted to about \$5,000,000. The Company have expended according to the statement of the President \$23,563,564, and estimating the cost to complete the work at \$27,000,000 we have an amount equal to \$50,563,564. This sum taken from \$103,000,000 leaves a balance of \$52,536,436, the net profit of the Company. If we add to this the amount which it is proposed to lend the Company, which I say is a gift, one which this Government, or any other Government, will never be able to extract from the Company—if we add this amount, to the profits of the Company, these profits will aggregate \$74,936,000. I shall now glance for a moment at the present position of the Company. According to the statement of the president, they have expended \$23,563,564; they have received \$21,318,222; so that they have expended over and above the amount they have received, \$2,245,342. Against this they hold a land subsidy of 10,000,000 of acres equal to \$20,000,000, at a very low valuation, because the lands already sold have brought an average price of \$2.36 per acre. Deduct from the \$20,000,000 the amount they have expended, \$2,245,000, and there is left a profit of \$17,755,000. But the roads completed by the Government are valued at \$19,000,000, so that the Company have, as they actually stand to-day, a profit of \$17,755,000, together with the \$19,000,000 worth of completed roads, or a total profit of \$36,755,000. In addition, they are to receive, for the pur-

pose of covering current obligations, the sum of \$7,500,000;—I do not take the full amount, because the hon. Minister says that is to be expended in constructing the balance of the road. That would bring the amount of their profits up to \$44,255,000, or, if you deduct from that \$7,500,000 the \$2,250,000, they still have cash in hand amounting to over \$5,000,000. So that, Sir, taking that statement as correct, it shows that that Company have never put one single dollar into the construction of the road, and they are making, as they stand today, a profit of \$44,255,000. And these are the men, Mr. Speaker, who come to this Parliament and say that they cannot construct this road unless they get this immense loan. These are the men who, the hon. First Minister told the people and the country, were able to construct the road out of their own private means if they never should receive one dollar from outside resources. These are the great capitalists we have heard about from every platform in the country since 1880. These are the men for whose benefit the taxpayers of this country are asked to put their hands in their pockets and pay over this large amount of money. These are the contractors who possess such an influence over this Government as to force them to hurry through these Resolutions without bringing down to Parliament the proper amount of information necessary to enable us to understand them. This is the Company who, despite the opposition of the French-Canadian press, despite the hostile attitude of certain other corporations, are able to induce the Government to hurry these Resolutions through. Is it a far-drawn inference to say that there is a power which the people of this country know nothing about, forcing the Ministry on in a way which their better sense and feeling must disapprove of? These are the men who come to this Parliament and ask that the people of this country should mortgage their farms and their properties throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion for the purpose of helping them to bind down the people of the North-West with greater fetters than ever. These are the men who are retarding the progress of that country, and crushing out its very vitals. They are not willing to surrender their great monopoly or one of the many privileges they possess. They demand this favour from the Government, and the Government, without asking for a single concession, are willing to accede to their demand. I say that the people of this country will pronounce this transaction to be a most shameful one. Although they condoned, to a certain extent, the contract of 1880, they will not condone this transaction, but the Government, when they go before the people, will have to answer for their conduct.

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who interrupts me is no doubt a very loyal citizen—he is willing that all his friends and relations should serve the country. He has a great many of them feeding at the public crib now, and I do not doubt that he would be willing to take the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture if he could get it. Sir, it is urged by the Government, as a reason why this transaction should be carried out, that in order to develop the North-West, it is necessary that that road should be speedily constructed. It is said that that is necessary, in order for us to get an entrance into the country. It is also urged, as a reason for the speedy construction of the road, that the Northern Pacific Railway is obtaining the through trade, and that unless the Canadian Pacific Railway is speedily completed, that trade will be permanently diverted from it. Let us examine this plea for a moment. We were told the other day that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be the shortest and best of all the trans-

Mr. LISTER.

continental lines, and with the easiest grades. Under these circumstances, I say that no matter what other railways may be constructed across the continent, the shippers of freight will seek the shortest and cheapest route; and whether that road is finished by 1885 or 1891 makes no difference whatever to the country. But hon. gentlemen say that, in order to attract immigration to the North-West, it is necessary that the road should be speedily constructed. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he controlled the Government, recognized the importance of making connection with the North-West Territory; and with that view he constructed the Pembina Branch, and immediately set about the construction of the Thunder Bay Branch. These two branches are running to-day, and they are the very routes by which the Canadian Pacific Railway carry all the immigration into that country. As an hon. member said the other night, no immigrants go into that country in mid-winter; they go there in summer; and the preparations which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made are such as to offer greater inducements to them than they would have if there were only an all-rail route. They point out to immigrants that they are able to avoid the tiresome journey of an all-rail route by taking the boats to Port Arthur, and there changing to the cars, to be carried on them to the great North-West. Therefore, I say, so far as immigration is concerned, that every facility which it is possible for the Company to offer to immigrants now exists; and if the speedy construction of the road is desirable, it is in the interest of the Company, and not in the interest of the country. But, Sir, do hon. gentlemen opposite think they are going to attract immigration? Do they think for one moment that they are going to induce immigrants to settle in the North-West, in the face of the fact that that country is under a grinding monopoly? Do they believe that people will go into that country, while they have before them the prospect of paying a yearly tribute to that Company of \$6 or \$7 an acre on all the land they cultivate? Do they think that immigrants are likely to settle in that country, in the face of the oppressive land regulations that exist and in the face of their uncertain administration? No, Sir; if hon. gentlemen calculate on a large immigration into the North-West, I think they will be greatly mistaken. Let us look at the past, which, perhaps, affords the best indication of what the future will likely be; and what do we find? That railway facilities have been opened up through that country for the purpose of encouraging immigration. And with what result? Let us look, for a moment, at the census statistics of the Dominion of Canada for 1881. According to them the population of Canada in 1881 was 4,324,811; and in 1871, 3,635,024, an increase in ten years of 689,787. I think every one will admit that the natural increase of population should be at the rate of 2½ per cent, which would give, as the natural increase during those ten years, 896,451. The official returns show that the number of immigrants who arrived in Canada during the last ten years was 261,205. Adding this immigration of 261,205 to the natural increase of 2½ per cent, 896,451, you have a total increase of 1,157,656; yet these census statistics show that the actual increase was only 689,787. There is thus left to be accounted for 467,869. We find in the report of the British Minister at Washington that he estimates the emigration from the United States to Canada at 64,000 in 1873. If we take up the American statistics, we will find that these 467,000, unaccounted for on our Canadian returns, have gone to the United States; or that double the number of people who have come into this country during the last ten years, from 1871 to 1881, have left and settled in the United States. Looking at the statistics for ten years, we find that each year the number of people who left for the United States was as follows:—

In 1874.....	32,690
1875.....	24,137
1876.....	22,399
1877.....	24,065
1878.....	25,490
Total.....	128,781

During the five years the late Government was in power. In the five following years, the record is as follows:—

In 1879.....	31,268
1880.....	99,706
1881.....	125,391
1882.....	98,295
1883.....	64,000
	418,660

In the first two years, 1874 and 1875, the emigration is only calculated on those who left the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, so that, according to American statistics, it showed that during those ten years 418,666 people left Canada and settled in the United States. Deducting 128,781 the emigration to the United States under the Mackenzie Administration, from the 418,660 that left in the last five years, and we have an emigration during the last five years of 289,879 over and above that which took place when the hon. member for East York was in power. It will be said these American statistics are not correct, and I am aware a gentleman named Lowe has been travelling through the western parts of the country, pretending to gather statistics for the purpose of showing what the real emigration was. I understand the way that was done. It is not necessary to repeat it here. I may also say there is a very large difference between his statistics and those furnished by the American Government; but I call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that during the years in which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was head of the Government, they were willing to take these statistics as correct. You can scarcely take up a copy of the *Montreal Gazette* and *Toronto Mail*, during 1877 and 1878, in which you will not find these hon. gentlemen saying that the country was becoming depopulated, and proving their statements from the American statistics. These statistics are proved to be correct beyond peradventure by the fact that we should have a population of 467,000 more than we have to-day, according to the natural increase in the immigration, and the American statistics show that 417,000 of our people have settled in the United States. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think they are going to attract immigration to the North-West, in face of the fact that in the United States they have competing railways and every facility is offered to the settler to make himself contented with his home? I say no, and I say that the predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite for the last two or three years have not been verified, because they have given us to understand that thousands of people would rush into the North-West and settle up the country. The returns however show that scarcely 25,000 went in there during the year 1882, and I venture to say the immigration into Manitoba during the present year is much less. I was pained to hear the hon. member for Cardwell make the reference he did the other night. Although I am prepared to admit that no hon. gentleman in this house is calculated to give a better opinion upon the spoon-feeding business than the hon. gentleman, I do not think he showed any reason in applying this epithet to the North-West. He said: "The grievances in the North-West, what are they? Hon. gentlemen opposite have manufactured most of them. The people there grumble because they have not a railway to their own doors, and are not spoon-fed by the Government." Hon. gentlemen opposite were willing to applaud this statement. The hon. member for Cardwell talked of the differences between the present time and the time when our fathers settled in this country. You can draw no

parallel at all between them. In this age, when settlers can go to almost any portion of the United States and have all the railway facilities they require, when they have telegraphs, and everything that modern civilization supplies—is it proper to say to the people of a country who have been accustomed to this state of things and have abandoned them, that they are spoon-fed people; The people of the North-West are not spoon-fed; they are suffering from real grievances; they are suffering from the high taxation imposed on them by this Government, and the railway monopoly which only reduced its rates a few months ago, because they have an application before the Government, but the moment that application is granted I venture to predict the old rates will be established. This generous Company when it wants a favour from the Government is prepared to make concessions, but when it has received that favour is equally ready to withdraw its concessions. Under these circumstances, it is not at all likely that you will be able to attract immigration to the North-West, unless you wipe out entirely the monopoly in that country. That you must do or you will never settle that country. In this nineteenth century it is monstrous to think that a Government of free men, living in a free country, can be found who will fetter the people by such a monopoly. If the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches had lived 300 years ago and had attempted to create a monopoly of that kind or any other monopoly they would have been hanged. Why, Sir, it was a penal offence in England, three hundred years ago, to attempt to create monopolies, but that law is not in existence now, and we are going back to a state of affairs which then existed, and, if we go on as we are going on now, the time will not be far distant when it will be necessary to re-enact those laws. I have a word or two to say in reference to the speeches of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe and the hon. member for King's County, New Brunswick. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) says:

"The Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1873, entered into an arrangement with Sir Hugh Allan and his associates for the construction of this railway. Sir Hugh made an effort to raise the necessary capital; but, as every one knows, he failed. He was met by much the same opposition which has turned up against the present Company, and he had also to contend with this: that the country was then a comparatively unknown wilderness."

The hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth) says:

"In 1873, it is well known that the Allan contract, so-called, was made. That contract gave 54,000,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000 to a company to build a railway from Lake Nipissing to Burrard Inlet. Everybody knows the fate of that contract. Everybody knows how it collapsed. Everybody knows the reason why it collapsed, and that we were unable to gain what all parties in the State declared was a very great object to gain, namely, a railroad to the Pacific Ocean on Canadian soil."

Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen by those speeches declared to the House and to the country that the reason why the Allan contract failed was the opposition of hon. members on this side of the House. I desire to inform those hon. gentlemen, if they do not know it, that these are not the reasons why the Allan contract failed. I desire to tell them that the Allan contract failed because of the unearthing of one of the most flagrant and revolting cases of political immorality that ever disgraced the Legislature of this country. Sir, as I stated a moment ago, I do not desire to enter into the details of that transaction—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. LISTER. If hon. gentlemen desire that I should go on, I will do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. LISTER. We know that, in the year 1873, the Government entered into a contract with Sir Hugh Allan for

the construction of that road; we know that, as a consideration for that contract, the Government of this country received from Sir Hugh Allan \$358,000; we know, as a fact, because it was proved before the Royal Commission which sat upon the case, that, in consideration of that money, he received the contract; we know that, on that account, the people of this country were so shocked at the developments that were then brought forward, that the hon. gentleman's own followers in this House—and he had a large majority—were so shocked, that they abandoned him, that they deserted him, that they were willing to place their country above their party, and the hon. gentleman, in order to escape an ignominious defeat, resigned the position he then held. These are the circumstances, these are the facts under which the Allan contract was set aside. This telegram will live as long as Canadian history is written and read—"I must have another ten thousand; last time of calling." That telegram is addressed to the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), and I have no doubt that the other \$10,000 was sent. That hon. gentleman's handiwork was to be seen throughout that contract and that arrangement, and the same hon. gentleman who then brought disgrace upon our country is here to-day, the paid solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, receiving, they say, a salary of \$12,000 a year, and he is the main manipulator in this transaction.

Mr. SPEAKER Order. I must ask the hon. gentleman not to allude to any hon. member of the House in such language.

Mr. LISTER. I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman who was then acting, the hon. gentleman to whom I have alluded as acting for the Canadian Pacific Railway, is still the solicitor for that same railway, and I have no doubt, if the original papers could be seen, it would be discovered that they are prepared by him; and, if, in 1873, that gentleman brought such disgrace upon the country, is it improbable that there is now something behind the scenes that we do not know? How is it that this matter is hurried on with such indecent haste? How is it that, in face of opposition from the people of the Lower Provinces, in face of opposition from the Province of Quebec and from all parts of the country, the Government force this on, and how is it that they will not place upon the Table of the House the information which is necessary to enable hon. members to understand this question? Why are these things? Is there but one answer? I believe the answer is that the Government are not able to resist the importunities of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that they are in the palm of the hand of the managers of that Company. Sir, these are the circumstances under which the Allan contract was lost in 1873, and, when the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was called upon to form an Administration, he at once, in 1874, passed an Act authorizing the then Government to form a company for the purpose of constructing this road. We know that he attempted to form a company, and we know that he failed, and I assert here that it was a good thing in the interests of this country that he did fail, for he then propounded a policy and followed it out which, if it had been followed by his successors in office, would have been in the interests of the country. He said: "We will construct that road as the finances of the country will warrant, and will not tax the people." But, even if the road had been given to a company to construct, what would have been the result? We find that the Act of 1874 carefully protects the settlers in the country, protects the people who might go into that country in their right to get their land, for only one-third of that land was to be given to the company, and the other two-thirds were to be held by the Government as trustees for the company, and to be sold at a

Mr. LISTER.

price of a dollar an acre. So that, if that policy had been carried out, the people who immigrated to that country then and since would have been protected in their rights to the land. But he proposed another course which was still more in the interests of the country. He proposed to construct the line by the Government as the finances of the country would warrant, and, if that had been pursued, we would have been as far advanced to-day as we are under the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Minister of Railways tells us that this is a great national undertaking. It is a great national undertaking, but it could be carried out as well by the Government as by the Company. He takes great credit to the Company for having constructed the road on the prairies in such a very short time, but every one knows, who knows anything about the construction of railways, that it is nothing at all to construct a railway through the prairie section of the country. The real work is yet to come, along the north of Lake Superior and across the Rocky Mountains. But to take credit for the construction of the 900 miles, as they have done in the space of two years, shows to what straits they are reduced. It amounts to nothing, they are not entitled to take credit for it at all. That, Sir, is the difference between the policy of the late Government and the policy of the present Government. I again state that under no circumstances, judging from the information now before the House, should the Government assist the Canadian Pacific Railway further. I say that the reasons that have so far been given us for assisting that railway, are entirely insufficient. There is nothing binding upon the Company to construct the road; if it is constructed it will be in the interests of the Company and not of the country. I say that it will not assist immigration; the danger which the hon. gentleman pointed out does not exist, namely, that of diverting the traffic; and therefore these reasons having failed, there remains no other reason why the Government should assist this Company by mixing themselves up in its private affairs, or by becoming security for the Company. I say this is quite outside the proper functions of the Government. They have no right to do it, and if they do it they will be acting wrongly; and yet, according to the Resolutions, this is what the Government proposes to do. The hon. gentlemen opposite on every conceivable occasion charge hon. members on this side of the House with being unpatriotic, because they do not agree with the policy propounded by the Government. Sir, I take it that we have heard the last of the loyalty cry. I think, Sir, that the speech of the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Brecken) is a sufficient rebuke to those who harp upon the loyalty cry. That hon. gentleman is one of the strongest supporters of the Government, but so sickening was this cry of want of loyalty, which is repeated over and over again, that that hon. gentleman could not resist quoting a remark of Dr. Johnson "that patriotism was the last refuge of a scoundrel." That hon. gentleman is one of the strongest supporters the Government has in the House to-day, yet so disgusted was he with the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite that he felt himself forced to administer to them that rebuke. Why, Sir, the man who is truly loyal is the man who points out to the Government their mistakes; the man who is truly patriotic is the man who points out the mistakes of the Government, and also points out the remedy. But, Sir, to cover up wrong with a cry of patriotism, is to commit a double crime; and I think, Sir, that it will be long before we hear this cry again from hon. gentlemen opposite. I desire to say that hon. members on this side of the House are as loyal as, and a great deal more loyal, than those of the other side, and I trust that as long as I have a seat in this House I will never hear this ostentatious cry of patriotism again. I have only one word more before I conclude. I see the hon. gentleman for King's, New Brunswick (Mr.

Foster) sitting opposite me, and I can hardly conclude without making some reference to the very eloquent speech he made the other night. Sir, I think that hon. gentleman is a most remarkable man. He told us that in the early days when he was a boy at school, and when most boys were up to mischief or anything but study, he was engaged in poring over the maps, and looking forward to the day when he would have a country that he could be proud of. Sir, it is an extraordinary thing to see that hon. gentleman grown up to manhood after he had such ideas in his youth. We are accustomed to read that good little boys always die young, and that it is only the bad boys that grow up. Sir, in conclusion I desire to say that, as a member of this House and representing a county composed of loyal and intelligent Canadians, I must strongly protest in the name of my constituents, as well as on my own behalf, against the passing of these Resolutions.

Mr. ORTON. After these Resolutions have been so exhaustively discussed during this debate it cannot be difficult for hon. members of this House to make up their minds with regard to the important points involved in the question before us. Sir, before touching upon the question generally, I wish briefly to refer to some remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lister). In the early part of his remarks he stated, with a boastful air, that the predictions of the hon. leader of the Opposition, with regard to the evils to result from the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, had been fulfilled. I think, perhaps, in the course of my remarks this evening, I shall be able to show that the beneficial results predicted for that enterprise are likely to be attained. I wish to refer to one remark of the hon. gentleman, to show how contradictory he has been in the speech he has delivered here to-day. That hon. gentleman stated, that neither he, nor, I suppose, his party, believed that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would ever come back to this House with such a monstrous request for further assistance—showing that he, at least, had no faith in the boasted prediction of his leader. The hon. gentleman has used language here to-day which is certainly of a very extravagant character, and which, I think, would better become a Communist in France, or a Nihilist in Russia. That such language should be used in this House with regard to the Government, I think is simply monstrous. When he stated that if a law had been passed by any European Government, such as that giving to the Canadian Pacific Railway a monopoly in Manitoba, the members of that Government would be hung—I think such language ought to be denounced by every candid, honest, and careful man in this country. Enough injury has already been done by agitators of the class of those who use such extravagant language, as is used by the Communists and others, and which, of course, I do not wish to attribute to my hon. friend. He then went on to state that the Government of Canada were in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and were forced to carry out their wishes and their desires, and that it was by means of that power that they had forced the present Government to come to this House and ask for this loan. Sir, I think if he had watched the course of events he would have seen why the present Government were forced by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to come to this House with these Resolutions, and in the course of my remarks I hope to be able to show him why the Company have asked for this assistance. The hon. gentleman then, in a very careless manner, referred to the fact of this Company constructing 900 miles of railway over the prairie section, as a mere nothing. Why, Sir, the construction of this immense distance by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is a feat which has never been surpassed by any other company under the sun. If he had travelled over that country

as I have done, and as he has not done, he would know that obstacles exist—that there are wide rivers to cross and valleys to fill up; and, when he recollects the character of the country from Regina, I may say, to the Rocky Mountains, especially, he must admit that the Company have had great and serious obstacles to encounter. When he recollects, also, the character of the country from Calgary to the Rocky Mountains, I think, if he had wished to deal candidly with this question, he would have acknowledged that the construction of this 900 miles by the Canadian Pacific Railway was a great and successful feat. Another question we have to consider is, will this loan entail upon this country additional taxation? I have no hesitation myself in stating as my opinion that it will not increase the taxation of the people one iota. We are not asked to vote money, to give a bonus; we are asked simply for a loan, and I think it will be time enough for hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about heavy burdens of taxation being imposed upon the people when we are brought face to face with the question as to whether this loan shall be made a bonus, or whether the Company have failed to fulfil the obligations they have undertaken, should Parliament grant this loan. Now, it has been acknowledged by quite a number of hon. members opposite, indeed it is used as an argument by those hon. gentlemen, that the very fact that this railway has proved itself a paying concern is a reason why the Company should not have come to Parliament and asked for a loan. In my opinion that is a very strong and sound reason why it will be utterly impossible that the Company can ever have any good reason to come to Parliament and ask that this should be a bonus instead of a loan, or ask for any extension of the terms granted. The security for the advance is, I think, ample. It seems to me totally absurd to talk about the want of security. Why, Sir, when we consider that we shall have as security all the money and land which the Government have granted for the construction of the road, also the portions of the railway constructed by the Government itself, besides which we shall have the branch lines which the Company have purchased, and the steam vessels which they have recently placed upon our upper lakes, and also over \$22,000,000 invested in improving the property, which of course increases the security instead of diminishing it, no man with ordinary candor can help acknowledging that the security is full and ample. Under such circumstances it is very natural to ask, why should the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with such abundant security have come to Parliament for a loan; why did they not go to the money markets of Europe and obtain the money they required? The reasons have already been enumerated, but I may be permitted again briefly to refer to them. In the first place, it may be stated that the great depression in railway securities in Europe, and especially in American securities, in consequence of the collapse, I may say, of the Northern Pacific Railway, added to which was the fact of a partial failure of crops throughout this continent, combined to form one reason, no doubt, and a strong one, why it was difficult to float the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's bonds. Another reason, and it is one which I think will bear dwelling on for some time, is the discontent which existed, and the outcry which was raised in the North-West. Having some little knowledge of that country and of what occurred there, I may be pardoned if I dwell at some little length on that subject. Sir, it is a fact that some dissatisfaction has existed, and some may still possibly exist. But the reason is not very far to seek. We know very well that the North-West has suffered a partial failure of crops, but only a very partial failure as compared with the rest of the Dominion, and only a very partial failure as compared with the United States. But the fact that a partial failure of crops in that country occurred at the very time when they had so large a surplus of good grain to dis-

pose of, and the fact that for the first time they had been brought face to face with a surplus, and that at a time when provision was not made for exportation of the surplus of the country, intensified the situation. Buyers, either millers from the eastern Provinces, or buyers for foreign export, were not in a position to go into the market of that country, and indeed, they were not thoroughly cognizant of the fact that there was actually a large surplus to dispose of. They had not warehouses ready, and the result was that the people of the North-West had to bear not only the depression caused by a partial failure of crops, but also the fact that prices were exceedingly low in consequence of the lack of accommodation. The farmers were in the hands of monopolists, two or three millers being the only buyers in that country, and they managed to club together so as to ensure that the farmer should receive as small a price as possible for his grain. That is a good and sound reason for all the dissatisfaction existing in that country. There was some dissatisfaction, no doubt, in regard to the extension of branch railways. People settled in the back districts want branch railways, and we hope they may soon have them; but that result will not be obtained by denouncing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and endeavouring to destroy its credit in the money markets of Europe. There is another point in connection with this question of dissatisfaction in Manitoba, to which it is proper to refer. I think a great deal of credit is due to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government for the prompt manner in which they came to the relief of the people of the North-West. The rates for the transportation of grain eastward to Port Arthur were promptly reduced by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Company also offered buyers the use of their warehouses and elevators at Port Arthur free of charge, so as to enable the millers of the eastern Provinces, especially of the Province of Ontario, to send there and buy grain, because it is well known that the short crop in Ontario gave rise to an increased demand on the part of millers for North-West grain. They not only did this, but they gave 30 per cent. of the ordinary rate for undamaged grain, for the transportation of grain which had been injured to any extent by frost. They also promptly endeavoured to obtain the co-operation of United States railways, to assist in getting relief to the farmers of the North-West, thus showing in the most marked way that their interests were thoroughly wrapped up with the interests of that country. But, Sir, while this was the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway, what has been the course pursued by the Grand Trunk, and the railways in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the other side of the line? We find that they used the temporary misfortunes of the farmers of the North West, in order to try to injure the reputation of that country in Great Britain and Europe. Not only do they do that, but they used political agitators in the North-West to increase the agitation, by raising cries of the most unreasonable and absurd character among the people, with regard to both the Canadian Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. These political agitators were headed by a political adventurer, who is well known to hon. gentlemen who sat in this House under the *regime* of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and who is particularly well known to the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). We all recollect what that political agitator and adventurer, who was elected by the Conservatives of Huron to represent them in this House, did, when he came to Parliament. It is also within the recollection of hon. gentlemen here, that after he was unseated for bribery and corruption, he gave way to the hon. member for West Huron; and it is said that a very valuable consideration was

Mr. ORTON.

in question. At any rate what we do know is, that the hon. member for West Huron owes his place in this House very largely, to the course, and what I call the dishonourable course, pursued by that political adventurer. I shall not say that the mission of the hon. members for West and South Huron to the North-West was to assist in pulling the wires so as to increase the flames of that agitation. I do not believe that such was the case. I believe that it was their business, in connection with their property in that country which caused them to visit our great North-West about that time. But, Sir, I do not think it would be a loss of time to refer to the intrigues of the Grand Trunk, of the railways opposed to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and of the political agitators, in order to enumerate reasons why the Canadian Pacific Railway could not float their bonds in the British or European markets. Sir, what was the result? We all know that almost every stockholder in England has Grand Trunk bonds in his possession, and such was the influence of the Grand Trunk, and of other railways, who assisted them in bringing their influence to bear on the money lenders of Europe, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were unable to float their bonds; and even when the Government of Canada came to their aid, and guaranteed their bonds at 3 per cent., they were still unable to float them. The Government were driven—not by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I would wish my hon. friend from West Lambton to bear in mind—but by this combination of circumstances, to ask the Parliament of Canada to grant a loan to the Company. It is not an uncommon thing to see times when the owners of money become so frightened that they will not invest their money in the very best securities. We have seen it the case in the past, in this country, where there is not a very large accumulation of capital, that the best securities will not be realizable; it has been the case in the United States, where there is a larger accumulation of capital. It has been the case in France, and other European countries, that the best investments could not command money, in consequence of the condition of the money market through some such "scare"—to use a common expression—as that which now seems to possess the money brokers with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway and other securities. While referring to this matter, I may be permitted to refer to what appears to me the somewhat absurd position of our present banking and financial facilities, for the purpose of showing the danger which may occur to the country, through the existence of our banking institutions in their present position, and the total dependence of the Government of Canada upon foreign money owners. I would ask hon. gentlemen, as well as the members of the Government, to consider a few facts on this point. Bismarck and the Emperor of Germany, knew well wherein lay the safety and greatness of their country. It was in delivering their country from the bondage of gold owners and gold loaners. To-day, the Emperor William of Germany has accumulated for his own use and the use of the Empire something like £40,000,000 of gold. We know that that very fact adds to the prestige and strength of the German Empire. It is also well known that the extraordinary prestige of the United States is owing not alone to the vast tracts of land, the vast resources, the great, active, and intelligent population of that country, but also to the fact that during one of the most prodigious internecine wars that has ever afflicted a nation, that country was able to do without foreign gold by issuing a currency of its own. And, Sir, were we in such a position, and not so dependent as we are to-day upon foreign gold owners, the Government of Canada would not occupy its present humiliating position. The trickery and intrigues of a Grand Trunk Company or of other rival companies could not have so impaired and impeded the policy which the Canadian people calmly and deliberately adopted in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. But, Sir, what do

we find? The Government found themselves face to face with a difficulty. They had promised the business men of Canada that by the year 1836 the Canadian Pacific Railway would be constructed from ocean to ocean, which should be a fitting adjunct to the National Policy which had been adopted for the protection of our own people, and which had been followed by the development of our manufacturing and other industries on a larger scale than before. The Government had also promised to immigrants that this road would be completed by that time for their accommodation. This promise had been proclaimed not only in Canada, but in Great Britain and in every other European country from which immigration was to be expected, and it was thought, and properly thought, to be a marvellous exhibition of the energy and vigour and vitality of the people of Canada. I say, then, that when the Government found themselves face to face with this difficulty, they could not preserve the prestige and the honour of the Canadian people had they done otherwise than come to this House and ask the representatives of the people to vote the assistance proposed, to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to carry out their contract—not in the shape of a bonus, but in the shape of a loan, until the money markets of the world possess a little more confidence in our great Canadian Pacific Railway scheme. It is well known to all commercial men in this country, that had it not been for the deposit in the banks of Canada of something like \$15,000,000 in connection with the guarantee, the depression in Canada to-day would be much more terrible than it is, and perhaps many people would have been out of employment because the banks would have been unable to give the usual accommodation to business men. And why did that occur? Partly from the fact that the enterprise of the people had been stimulated by the promise that this road would be speedily constructed. Sir, we had some experience of a depression caused by want of action, by want of that intelligent foresight which characterizes the present Government, during the dark days when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. We well recollect the intense suffering of the people of this country from 1874 to 1878. The fact of those terrible times seems to haunt the memory of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) like a horrible nightmare. He could not help referring to them when discussing this Canadian Pacific Railway question the other evening. We all remember how, out of that capacious cranium of his, he drew out the statement that a certain politician had told him that the best way to tell a story was to give a historical narrative; and in order to exemplify that precept to the House, he endeavoured to make us believe that the depression at that time was caused by the taxation imposed on this country by the reckless and insane expenditure of the Government which preceded that of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). I could not help thinking of the statement he made when he went to borrow money in England. Was he telling a historical narrative when he went to the money lenders of Great Britain and showed them the silver shield, and informed them that all the money which had been expended by the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald had been expended upon useful and remunerative public improvements? But, Sir, when he came back to Canada he told the historical narrative he stated in this House and on every platform what he stated the other night, that the debt of this country had been increased by the insane and reckless expenditure of a former Government. I could not help thinking that had he desired not to tell a historical narrative he would have referred to the reckless and insane expenditure on Port Francis Locks, on the Goderich Harbour, on steel rails and other reckless expenditure which has entailed heavy burdens on the people and which to-day would be depressing us in a very marked manner had it

not been for the success of the policy adopted by the present Government. I shall just refer to another point in reply to this question, whether it is wise and in the interest of Canada that this road should be built in the slow manner in which it would be constructed were this loan not given. I will take first the interests of the Province of Ontario. Although I do not think it necessary to refer particularly to any one Province in this connection because I believe that what will benefit all the Provinces is in the interest of each, still what would be the result as regards Ontario it is not difficult to ascertain. We all recollect very well that from the pressure brought to bear by the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway had very nearly fallen into the hands of that road and thus the Grand Trunk Railway threatened the people of this country with a huge monopoly. We know well that Ontario has given large bonuses from every important municipality for competing roads; we recollect the eloquence with which the hon. leader of the Opposition in the Local House introduced the railway resolutions there and the unanimity with which people endorsed his action. What was the most cogent reason for these Resolutions? It was that we might get opposition to the Grand Trunk Railway. I was rather astonished that the hon. member for North Wellington who lives in a town where he ought to know the importance of keeping up two lines of railway instead of one—in a town where his own fellow citizens have voted immense sums of money in order to have not only the Grand Trunk Railway but the Canadian Pacific—now the Toronto, Grey and Bruce—take the line of argument he did. To show that this is followed keenly by the people of Ontario, I will just read an extract from a letter which I received previous to the bringing down of the previous Resolutions—previous to the time the Government stated what assistance they were going to give the Canadian Pacific Railway. This gentleman who is largely engaged in business in my county writes:

"I hope some scheme will be devised to push to completion the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1886 as Canada would be under a cruel master if left to the tender mercies of the Grand Trunk Railway. I hope whatever may be done will be a scheme to complete the whole road at once."

We well know what was the result of the absorption by the Grand Trunk Railway of the Great Western. We all know that no sooner was that done than up went the rates all through Ontario. That means that every farmer in Ontario has to pay a higher rate for the transportation of his grain to the markets of the world; and had the Grand Trunk succeeded in absorbing the Canadian Pacific Railway and thus have obtained a monopoly of the whole business of the West, every farmer in the North-West would be obliged to receive five to ten cents per bushel for his grain less than he otherwise would; it meant, in fact, destruction to the prosperity of the North-West. What has the policy of the Grand Trunk Railway been in the past? Have they ever shown their gratitude to the Canadian people for having loaned them \$15,000,000 of money? While referring to this I wish to state that I believe the people of Canada themselves desire to uphold the honour and integrity of our country—that it is just as important we should be considered honest abroad and an upright people in Parliament assembled as in our general business transactions—that we should try and perpetuate the name and the fame which made England so great, the honesty and the uprightness of her merchants. These qualities characterize the people of Canada. I do not wish to be too harsh in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, I know the people of Great Britain did give us their money—the monied men of Europe gave us their money to construct this road and expected to get large returns; but when we recollect the reckless manner in which that money was expended, when we recollect that to-day many of the large monied men of this country owe their fortunes to the reck-

less manner in which that money was expended, when we recollect that that road cost per mile no less than \$130,000, without any difficulties to contend with as on the North Shore of Lake Superior and in the Rocky Mountains—when we recollect these facts we must conclude that it would be unfair to ask the people to suffer for all time to come for the reckless expenditure in connection with the construction of that road, nor do I believe that the men who originally invested the money in the Grand Trunk Railway would be benefited, even should this House refuse to loan the \$22,000,000, to the Canadian Pacific Railway. While, however, desiring, as I believe every honest man does, that the Grand Trunk Railway should prosper by doing all the legitimate business it can, I think it is unfair to ask the people of Canada to pay for their unwise expenditure. Further than that, the Grand Trunk Railway have to blame themselves a good deal if the people of Ontario and the people of the other provinces do not view their rule in Canada with the feeling with which they perhaps otherwise would view it. On every occasion they were ready to put up the rates sometimes to an enormous extent. You may talk about the water competition between Toronto and Montreal, but we know that as soon as that is locked up, the Company nearly double their rates. I had some experience myself of this in business. We also know, as is known to all the business men in Ontario, that they not only do that, but they give preference to their own favourites engaged in business. It is true we had last year a large body of the business men of Ontario brought down here, but I repeat what I said then before the Railway Committee, that more than half of these men were brought down because they dared not stay at home. I was told by numbers of men engaged in business, who have suffered gross and great wrongs from the Grand Trunk Railway, and yet they were afraid to stay at home. Some did stay at home, though—a good many. They were urged, and urged in a way that was not very delicate, at any rate, to come here. Then, Sir, ought they not to blame themselves for destroying as much as they have the effects of the National Policy on the farming interests of Ontario. What are the facts to-day? Notwithstanding that 50 cents a barrel was put on flour under the Tariff, and 15 cents on wheat, still, through the privileges they have given to American farmers over Canadian farmers, in moving their produce, the duty of 50 cents per barrel on flour is comparatively nugatory. Why, I find that they give a rate from St. Louis to Montreal of 42 cents per barrel for flour, while from the town of Guelph in my county they charge 45 cents per barrel for flour. Their rate from Chicago is also cheaper than that from the city of Guelph. In this way, as I say, they have ever disregarded the vital interests of the people of my Province, and also of the people of other Provinces, and to-day they find themselves face to face with the fact that the people have come to the conclusion that it would be the most dangerous thing that could ever occur to the people of Canada were the Grand Trunk Railway to become the owners of the Canadian Pacific Railway. And there are other reasons why Ontario desires the construction of this road, and the completion of it as rapidly as possible. Reference has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to that portion of the road through the Rocky Mountains, and they have stated that that might be delayed. They made very little reference to another difficult portion of that road—that portion between Thunder Bay and Callander, north of Lake Superior. The people of Ontario think it of vital importance to their interests that they should have railway communication with the North-West as rapidly as possible. They have been promised it. They expect the fulfilment of that promise. They have gone into manufacturing enterprises in anticipation of the fulfilment of these promises. And the people of Manitoba also desire to

Mr. ORTON.

see that portion constructed as rapidly as possible, in order that they may have communication during the winter with the Province of Ontario. They know very well that the grain they produce in Manitoba and the North-West is peculiarly suitable for flouring purposes—makes the best flour in the world,—and they also know well that many millers in Ontario are most anxious to obtain that wheat to manufacture it into flour. Therefore, their interests and Ontario's interests are wrapped up in the rapid completion of that road, and it appears to me astonishing that any member from the Province of Manitoba should for a moment hesitate in regard to his course in this matter. While referring to Ontario's interests in this light, I may just draw the attention of the Government to one fact. It is stated that the connection between Ontario and the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be made by the construction of a road from Gravenhurst to Callander. Now, it has been pointed out to me by others, and it appears to me to be a very good idea—why should not that connection be with Sudbury Junction instead of with Callander? A saving would be made of some fifteen or twenty miles—some say thirty or forty, but I think it would be at least twenty miles. That would be a great saving and a great benefit in the long run both to the manufacturers in Ontario and to the wheat-growers in the North-West, and I think the Government should bear in mind that point. I think my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition should hesitate before he finally, and for ever, I may say, casts in his lot—because he cannot be considered as doing anything else—with those who desire to place us under one huge monopoly. I think it would be the gravest mistake he had ever made in his life. I recollect that, some years ago, I had the honour of a visit from that hon. gentleman in my riding, and that his meetings were advertised throughout the length and breadth of my riding, and the whole county and the neighbouring counties, and in the notice he was called "Big Edward—Canada's greatest statesman." I recollect well the thousands of people who assembled to hear that hon. gentleman at a time when the hon. member for East York was in power, and I recollect how very enthusiastic they were in regard to the future course that hon. gentleman would take, and the reforms he would inaugurate, had he the opportunity, in this country. It does appear to me to be a humiliating conclusion of his career when we find him to-day the advocate—I do not apply that term in the sense of the paid advocate or the legal adviser, but the advocate in Parliament—of the policy pursued by the Grand Trunk Railway, which means the absorption of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the creating of one huge railway monopoly in this country. There could be no excuse for him; there is no possible way in which he could apologize for such a course, except one, and that is that it might possibly be a way—but it would be a very expensive way of doing it—of bringing about what so many people desire, that the railways of Canada should be run by the Government of Canada. I hope that he will consider well, and hesitate, and try, at any rate to wash off a stain which, whether with truth or not, has attached to his party, or to some leaders of his party, the reputation, I may say, that they are ready on every occasion that presents itself to sell the best interests of their country—I do not refer in that manner to any hon. Member of this House, I would not do so, but to others outside, to some of the strong wire pullers, of whom it has been said, I do not say correctly, that they are ready at any moment to sell their country, to sell the most vital interests of their country, for the success of their party, in order to get their party into power. I hope that the hon. gentleman will try, by his course on this question, to disabuse the minds of the public of that impression. Sir, before sitting down I desire to refer to a paragraph in the *Globe* newspaper. It has been said that

the *Globe* is the paid organ of the Grand Trunk Railway, and that it shapes the policy of the Reform party; I do not believe that, because, if it were true, it would make the Reform party simply the political advocates of the Grand Trunk Railway—which I do not believe. However, in that paper of Friday last, February 15th, is a striking article headed "Is it a crisis?" It refers to an article in the *Minerve* from which it quotes as follows:—

"Before we even enquire if it is right to grant so large a sum, we wish to know what will be left for ourselves. If the financial position will not permit of both, then, indeed, do we insist that the Pacific has not better rights than we have, and it shall wait with us or step behind us."

Then the editor goes on to remark on the above:

"If there is one point upon which the French Conservatives pride themselves, it is a devotion to their own provincial rights, and it is not improbable that they may take a firm stand against Sir John on this occasion. If they choose to do so they can be the means of saving the Dominion from an appalling calamity."

I suppose the calamity here meant is the remaining in power of the Conservative party.

"Why cannot they unite with the French Liberals for once in assisting Mr. Blake to stem the tide that threatens to overwhelm us all, and after that national danger is averted, let them state their grievances with confidence that no wrong shall be done them."

Now, Mr. Speaker, our French fellow countrymen know the interests of their Province better than I do, and it would be improper for me to speak of them. But, Sir, as an admirer of my French fellow countrymen I cannot help regarding that article as one of the greatest and grossest insults that have ever been offered to the French people of this country. Sir, I have been taught, and properly taught, to look upon our French fellow countrymen as loyal to the best interests of this country. We know that they have proved themselves such on many trying occasions, ever since Canada became a dependency of Great Britain. I have always looked upon them, and still look upon them, in the same light, and shall ever do so, as ready to fight for the best interests of this country, either by taking up arms or otherwise. I have always felt, Sir, that they are an honourable and a chivalrous race, a race that would rather die than sacrifice their honour; therefore I regard such an article as the grossest insult that could be offered to the honour of the French people. Sir, when we find in the newspaper organ which is supposed to be the exponent of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, such an article as I have just read, it is enough to make any honourable and honest man feel the greatest contempt for men who would for a moment condescend to such a policy as that indicated in the words I have just read. Sir, before resuming my seat I wish to refer to one point to which my hon. friend for West Lambton alluded, namely, the exodus to the United States. I was sorry to hear him do what his *confères* on the other side of the House have so often been doing—trying to run down this country. If he had made himself familiar with the facts he would have known that an investigation has been made at Port Huron with regard to the actual exodus from this country, and that instead of the 80,000, or 100,000, that we have been accustomed to hear the hon. gentlemen opposite speak of, there has not been during the last three years an average exodus from this country of more than 4,000. This has been satisfactorily and conclusively proven after the most careful investigation. There are one or two other points in connection with the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway which I think are worthy of the attention of the House; one is the fact which has been brought to our attention this afternoon. Upon the notice paper there was an enquiry with regard to the use of the Mounted Police in quelling Indian troubles in British Columbia. Now, Sir, we know that in case of a large influx of white population into that country there is a possibility of the Indians, who are very numerous in British Columbia, giving trouble. Now, if any trouble of that kind occurred

is it not wise, and is it not in the interest of the Dominion, in view of these possible difficulties, that this railway should be pushed on as rapidly as possible to completion so as to give us easy communication into that country? Then there is another point worth considering—the bonding system which we now have and by which we can transport our goods from Canada to Manitoba and the North-West, which is a privilege granted to us by the United States under the Washington Treaty. In two years from this we expect that the people of the United States, through their representatives, will come to us and ask for a reconsideration of the terms of the agreement between that country and Canada, including this matter, amongst others. Well, Sir, if the Canadian Pacific Railway is not constructed in two years, we shall again have to ask them as a favour to give us the bonding system to enable us to take our goods through the United States to Manitoba and the North-West; whereas, if this loan is granted, and that road is completed in two years, when the Americans come to us to negotiate another treaty, we shall not be obliged to ask them for a renewal of bonding facilities. Sir, it does seem to me that when we consider that these Resolutions propose to give a loan and not a bonus; when we consider that we are not asked to expend any money that we are not likely to get full return for; when we consider that at a time when Canada was comparatively poor, when her revenue was very small, we loaned the Grand Trunk Railway \$15,000,000, and have not yet received a cent of it back; when we recollect that the request for a loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway of twenty-two and a half millions is a mere bagatelle compared with the loan made during our financial weakness to the Grand Trunk Railway, then, Sir, I think we need have no hesitation about acceding to the proposals of the Government. I recollect that only a few years ago the United States Government gave something like \$70,000,000 for Alaska, a country of ice and snow, without any agricultural lands, and they considered they had got a very cheap bargain. When we regard the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a means of developing our vast North-West with its millions upon millions of acres of the richest arable soil of the world, where wheat can be grown to greater perfection than in any other country under the sun, it appears paltry on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to offer such opposition to the proposed loan. In conclusion, it is my opinion that the interests of the Dominion as a whole, the interests of every province, and the prestige and honour of Canada unite to call upon every candid member of this House who desires to serve his country to vote for the Resolutions now under consideration.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at what may be called this late stage of the discussion, to enter minutely into the arguments that have been advanced by hon. members on the other side of the House. In fact, Sir, when a question, however important it may be, has been discussed for three or four nights in succession, all that can fairly be said on either side of the question has been said. I agree to some extent with what the Minister of Railways said some nights ago in answering the speech made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) that the debate was practically closed the night on which the hon. gentleman submitted his proposition to the House. The debate was practically ended at the close of the able, I may say the magnificent, speech delivered by the hon. member for West Durham. So far as I have been able to gather, and I have listened with some considerable attention to what has been said on both sides of the House, no hon. gentleman on the other side of

the House has undertaken to grapple with the mass of facts and figures submitted to the House by that hon. member. That being the case, I agree with the hon. Minister that the debate was then practically closed, and those of us who have the misfortune to discuss the question at a long subsequent stage always labour under the disadvantage that the ground has been thoroughly gone over, the arguments fully and fairly adduced upon both sides of the House. Sir, I do not propose to discuss at length the arguments advanced by all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken from the Government side of the House. If the position assumed by the Minister of Railways is met and answered, if the prophecies and predictions which that able and eloquent gentlemen made to the House in 1880-81, when he was submitting his original proposition respecting the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway are answered, every speech which has been made in the House by hon. gentlemen who have followed him has been answered; because, Sir, every speech made in the House by gentlemen who have followed him has been answered, because they did nothing more than regularly repeat what the hon. gentleman said, and just as regularly weakened what the hon. gentleman said. Now, Sir, I have only a word or two to say to the hon. gentleman who preceded me. I shall not undertake to answer his arguments, or to controvert the position he laid down, I am not going to discuss the banking system of the country to-night; I am not going to deal with the propriety of establishing banks for farmers; I am not going to say very much about the nature of the soil from Brandon to the summit of the Rocky Mountains discussed by the hon. gentleman; and, therefore, I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in his so called line of argument. One thing he did say, which I wish to controvert. You, Sir, will recollect that my able predecessor in the representation of South Huron was characterized by the hon. gentleman as a political fraud, a political humbug, a political adventurer, and the hon. member stated that to that gentleman was largely due the measure of discontent which now prevails in the North-West Territory. Sir, I did not know that my friend, Mr. Greenway, had such extraordinary influence in that country that he could mould and shape political opinion to the extent described by the hon. gentleman. I have known Mr. Greenway for many years; he was for many years opposed to me in politics, but I say it is an outrage on common decency to say that he was either a political fraud, or a political adventurer. I say further, in answer to the charge made by the hon. gentleman, that Mr. Greenway was elected as a Conservative, and that he came down to Parliament and supported the Liberal party—I say, in justice to Mr. Greenway, that he was not elected as a Conservative, but as an Independent—elected to give his voice and his vote in favour of the party which in his judgment would best carry on public affairs in the interest of the country. He came to Parliament and saw and heard for himself, and having seen and heard, he saw fit to cast in his lot with the Liberal party. Many great men have changed in their politics. My hon. friend, the always bland and smiling hon. Minister of Finance, changed his politics—many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have changed their politics. I do not think it is any reflection on a man's honesty or ability that he has changed his politics. There is no greater fool than the man who never learns. Mr. Greenway learned to do what is right, and the only difference between him and the hon. Minister of Finance is that the latter learned to do what is wrong. I cannot pass on to the discussion of the question before the House, without congratulating hon. gentlemen on the other side, on the marvellous harmony which appears to reign supreme on the Ministerial benches—the singular unanimity of sentiment which appears to exist between the different members of the Government, and the

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

different organs of the Government outside of Parliament. One is curious to know, Sir, whether the old spirit of rivalry which used to exist between the Secretary of State and my always esteemed and able friend the Minister of Public Works—whether these political battles, and political duels, which formed the little side warfare of the Government have all been settled—whether they are all harmonized, and in thorough sympathy with each other. Perhaps they are; but it is quite clear that they have not been able to reconcile the expression of opinion of the party organs outside, with the expressions of opinion by the hon. gentlemen themselves. One would gather from what my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) said the other night; that the little difficulties are not all yet settled. One would rather be inclined to believe from the thunders of denunciation which one hears occasionally from the Canadian House of Peers, and re-echoed from the public platform, respecting the actions and conduct of the Secretary of State, that all these little difficulties are not yet reconciled. Sir, the hon. gentleman, however, sits there, he occupies a seat as a member of the Government on the Treasury benches, notwithstanding all these rivalries and jealousies, notwithstanding the denunciations of the public press controlled by himself, he sits there like a fly in amber and one wonders how the mischief he is there. There, however, he sits, as a Minister of the Crown. Now, Sir, I have always admired the genius, the ability, and the power of controlling men, which are possessed by the First Minister. It is one of those traits in his character which is unparalleled in the history of any other man in this wide Dominion. But I think the hon. gentleman has a little difficulty just now. His colleagues may be submissive, they may yield when the proper kind of pressure is brought to bear upon them by the right hon. gentleman, they may lend an unwilling hand to him in carrying out the different schemes he may see fit to devise, but still, I think, the hon. gentleman has a difficult task before him. He has not been sleeping on a bed of roses for the last four weeks, nor has he after the labours of the day sunk quietly into the arms of Morpheus during that period. How could he, with the Secretary of State on one side, and the Minister of Public Works on the other, with *La Minerve* and *Le Monde*, in the great Province of Quebec, denouncing the Ministry as dishonest and the Minister of Railways as an utterly incapable Minister. The hon. gentleman has his difficulties, as I have said; he has difficult material to deal with, I sympathize and with him. He has got the fighting member for Cumberland, he has got the always bland and suave gentleman who is called the honest Minister of Finance. He has got the handsome man from London, and he has got the gallant man from the county of Quebec, as well as the not very handsome and not very gallant man from the great county of Compton. Then he has the Minister of Public Works, and the Secretary of State, and I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, if they do not make up quite a museum of curiosities. He has birds there of rare and noble plumage, both alive and stuffed. Then he has the organs of his party denouncing him, and pronouncing the Minister of Railways incapable. I do not agree with the organs in that respect. I say that the Minister of Railways is quite capable—that he is always able to take care of himself, and does take care of himself. I repeat that I do not agree with the organs of the party in saying that the Minister of Railways is incapable, or that he has exhibited his incompetency in the Resolutions which have been submitted to the House. But these are not the only disturbing elements—in fact one looks round and finds nothing but disturbing elements. For instance, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier threw a bomb-shell into the ranks of the happy family the other night. Let me tell my hon. friend that it is a dangerous thing to carry dynamite about him when he comes into Parliament. It is an explosive substance, and it may explode inopport-

tunely and destroy his friends. The hon. gentleman's speech the other night was a living illustration of this. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you had the good fortune to occupy the place I did the other night while my hon. friend was pointing out—honestly pointing out—the anomalous position in which the Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau) was placed, with the organ that he owns and controls denouncing the Government in the strongest possible language for the proposition submitted by the hon. Minister of Railways to the House—I say if you had sat in my place, and glanced at the countenances of the Secretary of State and the First Minister, you would have agreed with me that they were a study for a physiognomist. Why, a photographer would have made a fortune if he had caught the profiles of these hon. gentlemen at that particular moment; and Barnum, I venture to say, would have given millions for the picture, because “there were millions in it.” My hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Brecken) is another dynamite carrier, and, in his burst of fervid eloquence the other night, he threw a bombshell into the ranks of his friends which they did not like a bit; it did not rebound on this side of the House as intended, but remained on the other side where it properly belongs. Now, let us see what is the result of all this little wrangling, this little struggling, this little quarrelling. While we are here, listening to the differences of opinion between the members of the Government, while they are airing their grievances and washing a portion of their dirty linen before Parliament, what are the members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company doing? They, Sir, are quietly looking on from the gallery at the duel that is being fought on the floor of Parliament—happy, satisfied, and contented with their position, because they know perfectly well that they have got matters in such a shape that it is difficult for them to lose. Sir, like Iago in the play, they may well say: “Whether Cassio kills Roderigo, or Roderigo kills Cassio, or each kills the other,” the Railway Company must win. That is just the position those men occupy, and they look on the scene below contented and calm and satisfied. Now, Sir, when engaged in a debate of this kind, one expects to hear arguments that are pertinent to the question. I submit this proposition to you, Mr. Speaker, as an independent member: did you in your long parliamentary experience, ever hear a great question discussed on the floor of Parliament, when the Liberal party joined issue with the Conservative party, when the Liberal party pointed out what they believed to be some job on the part of gentlemen on the other side of the House, and gentlemen on the other side of the House attempted to defend the job, when the Liberal party undertook to expose some alleged or actual fraud perpetrated by the Government and the Government undertook to defend or justify that fraud, when legislation was being forced through Parliament which was dangerous to the best interests of the country and the Liberal party pointed out that danger, and gentlemen on the other side of the House defended it—I say, did you ever hear the Government, on such occasions as these, when they felt that the charges made by the Liberal party were unanswerable, and that their statements could not be controverted—I say did you ever hear the Government answer charges of that kind except by taking the one old ground, by raising the one old cry of disloyalty and the want of patriotism? Now, Sir, I know from your experience of the last twelve or fourteen years, that you must agree with me, that upon almost every occasion, and under all possible circumstances, the one argument put forward by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House was the argument of disloyalty. If anything is bad in their policy, and you point it out, you are unpatriotic; if anything is fraudulent and you expose it, you are unpatriotic; if you do not agree with some particular line of their policy, you are unpatriotic. Now, I

want once for all to show the fallacy of this line of argument. I do not lay it down as a rule that one party should be credited with patriotism because that party finds fault with the policy of the other party; but I say that if there is one party in Canada justly entitled to be charged with want of patriotism and with disloyalty, it is not the party that sits on this side of the House. Now, I propose to deal with this matter for a few minutes. I do not say that it has any particular bearing on the question before Parliament, except as illustrating the relative position of the Liberal and Conservative parties—the one exposing, the other defending misconduct and mismanagement. Sir, if our speaking of the necessities of the great North-West, if our pointing out the faults of the Government in initiating and carrying out their policy in that country, if our criticising that policy is a want of patriotism, then I think some of us are open to that charge. Sir, I am going to deal with this question somewhat exhaustively, and I am going to bring the charge of a want of patriotism home to the doors of hon. gentlemen opposite. If they will not admit what I say with the mouth, I intend to make them admit it in their hearts. I do not lay down a proposition that I cannot establish to your entire satisfaction and to the satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), for whom I entertain great respect, whose judgment is usually sound, and who is a man of intellect, was not above using this argument. I was much pleased with the opening speech of the Minister of Railways on these Resolutions, because for the first time in his life, he omitted to charge the Opposition with a want of patriotism. He was moderately civil, he was not aggressive, but behaved himself reasonably well, and his speech, on the whole, was a speech which surprised me, coming from the hon. gentleman. But I knew exactly what kind of a man he was, and I know that he was lying low, and that it would not be long before the dynamite exploded. It came when my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) moved his motion for information. I saw the hon. gentleman nursing his wrath, to keep it warm, and then, Sir, we had the old story, repeated over again, of want of patriotism. We had the same old argument, the hon. gentleman knows so well how to use, when he desires to arouse the enthusiasm of his followers. I hoped, I expected that this discussion would have been carried on without any recrimination of that kind, but the hon. gentleman followed the example of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, and, of course, every other hon. member from the other side down to the hon. member for Centre Wellington, took precisely the same course. Let us see what the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe said on that occasion and what justification he had for making the statement he did. He said:

“I maintain that the opposition which has been directed by hon. gentlemen opposite against this enterprise has directly tended to depreciate the securities of the Company and to prevent capitalists from investing in these securities. That opposition, also, has the tendency to prevent immigration to this country—not that hon. gentlemen opposite intended it should, for I do not believe that, wittingly, they could take so unpatriotic a course—but the course they have taken has had that direct result. How have the members of the Liberal party in this House prevented capitalists from buying stock? They have done so by exaggerating the cost of the construction of the railway; by under-estimating the area of the fertile portion of the country; by magnifying the extent of the mountain portion; by telling us, day after day, that British Columbia is a sea of mountains; by minimizing the volume of emigration; by magnifying the so-called exodus, and by under-estimating the probable receipts from the sale of lands in the North-West. How have they prevented immigration to this country? They have done so by preaching that such high rates are charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway, under the monopoly clause, and that such high rates will be charged by that Company, that it is a matter of indifference to any one going into that country whether he raises a good or a poor crop; they have done so by preaching that the Government land regulations in the North-West are so unjust that it is impossible for immigrants to prosper under them, and that those who go there invariably leave for Dakota and Minnesota; and they have done so by lauding the beauties of Dakota and the delights of Texas.”

I ask the hon. gentleman, if he is in the House to-night, or the hon. Minister of Railways: when and on what occasion did the Liberal party, as a party, exaggerate the cost of the railway? Why, if we ever exaggerated the costs, the fault is the hon. gentleman's. We took our figures from the hon. gentleman's own statement and from the reports of his engineers; and if there is any exaggeration in the matter, as the hon. gentleman from Richmond and Wolfe says there is, the responsibility rests on the shoulders of the hon. Minister and his officials, and not upon ours. When did we under-estimate the area of fertile land in the great North-West?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to tell him when the party to which he belongs exaggerated the cost of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. CAMERON. Go on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will refer the hon. gentleman to the Budget Speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance of the late Government in 1874, where he will find that that hon. gentleman estimated the cost of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway within ten years, at from \$150,000,000 to \$160,000,000.

Mr. CAMERON. That may be so, but the hon. gentleman conveniently forgets to add that the whole circumstances of the country have changed since then. In 1874, the hon. gentleman valued the picked lands in the North-West Territory at from \$1 to \$5 an acre. What does he value them at now? If his valuation then was correct, how much is he giving the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build this road? He is giving them nearly \$200,000,000. The hon. gentleman went back to the Budget Speech of 1874. I do not go back that far. I do not care much about that sort of ancient history, except as it bears on the hon. gentleman's policy to-day. To-night I propose to satisfy the hon. gentleman on that point, before I get through with this branch of the case. I challenge the hon. gentleman again to point out the circumstances under which the Liberal party at any time depreciated the value or extent of the fertile belt. The hon. gentleman knows well—if he does not he ought to know—that the Liberal party in Canada were always strong advocates of the acquisition of the North-West. Why? Was it because the lands were not fertile enough for settlement? Because the country was unfit for immigrants? No; we advocated its acquisition because we believed the lands to be boundless and fertile, because we believed we had only to open up that country in order to encourage the tide of emigration from the Mother Country, and the great countries of population in Europe, to flow in and develop our great North-West.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman like me to answer his challenge now?

Mr. CAMERON. If the hon. gentleman will just remain quiet for a while—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will answer the challenge of the hon. gentleman now and give him day and date.

Mr. CAMERON. I see I have touched upon a raw point but I am not going to be driven from my line of argument by interruptions. I am not going to skin the hon. gentleman altogether, but I will give him enough to answer before I get through, and he will have an opportunity of answering me when the time comes. I ask him again, I ask it now, and I want the hon. gentleman to answer me, not by vain declamation, not by general assertions, to name the time and place where and the language in which the Liberal party ever depreciated the extent, the value, or fertility of the soil of the great North-West. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe said we

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

minimized the number of immigrants that had gone into that country. When did we minimize them? The Minister of Railways has said that in thirteen years, 214,000 people had gone into the North-West. I tell hon. gentlemen now that had it not been for their policy, a policy calculated to retard the growth and progress of the country, a policy which has retarded its growth by at least twenty years, the population, instead of being 214,000 in the last thirteen years, would have reached 1,000,000 to-day, and if we have not got the population there to-day that we should have, it is simply because the Government have so mismanaged and misgoverned that country that immigrants will not go there. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe said that we magnified the exodus. Did he read the letter published by a professor in one of the Winnipeg colleges, some time ago, pointing out that he had visited Dakota, and stating the number of Canadians he had found there? I suppose the hon. gentleman has read it. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do—he cannot ignore the fact—that the exodus has not and cannot be magnified. Unfortunately for the interests of our people and the interest of the Great North-West, it has been very large. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe goes on to say:

"Then, Sir, besides the opposition of hon. members in this House, there has been the opposition of the Liberal press, which has been iterating and reiterating the arguments of hon. members in this House, of the points I have mentioned, and, being under less restraint, have gone one better, and have given the world the earliest information of blizzards and droughts and frosts in the North-West; and for fear that the world would not observe these reports, they have always given them a prominent place on the first page, and have drawn attention to them by heavy head-lines. Besides, there has been the publication of bogus experiences of supposititious individuals in the North-West; and these have been cut out and sent to a foreign press, subsidized for the purpose of discrediting the country and discrediting the Canadian Pacific Railway."

The hon. member for Cardwell had a hand in it too, but I do not think he improved the situation very much. He charged the Liberal members and press with precisely the same conduct. If the country has been decried, its advantages minimized, if immigrants have not entered it with the rapidity and in the numbers we would all like to see, I charge hon. gentlemen opposite with being the cause. I charge their policy and their conduct for the last five years as being the direct cause of any misfortunes—if misfortunes there be—that have overtaken the North-West. If the property of this gigantic corporation has been lessened in value, if they have not been able to sell their stock in the markets of the world, I charge hon. gentlemen opposite, by the policy they have pursued, by their utterances in the past and their conduct in the present, with being the cause. I make this charge against hon. gentlemen opposite, and I propose to prove it out of their own mouths. Sir, everybody knows in Canada the distinguished position that the First Minister occupies. Before he took his seat this evening, I was complimenting him in the highest possible strain upon the wonderful power which he possessed over men, and in the moulding of men's minds, and in securing their allegiance to his own train of thought. That hon. gentleman is known not simply in Canada. He is known abroad as a distinguished gentleman. He has been honoured by our gracious sovereign with a distinction conferred upon few men. He is a Privy Councillor and a Knight of the Bath. He is known in Canada—too well. He is known in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. His name there is as familiar as household words, and every word that hon. gentleman utters on the floor of Parliament, or in the public arena, or on the public platform, is wafted across the ocean to the other side of the waters, and there finds a place in the public press of the country. I say, therefore, that the words that hon. gentleman makes use of, if they are in the interests of the country, if they praise up and laud the

country, have their full weight and effect there; and, if they deery the country, if they deery the public men in the country, they have their full effect there; and, when you find a public man holding that position, with all the responsibility that rests upon his shoulders, holding the distinguished position he does, giving utterance to the sentiments which I shall read to you, I think any unprejudiced man will come to the conclusion that he has done nothing to build up the reputation of the country. In 1878, speaking as the leader of the Opposition, he said:

"We have no manufactures here. We have no work-people here. Our work-people have gone off to the United States. These Canadian artisans are adding to the strength, to the power, and to the wealth of a foreign nation, instead of adding to our own."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON. There is the utterance of the hon. gentleman. He repeats the same now. What cares he whether his statements benefit the country at home or abroad, so long as he can serve a petty, paltry political purpose by them? Nothing; and that is the spirit that actuates hon. gentlemen opposite. He goes on, in the same speech, to laud the United States of America as a fine country to live in, the people all prosperous, the artisans all employed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They had a National Policy.

Mr. CAMERON. Then he compares it with the picture on this side of the line.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Surely he did not say that?

Mr. CAMERON. He did say it. You will find it all in *Hansard*. My curious friend will find it all there. "On the other hand," he said, "our people are suffering from want of employment. Have not their cries risen up to heaven?"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON. Now, there are the patriotic utterances of the patriotic First Minister. When his opponents were sitting on the Treasury benches and he was languishing in the cold shades of opposition, he did not think anything about patriotism then. All he wanted was to have a slap at my hon. friend the then leader of the Government and my hon. friend the member for South Huron.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I wanted to carry the National Policy, and did carry it.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, he wanted to carry the National Policy, and in order to do so he was prepared to sacrifice his country. He was prepared to sacrifice the best interests of the country. What cared he? His purpose was served. He so managed to blindfold and draw the wool over the eyes of the people for the time being, he so managed to manipulate men and political movements, as to effect his purpose. And in order to effect that purpose it was wholly immaterial to him whether he ruined his country or not. Nothing cared he. But that was not all that he said. The hon. gentleman proceeded:

"The hon. gentlemen opposite sneered at the statements that thousands of our people had left this country to seek for employment in the United States. Let anybody look at the *Gazette*. Let anyone look at the number of insolvencies in Montreal, at the daily account of bankruptcies in Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa and other places, sufficient to disturb and affect the honest traders who suffer from the insolvency of their neighbours by the sacrifice by assignees of insolvents' assets, in the same manner as so many are ruined by this country being made the slaughter market of the United States."

There again, for the purpose of party, he was prepared to sacrifice the best interests of this country. So, again, he is followed—followed in this case; usually led—by the Minister of Railways. In denunciation and abuse, the Minister of Railways follows nobody—he is always first. Now, the

Minister of Railways is a pure patriot. From the first day he entered political life in his native Province of Nova Scotia up to the day when he was decorated with the distinguished honour of a cross upon his breast, the hon. gentleman has been a pure patriot, never did anything but for the interests of the country, sacrificed himself and his relations to the fourth generation in the interests of the country. Let us see what he said in 1878:

"The policy the Government has pursued has had the effect of depopulating the country; it has sent away the most skilled and intelligent labourers, the finest sons of Canada to a foreign country, to obtain employment that their own country denies them."

The hon. the First Minister was equally patriotic on another occasion. You have heard, Mr. Speaker, of the Amphitheatre. That was a great political arena, where the lions of party were let loose at each other. The lion of the camp of the Tories occasionally visited the place, and made more than one speech there, and he was not particularly choice or select in his language. Let me read an extract from a speech of the First Minister delivered in that Amphitheatre in Toronto:

"Why, is not our population leaving the country? (Cries of 'No' and 'Yes,' and 'A Voice—' They are coming back every day.') It is said that this is a cheap country to live in. Property is becoming so valueless that you can purchase property for comparatively nothing, and the shrinkage is so great that a man who thinks himself wealthy one year finds that he is unexpectedly poorer the next. I ask whether wages have not fallen; and the value of property fallen? Whether there has not been a decrease in the population—whether there has not been an increase in the number of insolvencies? The young men full of skill, full of energy and enterprise, have been compelled to leave the country; to go where such skill, energy and enterprise is better rewarded and more protected than here."

The hon. gentleman was followed, at a respectful distance, by the *Mail* newspaper, the organ of the Government. Let me read an extract from its columns to show what these patriotic gentlemen, encouraged by their patriotic organ, said of the condition of the country, at a time when it was just as prosperous as it is to-day:

"Our factories are going one by one, our population leaving us, our finances yearly growing worse, our lumber resources not far from an end. We shall soon be but a country of grass-grown towns, and impoverished farmers, undersold in foreign markets, and even at our own doors, in all we can raise, and forbidden to enjoy our manufacturing and mining resources, which would change our poverty to riches."

Now, Sir, I propose to read another extract from a speech of a distinguished gentleman on the Treasury benches. I will not submit the name of this distinguished person at present. I submit it as a conundrum to you, Mr. Speaker. As you are considered an adept at solving such mysteries, kindly solve this one:

"Where wealth, prosperity and happiness were in Canada, he will find gaunt poverty and distress pervading the country from end to end. I do not envy the hon. gentleman's feelings when he casts his eyes over the horizon of this country, and finds here and there spectres gaunt with famine and distress, poverty where wealth existed, famine where plenty was to be found."

Now, who do you think gave utterance to these patriotic words? Why, Sir, look at the bland, pleasant, smiling countenance before me—would you imagine he was the man who uttered these words. Yes, Sir, the Minister of Finance is the very man who uttered them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is all true.

Mr. CAMERON. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not care to hear more of his language and policy in the days gone by. Let us come to a more recent period. What did the hon. gentleman state upon the floor of Parliament the other day? I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there has not been a sentence uttered on the floor of Parliament since I have had the honour of a seat in Parliament eighteen years ago that was more calculated to destroy the credit of the country than the sentence the hon. gentleman gave utterance to within the last week in this House. I say, Sir, that there never was a statement made by a Finance

Minister in Parliament on his responsibility to the Crown and to the people of this country as Finance Minister, more injurious to the best interests of the country, and more calculated to destroy the credit of the country, than the statement made by that hon. gentleman. What did he say, Sir? He said: "We all know, by looking at the returns, that if to-day two-thirds of the banks of the Dominion were suddenly called upon to redeem their circulation, where these banks would be, and where the business of the country would be." I say, Mr. Speaker, that it was a scandal for the hon. gentleman, in the face of the fact that was staring him in the face, in the face of the knowledge that he must have had of the solvency of these banks—it was a scandalous statement for the hon. gentleman to make, and especially to make just upon the eve of his having to go to the money markets of the world for the purpose of borrowing money, to carry on the business of the country. Sir, we all know the result that is likely to follow from statements of that kind being made. I am sure the hon. gentleman now regrets it and wishes he had never given utterance to the expression. So much for the Minister of Public Works, the First Minister and the Minister of Finance. Sir, one of the ways in which we convey information to the world of our western possessions is through pamphlets and newspapers. Now, Sir, much good may be done by scattering pamphlets over the country if they are properly written, and the proper material inserted. I recollect that in the Session of 1880, twelve pamphlets were sent to me from the Department of Agriculture. I opened one of these pamphlets on the new territories and found the following statement:

"In the State of Dakota, the Government gives twenty years to pay for the land and charges \$1.20 per acre and 6 per cent. interest till paid; and if the settler plants ten acres of trees in his quarter section, the State exempts him from taxation for ten years. This is a more liberal policy than that laid down by the Government of Canada, who only give eighty acres of a homestead and a right to preempt a like additional quantity, but none of it within certain distance of the railway, called the six mile belt."

I found another statement inserted in one of these pamphlets and recollect these pamphlets were scattered by the thousand broadcast over the country. I am aware they were subsequently recalled, but I am just as well aware that before they were recalled the public had access to them, and the objectionable statement I have referred to got into the public press. Sir, another statement was as follows:—

"Fertile lands, cheap and healthy homesteads, in the famous Red River Valley, State of Minnesota. The St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company offers for sale, to actual settlers, about 2,000,000 acres of the best wheat lands, chiefly in the Red River Valley, and contiguous to their lines of railway, running from St Paul to the Manitoba boundary line, at prices ranging from \$3 to \$5 per acre, and easy terms."

Here is another extract:

"The settlers in the Red River region are of the most substantial character, well-to-do farmers from the older States, from Iowa, Wisconsin and Canada, and especially from the best parts of Ontario. The dominant nationalities settling on the Minnesota farms are Americans, Scandinavians and Canadians, in about equal proportions."

Now, Sir, where do you think these extracts came from? Sir, these extracts were culled from a pamphlet bearing the *imprimatur*—the name of the hon. Minister of Agriculture on the title page. They were, some of them, scattered through the length and breadth of the country, and extracts from them appeared in the papers. Yet hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, in face of the evidence I have given them of their utter want of patriotism, when they are sitting in the cold shades of opposition, have the hardihood, the impertinence to charge gentlemen upon this side of the House with being unpatriotic, because they see fit to denounce the conduct of gentlemen opposite when their conduct deserves condemnation. Now, Sir, there is something more upon this subject. I found in the *Mail*, a newspaper organ of the Government, the other day, a notice of valuable

Mr. CAMERON (HURON).

farming lands for sale in the State of Michigan. Now, the superlatively patriotic gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House and control this newspaper, you would think would not do such a thing; they would not be guilty of it, but here it is:

"MICHIGAN.—Farmers find the best markets in the world right at their own doors. Blizzards and tornadoes do not devastate their crops and ruin their homes. I have 300,000 acres for sale. Easy payments; long time; low rate of interest. O. M. Barnes, Lansing, Michigan."

Now, the hon. gentlemen know where the public got the information about the blizzards, the frosts, and the cold that occasionally prevails in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Sir, I could give you extracts innumerable from Conservative speeches and in newspapers supporting that party. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the *Winnipeg Times*, the creature of the Government, sustained by the bounty of the Government, denounced the policy of the Government in the North-West Territories, until it was brought to book for it? Does he not know that the *Regina Leader*, another organ of the Government in the Province of Assiniboia, pointed out over and over again that the policy the Government was pursuing in the North-West Territories was calculated to ruin the country, to drive immigrants from that country over to the freer soil further south, on the American side of the border? Does he not know that these journals, from day to day, from week to week, for months, were teeming with articles of this kind, begging, praying, and beseeching the Government to desist from the mad course they had entered upon and to pursue a policy that was more in the interests of the North-West Territories? The hon. gentleman knows it, but it was not until these organs were brought to book by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Government saw fit to instruct them to retrace the course they were pursuing. We know that the Premier of Manitoba, a man who is kept there by the breath of the nostrils of the First Minister, within the last few weeks, used expressions with reference to the policy of the Government that were calculated to alarm any persons who really had at heart the best interests of the country. The hon. Premier said: "At present here we are on the verge of a crisis from which we must emerge in a better or worse condition." The verge of a crisis! What, Sir, is the crisis? I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite, with some little knowledge of the North-West, that they are not aware of the gravity of the situation. I would that those who are in charge of the Departments connected with the North-West should take the trouble and the labour of visiting that section of the country; because I make bold to say in my place in Parliament to-night, that no Minister, I do not care upon what side of the House he sits, can govern that country wisely and well, without visiting it, without visiting every region of it, and understanding its wants and requirements. It will not do for a Minister to go up to Winnipeg and have one of the buffalo bulls killed in his honour, and be feasted upon the flesh of the animal. It won't do for him to go there and be wined, and dined, and feasted, and then come back and think he knows everything about the country. He must go through the various sections of the country, and go there with a view of ascertaining what are the real sentiments of the mass of the people. Why, Sir, I tell the hon. gentlemen they are on the brink of a volcano in respect to the North-West, and it will require the wisdom of our best men to tide over the difficulty. What does the Premier say:

"At present we are on the verge of a crisis from which we must emerge in a better or worse condition. Not, however, until the masses were made aware of the situation, would they stand up and maintain their rights. The time had arrived when Manitoba must be placed on a level with the other Provinces of the Dominion."

Now, Sir, I think I have shown pretty conclusively what the loyalty of those hon. gentlemen amounts to. I hope

I have heard the last of it, and I hope hon. gentlemen will cease making these reproaches, and discuss questions upon their merits. Now, Sir, I have a word or two to say to my hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman is a man of ability. Nobody denies that proposition. I should be sorry to say, otherwise than that I enjoyed moderately the speech made by the hon. gentleman, and especially that part of it which was delivered during last summer in the Province of New Brunswick, and entitled "My Ain Country." It was good, it was polished, it was ornate, the sentences were well put together and the periods were well rounded.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman can speak when I have finished.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman wishes to correct the hon. member.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to state most emphatically; first, that the first part of my address in this House was not a part of any address I ever delivered. I wish to state also that I never delivered a lecture by the title of "My Native Country" or "My Native Land," so that the hon. gentleman is not stating facts.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman is evidently not a Scotchman, and he did not catch my statement. I did not mean to say that the address was any discredit to the hon. gentleman. I said it was good. A good lecture will bear repetition more than once. There are parts of his lecture which I would go down to the Opera House to hear delivered by the hon. gentleman. Part of the lecture was not new; but when the hon. gentleman touched upon new and untrodden ground, it is no disgrace to him to say that better speeches preceded that delivered by himself. There was the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways, and there was the speech of my able and distinguished friend, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). Let me give the hon. member for Queen's a word of advice. A man never adds anything to the strength of his argument by introducing stale Latin quotations which everybody knows. I like plain English, as plain as I can speak it; it is always the best. The hon. gentleman undertook to air his knowledge both of modern and ancient history. He told us a great deal about heathen mythology, and about Cassandra, the famous prophetess of Athens.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CAMERON. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that I have given hon. gentlemen opposite the opportunity for a little cheering. I venture this prediction, that there are not four men on that side of the House who could now tell you whether Cassandra was an Athenian or a Trojan prophetess. I am pleased I made that slip of the tongue, it so amused the hon. gentlemen, and they have not had much in this discussion to be amused at. But let us go back to the old Trojans. They were a fine old race. The hon. gentleman undertook to air his knowledge respecting Cassandra. You know, Mr. Speaker, the story of Cassandra. It is an interesting one. It has a conclusion, and it has a moral. The hon. gentleman did not give us the conclusion; he did not give us the moral. It is interesting to follow the history of Cassandra. Where is the Minister of Finance? He is thoroughly conversant with the history of the old prophetess. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that Cassandra was tempted. She resisted the temptation. The hon. member for King's was tempted by the Minister of Finance. But he did not resist the temptation; the Minister of Finance caught him and secured

him. His virtue was not equal to Cassandra's. You know, Mr. Speaker, that Apollo promised to confer the gift of prophecy on Cassandra if she would yield to his embraces. She did not do so. The hon. gentleman was promised the representation of King's and the reversion of another position. Apollo was deceived; so may the hon. gentleman be. Apollo did not get all he bargained for; the other Apollo may also be deceived. We know that Cassandra was found when young in the temple of Apollo. The House will recollect that she was found there with serpents twisted round her body and licking her ears, and thus the gift of prophecy was conferred on her. I always find the hon. gentleman in the embrace of the hon. Finance Minister, and licking his ears. But the Divine gift of prophecy has not been given the hon. gentleman. Sir, there is also a moral to the story of Cassandra. The prophetess prophesied. Her prophecies were unheeded, her warnings were dinned into deaf and dumb ears; but every prophecy she made came true. She prophesied the downfall of Troy. Her predictions were unheeded—her warnings disregarded by the Trojans. But Troy fell all the same. She prophesied the death of Agamemnon. He paid no attention to her predictions, but the prophecy came true. There is just the same difference between the utterances of the prophecies and the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the criticisms of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). Every prediction and every prophecy he made has been absolutely and literally fulfilled to the letter. What did he tell us? He declared that the financial policy of the Government would ultimately prove a failure. To-day the Minister of Finance is forced to admit that there is a falling off in importations and a falling off in revenue, and that if the banks of the country were called upon to redeem their circulation a serious state of affairs would occur. He pointed out that the enormous grants, monopolies and immunities bestowed on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under their charter would cause a rebellion in the North-West. To-day we have the Premier of Manitoba telling us that the Province is in a critical position. Then the hon. member pointed out that there was no guarantee for the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway taken by the Minister of Railways. To-night we have the hon. Minister practically admitting that he has got no guarantee for the ultimate completion and working of that road. He pointed out that the fact of entering into the contract would not relieve the Government from further demands being made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. To-day we have clear evidence that we are not relieved to the slightest extent from such claims being imposed on the country. Let us now see what the Minister of Finance predicted? He told us in 1879 that it was his mission on earth to regulate the trade and commerce of the country; that his mission was to equalize the balance between exports and imports, so that there should be a Canada for the Canadians. His promise was to so regulate the balance of trade that our exports might be larger than our imports. What is the condition now? The balance against us is \$34,168,119. In 1878-79 the imports were \$7,491,251; last year they were \$132,354,022, or a balance on the wrong side of the ledger of \$60,762,767. Hon. gentlemen told us that they would keep Canada for the Canadians, and they have certainly done it in a most marvellous way. The predictions they made when they came into power have been scattered to the winds. Let me tell my hon. friend who was so fond of telling us on this side that all the false prophets were here, that we were nothing but "might-be's" and "may-be's," and that our predictions had never been realized, that the false prophets are to-day sitting in his immediate neighbourhood, not far from his right or his left hand. I tell the hon. gentleman to "Beware of false prophets, which come in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are

ravening wolves." I tell my hon. friend that the apostle had in view gentlemen on the Treasury benches when he said, "Many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many." I tell my hon. friend to beware of those false prophets. Sir, I can bring some comfort to my friends on this side of the House—none to my hon. friend—in the prophetic enunciation of that stern, sturdy, rugged, old prophet Jeremiah, who tells us that the false prophets shall become wind, and until that happy period arrives I fear the country will not become prosperous. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman appears never to have heard of Jeremiah, and I have the satisfaction of giving him something now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are hearing his Lamentations now,

Mr. CAMERON. Now, Sir, Let us see what the Minister of Railways says with reference to the security we are to get for this advance of \$22,500,000 in addition to the guarantee. I say, that Parliament and the people should have some reasonable guarantee from the hon. gentleman when Parliament is asked to carry through these propositions, that his statements are true, that he knows them to be the truth, that what he states as facts are facts, and that his predictions will be realized. The only way in which we can tell whether or not we may rely upon the hon. gentleman's assurances is to go back to his record. Let us see what the hon. gentleman said in 1880-81, when he was rushing through Parliament what he is now pleased to call his magnificent scheme. He says now :

"When the \$2,500,000 is exhausted, together with the \$12,000,000 of cash subsidy remaining in the hands of the Government, the Government shall have the certainty of the work being completed from end to end."

What does the hon. gentleman mean? Does he mean that when the present advance of \$30,000,000 is exhausted, when the balance of cash subsidy is exhausted, when the proceeds of the lands are exhausted, we shall have security for the completion of the road. The hon. gentleman knows that they cannot get this subvention and grant until the road is completed; and when the road is completed, then, and not till then, will the last payment be made. When the road is completed is there any security that the road shall be kept in proper repair, that it will be properly equipped or fairly well run. No, Sir. The hon. gentleman has not the scratch of a pen from this Company to justify the statement. He has not a dollar of money, or a particle of security, that the road will be kept in proper repair, or that it will be properly equipped or properly run. He says further :

"But while they do not ask the House to give them a single additional dollar, they ask us to give the credit of this country—which, thanks to the management of my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Finance, never stood in a higher position—to obtain the means of accomplishing this great national work by the end of 1835; and that without imposing the slightest shadow of a shade of additional burthen upon the Government or upon the country for the repayment of every dollar by the time the contract was to be completed, the 1st May, 1891. I say that if this is the position in which they are—and I think, I may venture to say that hon. gentlemen opposite will not controvert the soundness of that position, will not question the fact that the security offered to the Government for this temporary advance in order to quickly complete this great national work, is abundant—we should not hesitate a single moment in giving that measure our support."

What does the hon. gentleman mean? He says that under the management of the Finance Minister that not the shadow of a shade of an additional burden will be placed on the people of Canada by this loan. Does the hon. gentleman want us to believe that he is honest and sincere in stating that we can advance this \$22,500,000 by way of a loan, and \$7,500,000 by way of guarantee, without adding a dollar to the burdens of the country? The hon. gentleman knows that it cannot be done. He knows that he cannot put his hand into the public coffers and take out \$22,500,000, and hand it to this gigantic railway Company without thereby, and to that extent, increasing the burdens

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

of the people. What then does the hon. gentleman mean? Is the hon. gentleman a magician, or his Finances Minister a magician, who can, by waving his wand, make out of nothing the \$30,000,000 which we are to hand over to this corporation? I say that the statement made by the hon. gentleman must have been made thoughtlessly, carelessly, and recklessly, and without a due regard to the truth or consideration of the effect which it would have on the people of this country. The hon. gentleman said, in 1881, when asking us to support him in carrying his former propositions through Parliament, that we would have an undoubted guarantee for the completion of this work in the standing and financial ability of the members of the Syndicate. I will quote his words; I like to quote them, because they are always eloquent, and they always bear the impress of sincerity, but, unfortunately, they have nothing else but the impress of sincerity to commend them :

"Hon. gentlemen do not like the Company, but we would suppose that their ideas had undergone a revolution upon the question. One gentleman who had undertaken this work stands before the people of this country to-day in the strongest position that it is possible for gentlemen to occupy in relation to a great enterprise such as this. The Canadians engaged in this enterprise are men who are second to none in respect of commercial standing and capacity, and by their success in carrying out their great railway enterprises, they have afforded us the best possible guarantee for the manner in which they will fulfil their engagements with the Government and Parliament of Canada."

The hon. gentleman's followers were carried away by his earnest and eloquent words, and if I had not known the hon. gentleman better than some of his followers knew him, I might have been carried away by his enthusiastic and eloquent statements. If my faith had been bound up in him, as hon. gentlemen have their faith bound up in him, I might have been carried away; but fortunately for me, and for my political integrity, I knew the hon. gentleman better than his followers did. I was not carried away. The hon. gentleman went on. He emphasized; he always does. The hon. gentleman is nothing if not emphatic; he is always emphatic, always strong and always powerful. He found it necessary to be so then, and he finds it necessary to be so to-day. He found it necessary to be strong in his language in order to induce his followers to carry the original contract through Parliament. He finds it equally important to take the same line of action to-day. He finds it a good deal more so. Then the hon. gentleman had an undivided and a willing support; to-day, the hon. gentleman knows that he has not an undivided, and that he has an unwilling support. Why, Sir, his own friend the hon. member for Kings, N. B. (Mr. Foster), intimated that he regretted that this proposition came before Parliament, but that being before Parliament, he was bound to deal with it in the way he thought most in the interest of his country. Sir, the hon. gentleman finds it necessary to take high ground, to use strong language to-day, when he finds the public press of his party—a press that never found fault with him or his Government before—pointing out the utter incapacity and the utter inability that has swayed the counsels of the Government of this country in dealing with this whole question. Sir, the hon. gentleman went a step further. He said :

"I say that this Company embraces capitalists both of our own and other countries, who are men of the highest character—men whose names are the best guarantee that could be offered to the people of Canada that any enterprise they may undertake will be successful."

The hon. gentleman went still further :

"We have reason to know that all that a command of capital can do, they have the advantage of, and we have reason to know that all that skill and energy and a knowledge of precisely such work can do, has been secured in order to make this a successful contract, and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite what more is desirable or necessary."

Now, Sir, that is the kind of argument iterated and reiterated over and over again, by which the hon. gentleman induced his followers in the House to swallow the policy they were then called on to swallow. The same argument

was pressed by the First Minister. He told us why they gave this contract to the old Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He told us that they were men of enterprise, men of commercial standing, men of capacity, men of marvellous success in other great undertakings, men of the highest possible character, men whose names were the best guarantee we could have that they would carry out their contract—men of skill, of energy, of knowledge, and of great wealth, and that with that class of men the country had nothing to fear. Sir, where are those men now? Where is the old Syndicate? Where are the members of the old Syndicate? Financially dead, and gone. The hon. gentleman tells us they are dead, and that the old Syndicate is merged in the new Company—composed of whom we know not, with means to what extent we know not, to what extent controlled by the Government we know not. The members of the old Syndicate have slipped from the grasp of the hon. gentleman, and he has not got a scrape of the pen from them to-day by which we can compel them to implement the contract they made. Sir, the best men are out of the concern. The man the hon. gentleman most relied on and most boasted of as the man of practical skill and experience, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe tells us, is now out of it altogether. To this Company Parliament is now asked to grant \$30,000,000 more by way of a loan, without a tittle of information to explain the financial position of these men. We were assured when the contract was first made, we are assured now, that these were men of enterprise, of ability and energy, and would carry out the contract. We were assured then, and we are assured now, that if we gave them what we were then asked to give them, we would never be asked for another dollar. The hon. Minister of Railways has been proved to have spoken falsely when he said that, and I now undertake to say that in a few years the hon. gentleman's present predictions will prove equally false. The hon. gentleman at that time also stated:

"We shall soon have the proud satisfaction of seeing Canada assume an advanced and triumphant position, but she will be delivered from the expenditure of a single dollar in connection with the construction or operation of this railway."

And then we had a speech from the hon. Minister of Public Works, for whom I entertain great respect. I do not think he would make a statement which he believed to be incorrect, or that he would make a statement to deliberately mislead the House. The hon. Minister of Public Works said:

"Thus, according to our plan, we shall have the whole Pacific Railway built for \$78,000,000. I will not weary the House with long columns of figures, but will show that, under the present contract, the railway, completed and in working order, and with the condition that it will be worked for all time, will cost but \$78,000,000. Under the contract of 1873 it would have cost \$81,000,000."

Now, that does not agree with the statement the Minister of Railways made a little while ago that the contract of 1874 would have cost \$73,000,000. The hon. gentleman also gave us his solemn assurance that if Parliament sanctioned the old contract the Government would be relieved from all responsibility on account of this contract, that we would not have to advance another dollar, that \$78,000,000 would complete the work, and that with that Canada would be relieved from all responsibility. When the hon. gentleman made that statement his followers cheered. They cheered the other night when he said that the money and lands which were given to the Company in 1830-81 would not be sufficient to enable them to complete their contract, but that they wanted \$30,000,000 more. The hon. gentleman is in the happy position of being able to get his followers to cheer, no matter what proposition he makes. We warned hon. gentlemen opposite of the result sure to follow; they did not heed our warning; but subsequent events have proved that we were right and they were wrong. The hon. gentleman said that the road would cost \$78,000,000 and

no more. Subsequent events show that he was a false prophet, an unsafe guide. Let us see what the Company got. We gave them completed roads to the value of \$28,000,000; we gave them a cash bonus of \$25,000,000; we gave them 25,000,000 acres of land, which the Minister of Railways estimates at \$2.36 an acre—although I am not sure that I should attach much importance to that hon. gentleman's estimate of the land, for at one time he put it at \$2 an acre, another time at \$5, and another time at \$1—but, estimated at \$2.36 an acre, the land would be equivalent to \$57,750,000; we gave them in surveys nearly \$5,000,000; and they are now to get this subvention of \$30,000,000 more. So that this road, when completed, will have cost us \$135,750,000. Of course, if the Company pay back the \$30,000,000, it will only cost \$105,750,000. But the hon. gentleman, when he made his estimate, forgot to mention several important items. He forgot to mention all the monopolies and privileges we gave the Company—the exemption from taxation for all time to come, the exemption of their lands, or part of them, from taxation for twenty years, and the monopoly of the construction of railways south of the Canadian Pacific Railway. These monopolies and privileges and exemptions possess a value to this Company which cannot be estimated in dollars and cents; and when we talk of giving them \$30,000,000 more, do we remember that in giving them the monopoly they possess, we are giving fully as much in addition? If the hon. gentleman wanted to deal honestly and fairly with the people of this country, when this railway company came to him asking for an additional \$30,000,000, he would have firmly put his foot down and said, "Yes, I will give you a loan of money." But if you get the additional loan of money, you must give a *quid pro quo*. You must release your monopoly and deal generously with the people of the North-West country upon whose industry and trade you expect to live." The hon. gentleman stated further that these were men of wealth and there would be no danger of their coming back to us for additional assistance; or to quote his own words:

"He would relieve Canada of all additional responsibility in the further construction of the railway."

"And I ask when we were lifting from our shoulders to the shoulders of a private company all responsibility, I ask this House in candour to tell me whether they do not think that, as far as we could, we ought to put these gentlemen in as favourable a position for the construction of the road as we occupied ourselves."

He gave the most positive assurance that we were to have no further responsibility, that the burden, whatever it might be, was to be removed from the shoulders of the people of this country. He gave this House the most positive assurance that the statement was correct, and he was followed in the same line of argument by the First Minister and the Minister of Public Works, but I shall not trouble the House with quoting their statements. There was to be no further connection between the railway company and the members of the Government, but I say to you to-night that I believe, from the evidence disclosed in Parliament, from the returns brought down to Parliament, that the connection between the Government and the railway is closer to-day than it was three years ago. I venture to make this prediction, although I am not a prophet, that, as the years roll on, and time, which unfolds many mysteries, will unfold this one, before many years roll over the heads of the people of this country, we will have such disclosures in connection with the construction and management of the Canadian Pacific Railway that the people will be startled and astounded. Hon. gentlemen opposite express their disapproval of what I say in derisive cheers. I can understand hon. gentlemen opposite. They, too, did the same thing in 1880-81, and they will do the same thing now, when we are asked to give \$30,000,000 more to the Company now knocking at the doors of Parliament, and to this Company

asking this additional subvention. Hon. gentlemen opposite, who back up unhesitatingly the Ministry of the day, will cheer to the echo whatever statement or proposition the hon. Minister of Railways may see fit to submit to Parliament. The Syndicate, this gigantic Company which we were assured had got a magnificent subvention, and would require no further grant, are now here asking for additional assistance. Although we gave them grants, taking the value of the lands at the valuation put on them by the hon. Minister of Railways, amounting to \$105,000,000, they are asking to-day for \$30,000,000 more. What guarantee have we that the statements and assurances of the hon. Minister to-day will be more fully verified than those he formerly made. Where is the security for the construction of the road? Is it ample security? It is no security at all. What is the financial standing of the Company? No one can tell. We were told there would be no additional subvention. We see now that there is. We were told that we would be relieved from all responsibility in the construction of the road. To-night we are asked to grant additional sums for its construction. The hon. gentleman now plays a different tune from the one he played in 1880 and 1881, and he is backed up now, as he was then, by hon. gentlemen opposite. I know of no position in which a public man could be placed, so utterly untenable and inconsistent, as that of the hon. Minister of Railways. I challenge him, I challenge this House, I challenge you, Mr. Speaker, to find me a single parallel to the conduct of the hon. gentleman, and the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman, in the whole course of human life. There is no parallel to it. The hon. gentleman's former statements are in utter contradiction to his statements now. The hon. gentleman's predictions have not been verified by the facts as disclosed to us now, and I challenge any man to give a single instance of a case which displays such utter inconsistencies as are to be found between the hon. gentleman's statements in 1881 and 1884. The only parallel I can at all remember is the case of the woman in the parish workhouse of Kent, who was brought to bed of a white baby and a black one at the same birth. The hon. gentleman was delivered of a white baby in 1881, and he was brought to bed of a black one on the 5th February, 1884. Sir, the statements are wholly inconsistent and unreliable. I am sure that if there is one man in Parliament who will vote against these Resolutions it is the hon. member for Lincoln. Nobody can make me believe that he will vote otherwise. When we were pointing out, in the Session of 1881, that the Government took no security for the completion of the road, that hon. gentleman got up in his wisdom and said: "Oh, the Court of Chancery will compel that Company to a specific performance of the contract." The hon. member for West Durham doubted that proposition, but the hon. gentleman said: "There is no doubt at all about it. I lay down the proposition that the security is ample; if not the Court of Chancery will compel these magnates to a specific performance of their contract," and he was backed up in his law by the hon. the First Minister. Well the company have failed in their contract and where is the Court of Chancery now? Do we hear anything about it? Is the hon. member for Lincoln to fyle a bill in Chancery to compel them to carry out their contract, and is the First Minister to be leading counsel in the case. No; the Court of Chancery is powerless, but there is another court they appeal to, and this Parliament is the court that is asked to enforce the specific performance of this contract by the Company, by giving them an additional grant of \$22,500,000. The hon. Minister of Railways says he is only going to loan the money, but I say, as the hon. member for Lambton said, that no Government is justified in dealing as bankers with contractors. When a Government descends to that position, it is abrogating its functions as a Government. What supervision and control can this

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Government bring to bear on the Canadian Pacific Railway that will be at all effective in enforcing the completion of the contract. None. This Company is the creature of the Government, living, day by day, on the bounty bestowed upon it by the Government? Let us see what the hon. Minister said on that subject, and what he did with respect to other contractors financially embarrassed. He was not always of the opinion that it was the duty of a Government to come to the assistance of the contractors. When Section 15, a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was under contract to Mr. Whitehead, he became financially embarrassed, he applied to the Government for aid. The hon. gentleman stated in his sworn testimony before the Railway Commission:

"That it was of the first possible consequence to the country that Section B should be constructed with the greatest possible rapidity."

He said further:

"Mr. Whitehead got into financial difficulties and made applications to the Government for securities. The security he offered was ample for the loan he required."

What was the hon. gentleman's reply to Whitehead's application? Did he yield a willing assent to the application made to him by Mr. Whitehead, although in the interest of the country it was important the road should be constructed rapidly, and although the security offered was ample to cover the loan required? Not at all; the answer of the Government was that the Government "Cannot act as your bankers." It is true that the hon. gentleman yielded. It is true, when there was a little pressure brought to bear from the proper quarter, a power behind the Throne, that the hon. gentleman yielded to the demand made on him by Mr. Whitehead, when the proper influences were brought to bear and the hon. gentleman was properly canvassed. What are we asked to do now? We are asked to assent in Parliament to this loan of \$22,500,000 and this guarantee of \$7,300,000. I say, and I say it boldly, that no Government who had at heart the best interests of the country would yield to such a demand as that, upon the information and upon the facts that have been submitted to that Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I say, further, that no independent Parliament would yield to a demand of that kind without the most thorough investigation, without the most careful examination of every statement made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and without the most thorough investigation as to the reasons why they are here now, mendicants, as it were, at the doors of Parliament. I ask you what information have we got? What do we know of the cost of the road from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie? If we knew that, it would give us some idea of what these people spent on the prairie section westward. What do we know of the cost of the contract with Langdon, Shepherd & Co.? What do we know of the actual cost of the road west of Medicine Hat? We have not a scratch of a pen to show it. Has the Minister of Railways got it? Have his engineers got it? Do they know to-night how much the Canadian Pacific Railway Company paid the North-West Construction Company for the construction of that road west from Medicine Hat to the summit of the Rocky Mountains? If they do, there is not a member of this House who does. We can guess what it costs approximately, but we want it with certainty. Yet he wants us to agree to these Resolutions without that information. What do we know as to how much hard cash the Syndicate, this wealthy and munificently endowed Syndicate, put of their own money into the Pacific Railway? Absolutely nothing. The hon. gentleman says \$10,000,000. What evidence have we, outside of the Minister's statement, that they put a single farthing into it? What do we know as to how much hard cash they realized out of the sale of their bonds and the sale of their stock? We know nothing about that; and, without a particle of information upon all these points,

the hon. gentleman is forcing this proposition on Parliament, and forcing his supporters to swallow it, whether in the interests of the country or not, and without the necessary information. But the hon. gentleman yielded to the demands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as he yielded in 1881. As his followers yielded to the demands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company before, his followers will yield to the demands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company now. Sir, by the sheer force of the hon. gentleman's own energetic nature, by the whirlwind of words by which he attempts to cut off all opposition to his statements, the hon. gentleman, I fear very much, will induce this House and this Parliament to force these Resolutions on the people of this country. I say the Pacific Railway Company did well and acted wisely in their own interests when they induced the hon. gentleman to surrender the ease and the dignity and the emoluments of the mission to England, and to come to Canada once more and engage on the floor of Parliament in the active strife of keen political contests. I say the railway company did well, because there is no man to-day in Parliament, and there is no man out of Parliament in Canada, who could afford to have made the speech the hon. gentleman made on the 5th day of the present month of February. There is no man in Parliament, or out of Parliament to-day, who could induce his followers to carry this measure through Parliament, except the hon. gentleman. There is no man in Parliament to-day, there is no man out of Parliament to-day, who would, with the information that he has got in his hands, or, at all events, with the information he has vouchsafed to give to the people of this country, have attempted to carry this measure through Parliament, and it is only by the force of the hon. gentleman's energy and power that he is able to induce this Parliament to sanction his propositions. The hon. gentleman is known among his admirers as the Rupert of debate. The hon. gentleman will permit me to regard him as the Red Indian of debate. With a liberal use of the political tomahawk, the hon. gentleman cut his way, in his native Province and here, to place and power, and a recurrence to the use of the political scalping knife the hon. gentleman hopes to hold his place on the Treasury benches, to hold his place in the English mission, and to hold what he now holds—the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by the throat. The hon. gentleman went further. He made a calculation. He told us what this road would cost us in case it passed into our hands. I am going to trouble you for a moment, not because I think it is necessary, but because, in my place here as a representative of the people, I think it my duty, as far as I am able to do so, to expose the hollowness of the pretensions made by the hon. gentleman. He said 3,393 miles of railway, if the Company failed, would pass into our hands for a sum of \$54,508,128. What did he say on that point:

"The whole total is \$97,001,328. That is what the road would cost the people of this country. Now, Sir, what more? What shall we do with the lands? I have charged the land they have used at \$2 per acre, and put it on the other side of the account, and showed equally what the lands have realized, and what our position would be, and what the road would cost us. I credit the road with the 21,246,600 acres of land at \$2 per acre, making \$42,493,200 of cash that will come back to us out of the \$97,000,000; and I take the completed road of 3,393 miles without a charge of a dollar upon it, from Montreal to Port Moody, costing the people of this country \$51,508,128. That is the total. So, Sir, I say, that in that position, there is no intelligent man that will say, in the first place, that there is a shadow of ground for supposing that every dollar of this principal, and every dollar of this interest, will not be returned as provided for in these Resolutions, to the coffers of Canada. And I say further, that in case of that impossible contingency arising, we would stand in the position of having the lands—at the value these gentlemen have put upon them, the lands that would come into our hands, along with the 3,393 miles of main line and branches, from Montreal to Port Moody—at a cost to the people of this country of \$51,508,128. That is what the hon. gentleman said. It is a glowing picture; it is a bright picture; it is a profitable speculation if his statements are correct. But he goes further. He says:

"What will that road cost us, assuming that to-morrow after this arrangement is made, assuming that to-morrow they make default, assuming that to-morrow the Company were to abandon the work, what would be our position? And, Sir, it does not matter whether default is made now or at the end; the position, so far as these figures are concerned, will stand the same."

In other words, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, we would get back a road that had cost us \$97,001,328, for \$54,508,128. I ask the hon. gentleman now, without meaning to be offensive, did he really understand, did he appreciate, the nonsense of the proposition he was laying down? We expend \$97,000,000 on a road; we give the money, we spend the money; the road falls back into our hands, and costs us \$54,000,000. Now, the answer appears to me to be so self-evident that I am only amazed that the hon. gentleman should have submitted such a proposition to the House. Was he trifling with us? Was he imposing upon our credulity? Was he attempting to deceive anybody? If not, one cannot understand his making such a statement. He went a step further than that:

"Now, let us see what that is going to cost the people of this country under this Administration."

He is now dealing with the calculations of the expense of the road from Callander to Port Moody—the former calculations was from Montreal to Port Moody:

"The 457 miles of main line and branches between Montreal, Brockville and Callander cost \$23,550 per mile, amounting to \$10,762,736. The 305 miles of branches west of Callander cost, as shown by the Company's accounts, \$3,759,792; with the steamers, \$152,351, making in all as the cost of the road from Montreal to Callander, and the branches in the North West and the steamers, \$15,074,828. Take that from \$51,000,000, which included them, without one dollar charged against them, and you have standing as the cost to the people of the country, assuming failure and defeat, and that every dollar of principal and interest does not come back to the Canadian Treasury, of the 2,541 miles of Railway, between Callander and Port Moody, \$39,343,348."

Now, Sir, according to this calculation, we would have 3,393 miles of railway from Montreal to Port Moody at \$97,132,000. The road from Montreal to Callander was to cost, and did cost, \$15,074,823, which would make the expense of the road from Callander to Port Moody, \$81,936,500. Then he tells us this would have been the condition of affairs, no odds whether we took the road back now, or whether we take it back after it had cost us the further sum of \$30,000,000. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do, that if the road is built, the company will get every dollar of the subvention and the \$30,000,000. So we must give them the \$30,000,000 and the balance of the subvention more when the road is built than they have thus far received. Let us see, for a moment, what the road will cost us, adding the present subvention. When the road is built it will cost us the following sums: We gave the Company, in completed road, \$28,000,000; we gave them in cash subsidy, \$25,000,000; we give them now, by the way of a loan and guarantee, \$30,000,000; cost of surveys, \$5,000,000; with 25,000,000 acres of land, which the hon. gentleman himself estimated would be worth \$57,750,000. Now, it is plain as the nose on a man's face, that when this \$30,000,000 is advanced the road will cost us exactly \$145,750,000. Of course, if the road comes back to our hands, we get our \$30,000,000; therefore the road is entitled to credit for that sum. The amount the road will cost us if it comes back to our hands, is \$115,750,000. Now, I say that it is the worst kind of folly to try to make the people of this country believe that when they expend \$115,000,000 in the construction of a railway, and that railway passes back into their hands, the road will only cost them \$54,000,000; and the hon. gentleman knows it just as well as I do. Sir, if we are to advance this money to this Company, if we are to make this loan, if we are to give them this additional guarantee, I say, Sir, if we are to vote away the money of the people—because I set aside as unworthy of consideration the statement made by the Min-

ister of Railways, that you can loan \$30,000,000 to the Company without adding to the burdens of the people—I say, if we are to do all this, don't let us be led away by miscalculations, and by figures that have been cooked. Let us, if we are going to do it at all, look the matter squarely in the face; let us do it with our eyes open. If we are to incur all these liabilities, if we are to incur all these obligations I say, let us do it with our eyes open. The obligations we have incurred, and the liabilities that rest upon the shoulders of the people of this country, are becoming perfectly appalling, and they are enough to startle the strongest and the sturdiest patriot upon either side of the House. Sir, let us cast our eyes over the country just as it stands now. Let us see the effect of the financial policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, let us see the effect of that policy as it is shown to-day by the bankruptcies and the bank failures, and by the unfortunate condition in which the Finance Minister tells us the other banks are in. Let us, I say, consider the position in which the great mass of the people of the country are labouring to-day, ground down by a system of oppressive taxation; so looking one will be reminded of the words used by the old Hebrew prophet to his son: "Isaachar is a strong ass crouching down between two burdens," I say the Dominion of Canada is to-night crouching between two burdens—the burden of the policy and the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the burdens that have been imposed upon us and that are now about to be imposed upon us, by the construction of this railway. Sir, when these demands were made upon the Government of the country by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, what was the duty of the Minister of Railways, the responsible head of that Department? His plain duty was to have stood between the people of this country and this great, gigantic corporation, as a wall of adamant. The hon. gentleman was but clay in the hands of these men, and they modelled him to their will. They have succeeded, and to-night we are asked to vote an additional loan of \$22,500,000, with an additional guarantee of \$7,300,000. Now, Sir, what is the next statement of the hon. gentleman? He asks for time—time. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that they had no claim upon us, that the people and the Parliament of Canada were under no obligation to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway. Time was what the hon. gentleman was struggling for—the completion of the road in two instead of seven years. Time was of importance, because the immediate construction of this road would develop the resources of the country, and the tide of immigration would roll in there and fill it up, and the country would so grow and become so developed that the burden about to be imposed upon us by this advance would not be felt by the people of this country. Sir, in defence of the hon. gentleman's line of argument, he was good enough to give us a series of figures and, among others, the receipts from the Customs Department in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories during the last year and the years 1881-82. The hon. gentleman was treading upon dangerous and delicate ground when he undertook to deal with the Customs receipts in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. He knows that that Province is a purely agricultural one; he knows the people depend upon the production of the soil for their subsistence; he knows that his Government, during the last Session of Parliament, increased the duty upon agricultural implements from 25 to 35 per cent.? He knows that almost every implement used for years, were imported from the United States; and, Sir, it is no wonder that the revenue increased from \$1,106,356 in 1882, to \$1,832,942, in 1883. But the hon. gentleman congratulates himself upon squeezing the last dollar he can squeeze out of the farmers of the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Sir, it is not a

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

subject for congratulation, it is a subject, rather, for serious reflection, a subject for pondering, a subject for regret, that the hon. gentleman was enabled to exact from these people an increase in customs alone of over \$600,000 during last year. But the hon. gentleman tells us that time is of great consequence; time will open up the country; time will help us to fill the country rapidly, and an enormous number of immigrants will go in there if the road is constructed during the next two or three years. Sir, how is time going to help the hon. gentleman, the road is already completed through the fertile belt? Does he expect immigrants to settle on the Rocky Mountains or on the shores north of Lake Superior? The hon. gentleman knows that every foot of the ground for settlement on the line of the railway is now open to settlers, and when the countless thousands the hon. gentleman expects to flow in from the Mother Country, and from the crowded centres of population in Europe—when these are all there, the hon. gentleman will then be able to make his calculation upon some basis of fact; and to say that time is of consequence for the purpose of inducing immigration situated as we now are, is to say what is not the fact. I do not believe we have gained anything from the rapidity with which the road has been constructed. Assuming all responsibility for the statement I make, I say that judging by the opinion of the people of that country and personal observation, it would have been far better to have proceeded more slowly with the construction of this road, to have had our centres of population within reach of us and not scattered all over the vast region extending from Winnipeg to the summit of the Rocky Mountains as now. Not so did old Ontario settle her vast and fertile region. Hon. gentleman should know that in Ontario the whole Province was not thrown open to settlement at once. It was only as townships and counties filled up with thriving settlers that additional townships and counties were opened up for settlement. If the hon. gentleman had pursued that course, and had forced the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to have followed that course, the Company would not have been here soliciting assistance at the hands of Parliament. I say further that we ought not to pass these Resolutions on the information that is before us. Hon. gentlemen opposite have vouchsafed no information. Let me ask the House what information have we got as to the truth of the statement contained in Mr. Stephen's letter of 29th December, 1883? Not a particle. I ask the House what information we have got as to the stock jobbing by the old Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate. We know they sold \$55,000,000 of stock. We know that \$5,000,000 was sold at par, that \$20,000,000 was sold to members of the original Syndicate at 25 cents on the dollar. We know that \$30,000,000 was sold to another syndicate, of which the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate formed an important part, at 51 cents on the dollar. We know that the stock was placed on the markets of the world and realized or would realize from 55 to 61 cents on the dollar. Let us see what profit they made in dealing with the stock of the Company under these transactions. They obtained \$25,000,000 and could have sold it at 60 cents on the dollar on the European or New York market. If they sold it at 56, that would give them a profit of \$6,200,000, a nice profit to have made on that little speculation. Then there was the \$30,000,000 of stock purchased by them from the Company. That could have been sold at 60 cents on the dollar, and they could, or did, make a profit of \$2,700,000. Putting these two items together, apart from casual advantages, there was a clear profit of \$8,900,000. Did that account for the \$10,000,000 which the gentlemen put of their own money into the Company? Where did they get the money? I believe it was by those speculations, as is shown by returns submitted to Parliament. We have complained, and

we have reason to complain, that without full information on all these transactions, we are asked to vote the Resolutions through Parliament. Let us see what further information we want on this subject. What information have we as to the contract with Shepard, Langdon & Co. We have not got a particle of information as to that. What has become of the North American Construction Company? Is the company dissolved? We have evidence that the contract is dissolved. But the company still holds its charter of incorporation, and I fancy the moment these Resolutions are passed through Parliament, the company will again be in a position to take another contract. By means of this company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been able to contract with themselves. The *Mail* and *Gazette*, organs of the Government, tell us, but hon. gentlemen opposite do not tell us—they may have the information, we have not—that Mr. Van Horne says that the construction of the line from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops will cost \$10,100,000. We do not know what the cost of the western section for 45 miles east of Medicine Hat to the summit did cost. The Government have refused to give any definite information regarding it. The information, so far as given—and it is given in a return brought down—shows that \$2,506,000 were paid in cash, that the amount for material and supplies for this part of the western section was \$1,790,000, that for transportation charges there were paid \$1,378,000, making in all an amount paid on the 45 miles east of Medicine Hat to the Summit, \$5,674,000. This is an outside figure, because a large portion of the material, supplies and transportation charges may have been incurred on other divisions, but I give the Company the benefit of the whole amount. The contract between the railway Company and the construction company for the section 45 miles east of Medicine Hat to Kamloops, was \$17,880,000. There was spent on it \$5,674,000, and according to Mr. Van Horne's statement, it will take \$10,100,000 to finish it. These together, make \$15,774,000, leaving a profit of \$2,106,000 on this section in cash alone. They would get, however, more than that. They had, besides, as part payment for this contract, stock to the amount of \$25,000,000. That, at 56 cents on the dollar, would equal \$14,000,000, so that the total profit would reach \$16,106,000. What information have they furnished in regard to this matter? None. This is the condition of affairs, so far as we know. We want additional and fuller information before we sanction this loan. It is an insult to the members of this House to ask us to vote on the resolutions without furnishing information on this subject. What information have we as to the cost of the road west of the summit of the Rocky Mountains? Are there surveys and estimates submitted? There are none. The Minister of Railways made a reply to the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), which is as follows:—

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad to know from the hon. Minister of Railways if we are to understand from his recent statement that Mr. Schreiber has made a full examination of the western section which is to be built to Kamloops, if I remember aright. Heretofore, most of us have been under the impression that no final survey of that route has been made. Are we to understand from the hon. Minister that we were in error; that an actual location survey has been made, and that Mr. Schreiber has estimated, with the minuteness which is usual in such cases, the cost of constructing the road from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, when he asked the question, that no such location survey has been made."

Well, Sir, without a survey, without a location, without an estimate, we are asked to vote \$30,000,000 to this Company in addition to what we gave them before. I ask the hon. Minister of Railways this question: is it settled to-day beyond a doubt, that this Company will ever cross the Rocky Mountains by the Kicking Horse Pass or the Howse Pass. I ask the hon. Minister of Railways if it has not been a matter of serious consideration for the last six months,

whether or not there is a practicable route across the Selkirks through the Kicking Horse Pass or the Howse Pass? I ask him whether or not it is a matter of consideration to-day, whether it is not even now desirable to abandon this route altogether and adopt the line which crosses the Rocky Mountains by the Yellow Head Pass. I venture to ask the hon. gentleman these questions, with some knowledge of the position of affairs in that country, and some knowledge of the country itself. If the matter is settled beyond the possibility of a change what is the meaning of the answer given by the hon. gentleman, that not a single foot of the line west of the Summit was located? And what is the meaning of the regulations issued by the Minister of the Interior in November last, to the effect that he will not open lands for homesteading or preemption west of the fourth Meridian, because, he said the land there is not fit for settlement? What is the meaning of that regulation? Is the hon. gentleman paving the way so as to enable this Company to divert the line to the old Mackenzie route, and are they now asking this grant to enable them quietly to do so? I submit these questions to the House, and I say that they require and deserve the gravest consideration. I say to the hon. gentleman that if he wants this great transcontinental railway to be a financial and a commercial success, he must have that road managed and run so as to be in harmony with the interests of the people in that country, and in sympathy with the views of the people in the great North-West. If he wants that road to be a success in any way, if he honestly desires that portion of the western section of this continent, which belongs to us, and is under the British flag, to become what Providence and nature intended it to be, the home of countless millions of industrious and contented settlers, he must change his financial policy, his policy with respect to this railway; he must bring them in harmony with the views of the people in that country; he must not crush and stunt the growth of that country, as he has been doing for the past five years; he must leave the land there, the inheritance of the people, for the people; he must not encourage any landlordism in the wide regions of the great North-West. He must do more. He must open up every section of that country for free homesteads for the people who are living in that country, and those who are going there to better their condition. He must abolish all monopolies in that country; he must deal with the people as if they were independent Britons, and not hewers of wood and drawers of water, to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to hon. gentlemen opposite. In a word, until the hon. gentleman changes his course, until he deals with the people as he ought to deal with them, he must expect that his whole policy will prove a failure. When the hon. gentleman has changed his policy, when he pursues a different course, when he gives us the information to which we are entitled, I may deal with this question in a different sense; but until the hon. gentleman has done that, I for one will raise my voice and record my vote against these propositions, and in order to be consistent with myself, in order to put myself right before the people of this country and before Parliament, I shall move the following amendment:—

"That all the words after the word 'That' in the said motion, be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"before this House shall be called on to grant the further aid of a loan of \$22,500,000, and of a guarantee of \$7,300,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a Select Committee be appointed to make a full and searching inquiry into the condition and affairs of the Company, and particularly as to its operations in stock, and in respect of construction contracts—the real cost of the works done—and the proper estimate of costs of the works remaining."

Mr. RYKERT. I think every hon. member of this House who has spoken on this subject has recognized the importance of the question now under consideration. But while most of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in op-

position to the Resolutions have spoken at great length, very few, if any of them, have referred at all to the questions under consideration. I think, Sir, as all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me have stated, that this is the most important question this Legislature has ever been called upon to discuss. It is important, because it involves not only the good faith and credit of this country, but its welfare and prosperity to a very great extent. No person more than myself regrets that we are called upon to re-open the consideration of this question. I think every person on the Ministerial side of the House, who is supporting the Government, and is determined to support them throughout, have felt that it is an unfortunate thing that we should be called upon, on this occasion, to discuss this question for the second or third time. We all hoped, I am sure, that when the agreement was made with the Syndicate, that that would be the last we would hear of this great question, until the road was finally completed. But, Sir, if we are called upon now to discuss this question, if the necessities of the case require us to consider it, I say, that as men having the interests of the country at heart, we should not shirk the responsibility of it. If, in considering this question, the interests of our country are involved, I say that whether it results in the increase of our ordinary expenditure, or of our capital account, it makes no difference, so long as the interests of the country require that we should take this matter into our consideration and deal with it as proposed by the Government. When I read the letter of Mr. Stephen, the President of the Company, in December last, in which he stated that the assets of the Company were, in his judgment, sufficient to carry out that great undertaking, I felt some relief; but still, at the same time, when I read the letter I saw that it depended entirely upon the position of the money markets of the world whether they would be able to realize and carry out that great undertaking. It so happens that the Company now say, that they cannot raise the funds required for the completion of that great work, and they come to this Parliament and tell us plainly, and I think in the most satisfactory manner, the position of their affairs, and they say: We are ready to carry out in its entirety the contract entered into between you and us, but if you desire the road to be completed in the time we told you we could complete it in, namely, two years, it is necessary for the Government of Canada to come to our assistance and lend us a sum of money by which we may carry out that undertaking; if you think it in the interest of the country that the work should not be completed in that time, we shall go on and carry out the contract to the letter. That is the position of the Company; but hon. gentlemen opposite have not approached this question in the spirit in which it should be approached. They have started up in opposition to it, and their opposition has been of a purely party character. Instead of lending their assistance to the Government and helping to extricate it from its difficulties if this enterprise should fail, these hon. gentlemen say: No, we have got the Government in a corner and we will try and crush out this scheme, and if we can crush it out we shall crush out the Government. What do they care for the prosperity of the country if their party interests can be served? A party who have always placed party first and country afterwards cannot be expected, on this occasion, to lend their assistance to this Government in carrying out this great undertaking. Why have we so many questions of past history brought before us on this occasion? From the very commencement of this discussion hon. gentlemen opposite, who have been opposing these Resolutions, have brought up the old history of this question. They have gone back to old Pacific Scandal time, and we have heard repeated, over and over again, questions of a financial character having no bearing on this question. They are doing this for the purpose of drawing a red herring across the trail, in the hope of deceiving the public and drawing their attention away from this important issue.

Mr. RYKERT.

In so doing, they hope to convince the people that the Government are carrying out a scheme that will result in injury to the country. In discussing a question of this kind, I do not like to wander from the subject under discussion. I like to see hon. gentlemen confine themselves to what I consider the argumentative aspect of the case. But we find ourselves in this position: these gentlemen have made reckless and random statements which are not borne out by the facts, and if to-night I feel called upon to follow these gentlemen to some extent to show how mistaken they are, I do it because I feel that the country should have the antidote along with the poison. If these gentlemen, with no regard for the reputation of public men, make calumnious statements on the floor of Parliament, and these go forth uncontradicted, some portion of the public, at any rate, will have the idea that they are correct; and when I heard hon. gentlemen in the course of this debate make those statements which are at variance with the truth, I felt that it was my duty to send out the antidote along with the poison. I think we ought to discuss this question from a public and not a party point of view. Now, Sir, from whom does this opposition emanate? Not from the leaders of the Opposition, or from the Opposition side in this House; but from the outside. We find that the organs of the party, which appear to be subsidized by some person, have raised a hue and a cry against this scheme; they declare that the money to be loaned to this Company will be money thrown away, and that we shall never see it again. We find this opposition instigated by the organ of the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not wish to use any offensive terms towards the management of the Grand Trunk Railway. If they desire, in the interest of their company, to take a stand against the Canadian Pacific Railway, they are justified in so doing, provided they do not interfere with the interests of this country. If Mr. Hickson, for whom I have the highest admiration as a manager, who has done a great deal to elevate that railway from the unfortunate position in which it once was, to the high position it now occupies—if he opposes the Canadian Pacific Railway in the interest of his company—so long as he does not infringe upon our rights and privileges, I have no fault to find. But what do we find? We find the opposition to this scheme coming from the Grand Trunk Railway in particular, and they coolly ask this House to assist them in carrying out a project which would result in a greater monopoly than these gentlemen predict as the result of carrying out this scheme. They coolly ask this Parliament to throw into the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway the whole railway system of the Province of Ontario. Let me ask hon. gentlemen in this House if they will give their influence to establish a great monopoly like that? If we accede to the demands of that pamphlet which has been instigated by the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, what will be the result? Ontario will be in the hands of one great monopoly. But, Sir, it is rather extraordinary that we find the leading organ of the party suddenly changing front. Why, Sir, for years and years, almost every issue of that paper had large black lines describing accidents on the Grand Trunk, more bungling on the Grand Trunk, and things of that kind, and those who have watched the proceedings of Parliament will know that when railway projects were brought before Parliament, if they were at all antagonistic to the Grand Trunk Railway, that paper would use its influence in favour of these measures. It was only a short time ago that a charter was applied for in this Parliament for the Ontario and Quebec Railway, and another for the Toronto and Ottawa Railway, the latter being in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway. The *Globe* strongly denounced the scheme of the Grand Trunk Railway, and called upon this Parliament to crush it out and give the charter to the other Company. Now, however, we find

that paper suddenly changing front and asking this Parliament to adopt a scheme by which Ontario may be placed in the hands of this huge monopoly. Now, Sir, on this occasion it is necessary to examine in detail the objections advanced by hon. gentlemen. So far as I can gather, the chief objection raised by hon. gentlemen is that undue haste has been exhibited by the Government in pushing this question in Parliament, and also that there is no necessity of building the railway so rapidly. That seems to be one of the strong positions assumed by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. Now, Sir, I shall feel it my duty, though at the expense of being somewhat tedious, to meet those objections, and to show that not only the Reform party, but the leaders of the Reform party, have on all occasions desired, if we are to judge by their opinions as expressed on the floor of Parliament and outside of this House, that the road should be built in a speedy manner. Now, Sir, it will be necessary to discuss the opinions of the Reform party, and also of the leaders of that party to a certain extent, in order to show that they have agreed with the Conservative party that it was necessary to make considerable haste in constructing this road across the continent. Now, there is one thing that I think is a very remarkable circumstance, that while the organs of the Opposition have endeavoured to excite a feeling of hostility against the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the scheme now before Parliament, no petition has been presented as yet to this Parliament against it. We have heard of no public meetings held throughout the country against it. The people seem to be perfectly satisfied that the country must come to the rescue and grant the aid asked for. I think I am speaking the sentiments generally of the people when I say that in a question of this great magnitude the people feel the Government is bound to see that what the Company asks for is in the interests of the country. We have had an opportunity, during the last few weeks, of testing the opinion of the people. In the county of Kent, where an election was held, after this scheme was promulgated in Parliament, it cannot be said that the people were not informed on this important question. We had the Rouge element there and the Grit element there. We had the hon. member for North Norfolk making a strong and pathetic appeal to the electors not to give their support to a gentleman who intended, if elected, to support this most extravagant and corrupt Government, and which had propounded a scheme that would entail a vast amount of expenditure and a heavy burden on the country. No man knows better than the hon. gentleman how to make a stump speech. No man in this Parliament or out of it is better able—I was going to say, to deceive the electors, but perhaps that is going too far—no man can better gull the electors, tell a more plausible story, talk longer and louder than the hon. member for North Norfolk, and if anything were necessary to show what an extravagant set of men are on the Conservative benches, no gentleman is more capable of discussing that question. The people had the whole question discussed before them in all its bearings, yet knowing all the charges made against the Government, having a full copy of the indictment laid before them, they returned a supporter of the Government by a large majority. So that at the very first opportunity of testing public opinion, public opinion declared in unequivocal terms that the Government is acting in the best interests of the country. We had also an election in the county of York, and I presume the people of that county had the advantage of being possessed of the same means of information as the people of the county of Kent. Yet the result of the election there was that a former Liberal majority of 912 was reversed, and a Conservative majority polled of 176. If public opinion, therefore, be worth anything at all, we must come to the conclusion that upon this important question the people are in accord with the Government and are satisfied that the

Government are acting in the very best interests of the country. What have we been looking for, for the last fifteen years? From the earliest inception the people have declared that without a line across this continent through British territory, this country would never attain any position of consequence. American statesmen repeatedly declared in Congress and elsewhere that unless the American people were alive to the importance of this question, their Canadian friends, having the best and shortest route, would lead the march in the van of civilization as regards the eastern trade—that they would in a short time have a line across the continent, and thus divert from the American channel that great trade, to secure which is the ambition of the whole of the United States people. We recollect a speech which has been referred to here on more than one occasion, that of Mr. Seward, in which he declared, in language that bears repetition, and which justifies this Government in their desire to have this road rapidly completed:

"The route through British America is, in some respects, preferable to that through our own territory. By the former, the distance from Europe to Asia is some thousand miles shorter than by the latter. Passing close to Lake Superior, traversing the water-shed which divides the streams flowing towards the Arctic Sea from those which have their exit southward, crossing the Rocky Mountains at an elevation of over 3,000 feet less than at the south pass, the road could be here constructed with comparative cheapness, and would open up a region abounding in valuable timber and other natural products, and admirably suited to the growth of grain and grazing. Having its Atlantic sea-board at Halifax and its Pacific near Vancouver Island, it would undoubtedly draw to it the commerce of Europe, Asia and the United States. Thus, British America, from a mere colonial dependency, would assume a controlling rank in the world. To her, other nations would be tributary, and in vain would the United States attempt to be her rival, for she never could dispute with her the possession of the Asiatic commerce, nor the power which that commerce confers."

It seems to me that if any reason can be urged for expedition in building this great road, it is the views expressed by that gentleman, reiterated throughout the whole of the United States, and concurred in by other gentlemen to whom I would refer if I had the time. The consensus of opinion has been that across the Canadian portion of North America there could be built a line which would be 1,000 miles shorter to the seaboard than the line through the United States, and which would be the means of drawing the traffic of the east to the west. Those who in years gone by had the pleasure and gratification of listening to the great leader of the Reform party—I do not mean the hon. gentleman who leads it to-day—but the great leader of the Reform party who has passed and gone, will remember how eloquently he held up to the people the great desirability of having a road across the continent. I cannot better trespass on the time of this hon. House than by reading an extract from one of his speeches:

"It must be pushed through at whatever expense; we believe it can be pushed through, not only without being a burden, pecuniarily, upon Canada, but with an absolute profit in every point of view. Without such a line, a great British North America would turn out an unsubstantial dream; with it, and with ordinary prudence and wisdom on the part of her statesmen, it will be a great, glorious and inevitable reality."

We have there the opinion of eminent men from both countries. We have men living in this country to-day who have looked forward to the time when that road will be completed, and that, too, at an early day. That, I say, has been also the position of the Reform party. They have claimed that the road should be completed at an early day. But, when the opportunity was in their grasp, and they had the power to place that road under construction, they threw every impediment in the way. When the hon. the leader of the Government, in 1872, when he was also the leader of the former Government, propounded a scheme for the early completion of the railway, the hon. gentleman who is now the leader of the Reform party, the member for West Durham, thought there was too much haste in it. That was when the Bill was before Parliament in 1871. Then, when the

Bill was passed and the House had determined that the road should be built, upon a question as regarded the charter and how the road should be built, that hon. gentleman then declared that the opinion of the country had been expressed upon it, and that opinion was irreversible. Upon several occasions he so expressed himself, that he desired that the road should be completed speedily, and that the House had no alternative but to carry that measure through. In 1872, upon May the 8th, the hon. gentleman delivered himself in Parliament of a speech upon this question, and he then showed conclusively that he felt the country was pledged to the early completion of that road. He said:

"Such having been the case last Session, and the objection having been overruled, it did not now become the duty of this side of the House to say a single word, no matter how great the difficulties might appear; but it was their duty to give their earnest endeavours to carry out in good faith the obligations we have incurred. He apprehended that it was solely in reference to the mode in which the Government proposed to carry out the undertaking that a difference of opinion could arise."

Now, Mr. Speaker, listen to the language of the hon. gentleman. Then he was a true patriot; then he felt that the country's interest was paramount to that of his party; he then exclaimed:

"I think that it behoves us all, on whichever side of the House we are, to extend to the Government that has to deal with this enormous question, the most generous consideration."

Now, if there was a necessity ten years ago to extend to the Government most generous consideration in the discussion of that question, why cannot he do that now; why cannot he draw himself entirely out of the loop-strings of his party; why cannot he say: I am bound to be a patriot and to act in the interests of my country? No, he still hopes that, although he appealed to a tribunal of the people three years ago, and hopefully too, he may again appeal to the people on some other occasion, and that, upon this question, perhaps, their verdict may be reversed. We find that all these gentlemen were desirous that that road should be built rapidly. I think I can show another proof of it. It is at the time when the hon. gentleman jumped away from his party a little, became a little restive, because there are times when the hon. gentleman has been restive in his party. He has not been always in accord with the Liberal party. He is somewhat in advance of them in his views. And, when the hon. member for Lambton was endeavouring to push a Bill through Parliament in relation to the Nanaimo and Esquimalt railway, he took exception to that railway, that it was paying too dear for the whistle, and at that time he voted against the leader of his party, and it is said by some who profess to know about the question that the hon. gentleman exercised an influence in the Upper House. At any rate, the Bill was defeated in the Upper House, and did not become law. But, on that occasion, the organ of that party seemed annoyed at the hon. gentleman's action in Parliament, and came out the following day with a thundering article in which it condemned the present leader of the Opposition, and complained that he had not acted in a patriotic manner, when he endeavoured, by a catch vote, to defeat the Government, and in that endeavour was backed up by the member for South Huron. The *Globe* of March 31st, 1875, says:

"The defeat of the Bill under discussion would simply have destroyed the compact, thrown British Columbia into a ferment, and produced at home and abroad the worst possible impression as to security of bargains made with Canadian Governments and of the national spirit of the Canadian House of Commons. If ever there was an enterprise which justified a liberal expenditure of public funds, it is our great Canadian highway across the continent. The necessity for the construction of that line is evident to everyone who takes—we shall not say a statesman-like view of what our Dominion is and what it will become, according as that railway is constructed or not. It is never to be lost sight of that Canada was solemnly and officially pledged to that bargain. The compact was deliberately and explicitly entered into, though technically the present Government might have repudiated it as

Mr. RYKERT.

a whole, and have told British Columbia to go out if she likes. It would have been neither for the profit nor the credit of Canada to have followed such a course. It is not a prudent proceeding for any Government to repudiate engagements of its predecessors."

And mark the censure which the hon. gentleman then got:

"The attempt to catch a majority against the Ministry on the point of the contracts not being submitted to Parliament was equally unworthy and transparently factious."

That, Sir, is the character which the hon. gentleman got from the *Globe* at that time, and since that time his course upon that question has been somewhat restive—not at all times consistent. Upon another occasion, we recollect that an attempt was made to show that Sir Hugh Allan wished to build the line to Sault Ste. Marie, and thereby make it a Yankee road, a road subservient to the Northern Pacific Railway. At that time, an objection was taken by a great many persons in Parliament to that proceeding, to that plan of building the railway. At that time, those who favoured that scheme were denounced in most unmeasured terms. I want to add another witness to the long list I have of gentlemen whom I shall call and ask for their opinion as to this question of making haste in the building of this railway. We had here during the last Parliament a gentleman whose departure, no doubt, hon. gentlemen on the other side regret, though I cannot say that we on this side feel so very sorry, unless for this, that, when he is in Parliament, it gives us an opportunity of exposing sometimes to a greater extent the fallacious arguments of those hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for West Middlesex, in 1876, was anxious to have this road completed at an early day. He stated as follows:—

"It had been said it was a great mistake to undertake the construction of this railway—that the resources of the country were not sufficient for the work. That is not the question now. This House had to consider that, in order to keep faith with British Columbia and discharge the obligations we had undertaken with that Province, we were bound to proceed with the work as quickly as possible."

That sentiment was concurred in by a gentleman who is sitting opposite to me now, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In 1880, that hon. gentleman was enthusiastic in regard to having the road completed at an early day. That hon. gentleman sometimes speaks on both sides of the question. He does so on this question particularly, and on the National Policy he has also spoken on both sides. He has mistaken his profession; he ought to have been a lawyer; then he could have taken a brief on either side. That gentleman, on page 1041 of the *Hansard*, delivered himself in this style:

"We want this region traversed as rapidly as possible. We want to see its productions flowing in vast and ever increasing volume along our commercial routes, giving employment to our railways and our lake and ocean marine. When all this is realized, our great North-West will have become an element of greatness and strength to Canada, and our policy should be shaped with a view to hastening in the most rapid manner the development we desire."

And, Mr. Speaker, he grows still more eloquent. As he went on, the House cheered him to the echo, feeling that these sentiments were the sentiments of the people, and the hon. gentleman waxed more eloquent, and on he goes:

"We must bear in mind that we have a rival on the south of us, through whose territory the tide of immigration seeking our North-West must pass, and immigrants, while passing through to the North-West, will have laid before them all the advantages offered by our neighbours as an inducement for immigrants to settle on their lands."

Sir, that is one of the arguments we now advance; that was one of the most important reasons to which I shall allude by and by, why we should keep faith with the people in the building of this great trans-continental railway: it is that emigrants may not be waylaid in going through the United States to the North-West, that they may not be turned aside from their road in going through the United States to that great country which we are now endeavouring to open up. As I said before, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has a happy faculty of going back upon himself. We find that in 1881, he was not exactly of the same

mind; he was, if I were to use an unparliamentary expression, playing the political hypocrite. Perhaps it might offend the hon. gentleman, and therefore I would not like to say it; at the same time a person can almost say it, and in quoting the hon. gentleman's own language, one can almost make a person believe that he was such. We find him delivering this language in 1881, and I think that is one answer I can give to the challenge made by the hon. member for South Huron. I intend to take up that challenge, and I will satisfy the hon. gentleman that there is no necessity of making any more challenges. Well, Sir, this is what the hon. member for North Norfolk said, in 1881:

"In 1874, we estimated that the North-West was to a great extent worthless, and in 1880 this was proved incorrect. If, in consequence of the changed relations, we believe the country has a value which we believe it did not possess in 1874, we should all agree to rectify mistakes in the past."

Now, Sir, that is the position these gentlemen assume when their previous record is challenged. We find these hon. gentlemen to-day rising in their places in Parliament and giving their word that a certain statement of fact is correct. They make statements here that they will vouch for, and yet three or four years hence, on the floor of Parliament, they will say: "Oh! circumstances have changed. We thought differently at that time; we were misinformed; we had not the information necessary." That was the position of the hon. gentleman then. Then he went on to say:

"True, in the North-West we had, indeed, millions of acres of land. In the North-West we had lands which would give sufficient sustenance for from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000. Let them get inhabitants for it as soon as possible."

In 1880, while decrying the country and the 100,000,000 acres, to build the railway:

"And at the risk of being considered unpatriotic, I wish to place before the House some facts which have a very intimate bearing upon our own interests. I wish to make some comparison between the present condition of this country and the present condition of the United States. I wish to show to this House and to the country that we are at this moment in a critical condition."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that if there was any argument wanting to show the necessity for making haste in the building of this railway, I have extracted that argument from speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite and their leader. I would ask this House this question: If there is no haste in the building of that railway, if there is no desire to have a railway across the continent through Canadian territory, why was it that upon the eve of a general election the hon. member for East York advertised for tenders to build that road from Lake Nipissing to the Pacific Ocean? Why was it, Sir, that that hon. gentleman, on the eve of an election, sent to the Pacific coast 5,000 tons of steel rails, if there was no necessity for the building of that road? Now, Sir, in the face of these facts, is it possible for any person to come to any other conclusion than that there is a necessity for building that road, and that, too, as rapidly as possible? If those gentlemen would pursue a patriotic course, if they could for one moment, or for one Session of Parliament, lift themselves from the mire of party politics, if they could feel that they represent the people, that there is a great responsibility resting upon them as representatives of the people, I think, Sir, that in the language of the hon. member for West Durham, they would join hands with the Government and give their hearty consideration to a question of the importance of this railway to the interests of our country. Sir, the hon. gentlemen know what has been the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it does not lie in their mouths to say that we are going to increase the burdens of taxation. It is true they recognized years ago that it should not be pressed forward if it had a tendency to increase the taxation of the people. That is the cry they raise now. They say it is going to increase the burdens of the people. I would like to ask those gentlemen if they thought so in 1878, when they stood

helplessly in the face of the people, when they stood with their arms folded and said: "We are helpless; our credit is ruined; we have run the country into extravagance; we have not a dollar in our exchequer; our credit is irretrievably impaired." If they at that time made a proposition to build the railway, if they expended a large amount of money upon estimates to build that railway, surely, Sir, they are not the men now to cry out against the promotion of this enterprise on the ground of expense. Surely, if they could build the road then, we can do it now. Now, Mr. Speaker, in discussing this question there are certain things which we ought to consider. In my judgment, the first thing we have to consider is, whether the demand made by the Company is a just and reasonable demand; secondly, has the Company satisfactorily shown to this Parliament that they are not, at present, in a position to complete their road, and if so, then in what time can they do it? Has the Company shown satisfactorily the true state of affairs, and what has brought them about? Are they responsible for it? Has it arisen from circumstances over which they have no control? Will the country be benefitted by the granting of the concession? Has the Company offered satisfactory security? And can we assist them within the spirit of the Resolution of 1872, recognized by all Governments, that is of not increasing the burden of taxation? These are the questions I propose to consider briefly. I think these are the questions for the consideration of this House, and not the random statements of the hon. gentleman made here, that this Parliament and the other Parliament were in favour of one measure or another measure—not the Pacific Scandal that turned one Government out and may turn out another Government. These are not the questions for discussion, although the leader of the Opposition made a long and eloquent speech upon them; although, Sir, the hon. gentleman sailed about as close to the wind as any person possibly could sail in an argument; although he made a speech of three or four hours' duration on subjects that have nothing to do with the question before the House. Sir, I sat patiently listening to him and taking notes—I have a great volume of notes here—and I waited three mortal hours hoping he would come to the question. I took down twenty-six objections he had raised of a fanciful character, which I wish briefly to touch upon later on, and I suddenly heard him close with a peroration, but with not one single word against the resolution, not one single argument advanced against the security offered by the railway. Now, the hon. gentleman can make a speech, use highly polished language; but, Sir, he can plead a case upon one side or the other to suit his convenience. The hon. gentleman can make, I say, a polished speech, make an impressive speech; he can make a speech that the people who listen to him for the first time, but who do not closely scrutinize his arguments, will call a magnificent speech, but when it is stripped of its verbiage, you see what it is made of. Now, Sir, I propose briefly to give some reasons why, in my judgment, the Railway Company is justified in asking for this assistance from the Government, and why the Government is justified in granting their request. I propose briefly, even at the risk of being a little lengthy, to refute some of the arguments, or statements, made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, although it is putting the cart before the horse in every sense of the word, I will first take up the speech made by the hon. gentleman who last preceded me. It seemed to me, Sir, when the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) was making his quotations, it was very much like Satan quoting Scripture. I have heard speeches made in this Parliament, I have heard speeches made in other Parliaments, but I never yet heard a more vulgar, a more abusive speech. I never heard a speech abounding with such gross ignorance; and never

heard a speech surrounded with so much pride, so much presumption, so much conceit, and delivered in such a theatrical style. I do not wonder the leader of the Opposition went to sleep. From eight o'clock till the hon. gentleman closed, he never raised his head from his desk. And why, Sir? The hon. gentleman knew it was a disgrace to Parliament, a disgrace to his party, that any member who sits here as a member of Parliament should be found who would make such an outrageous speech as that hon. gentleman made. The hon. gentleman, in a theatrical style, has thrown down a challenge on this side of the House. What does he take us to be? Does he think we have been playing Rip Van Winkle, for the last fifteen years? Does he think we have not been keeping track of him? I can tell him I have been doing so. Does the hon. gentleman think we have forgotten the record? That hon. gentleman challenged hon. members on the Government side of the House to show that the Liberals had ever been extravagant in their estimates of the cost of building the railway, and that they had depreciated the value of the land in the fertile belt. I always regret in this House and in court being compelled to call a witness in whom I have no faith; and it is the last resort of a lawyer to be compelled to depreciate the value of his own witnesses. I am going to call witnesses and see what they have to say about the matter. In the first place, did hon. gentlemen opposite make extravagant estimates as to the cost of building the railway? Let me take the leader of the Liberal Party, in the first instance. Let me call his attention to a time when he met the late distinguished member for Halton (Mr. McDougall), in the county of Welland, in his famous four hours speech in which he dealt with the extravagance of the Government in entering into such an enormous and outrageous scheme as that of building the Pacific Railway. What did the hon. gentleman then say:

"Mr. Blake then proceeded to criticise the Pacific Railway scheme, which was one of the maddest schemes ever thought of. The cost of equipment, construction and stock of our present railways ranged from \$80,000 to \$100,000 per mile. The first section of the railway from Ottawa to Fort Garry, at this rate, would cost \$100,000,000; the next was intersected by great rivers, which would necessitate costly bridging; and the third section, from the base of the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Coast, was full of mountains, and one of the most difficult in the world for the construction of a railway. He showed the dangers attendant on the carrying out of the Act passed last Session, the probability that the road would cost \$100,000,000, the inadequacy of the present grant, and the dangerous power conceded to the Government."

Then we have a statement by another high authority, the Speaker of the Grit Government, Mr. Anglin, on March 30th, according to the report of the *Globe* newspaper, used the following language:—

"He thought the estimate of \$100,000,000 would be found small enough. At any rate, the Government knew very little about what it would cost. The member for Wentworth has estimated the cost at \$200,000,000. The member for Lennox (Mr. Cartwright), who was well known as a careful calculator, had estimated it at \$240,000,000. Who could say that the Dominion, with its present resources, could pay the present debt, and assume a debt of \$240,000,000. \* \* \* But in addition to that, it would cost at least \$2,500,000 to run the railway after it was built. \* \* \* The cost of carrying a railway through British Columbia would be money thrown away, and a millstone on the neck of the Dominion."

Then we have another witness, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He is reported in the *Globe* of November, 1873, to have said:

"I may also add, that I hope we shall be able to devise means by which this shall be accomplished at a very much less cost than was contemplated by the company of Sir Hugh Allan. You are, perhaps, not aware that it was contemplated that the expenditure under this scheme would be \$180,000,000. That fact is not generally known."

Then we have the hon. gentleman still further delivering himself of a speech at Glencoe. He said:

"That gentleman (A. P. McDonald) saw no difficulty in undertaking to spend at least \$100,000,000, and he believed very much more, in the construction of the railway. It cost over \$300,000,000 to build the

Mr. RYKERT.

American, which was one-third shorter and had less natural difficulties in the way than ours, except in one portion of it. From the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific, through British Columbia, was exceedingly rough, and from the Lake of the Woods and Winnipeg River to the head waters of the Ottawa, the country was undoubtedly the roughest on the continent."

Then we have a statement by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), made in a Budget speech, in which he said:

"I entertain no doubt that if it were incumbent upon us to push the line through within the time specified (if it were possible) the revenue would be enormously increased, and that a moderate estimate would reach \$150,000,000 to \$160,000,000."

I submit to the House that I have proved—I will not say by reputable witnesses—that hon. gentlemen opposite made extravagant estimates of the cost of building the road. What do they now say? They tell us it can be constructed for from \$60,000,000 to \$70,000,000; and they talk about millionaires engaged in the work rolling up money. The next challenge is contained in this question: When did they under-estimate the extent and value of the lands? That is rich. At page 1965 of the *Hansard*, of 1879, we have the following statement by Mr. Rymal:—

"It was evident from the nature of the discussion, that they were not ready to commence the construction of the road. He had always looked upon this scheme as one calculated to outweigh the capacity of Canada. He did not believe there were 100,000,000 acres of fertile land in the North-West, and he feared that the price of \$2 per acre, placed upon the land there, would turn the tide of emigration to the United States."

Take another witness; ex-Speaker Anglin, at page 1590 of *Hansard*, 1880, says:

"The hon. member has clearly proved that the net proceeds of all the lands to be sold in that country would be entirely insufficient to pay the cost of this railway. He showed that if the road is to be such a one as we were led to expect; if, even on the prairie land, we were not to have the construction slighted, and the road made a mere colonization road, it must cost much more than the amount the hon. gentleman stated."

Another witness is the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He always inserts a reservation—provided I do not change my mind. That hon. gentleman said, at page 1556:

"From the estimates as to the extent of the arable land in that country, given by the hon. member for Lambton, it would appear that the total amount of arable land south of the north line of the railway belt really does not exceed seventy millions of acres. I have no doubt this is a very liberal estimate."

"It is barely possible that it may reach 95,000,000 acres. I believe this is a liberal estimate."

He goes on:

"Taking all of the land of the North-West, it is barely possible that it may reach 95,000,000 of acres. I believe that is a most liberal estimate."

The hon. member for East York also expressed his opinion on that question. He said:

"Having thus satisfied myself—indeed, I do not require any additional information to satisfy myself—on this point, that it is impossible for the Government to build the road from the produce of the land in the North-West, I have to consider what is the best course to be pursued. I have always held that whatever revenue is realized from the lands will be absorbed, mainly in settlement and Governmental expenses, and that the money must be contributed by the people of Canada for the building of this railway; that, therefore, any extravagant expenditure would simply involve us in an amount of debt such as we cannot venture to carry."

The same hon. gentleman made a speech at Cornwall, when claiming to speak by authority—because he said he had consulted General Palliser—he said: "I give you my word there are 44,417,235 acres." I think I have proved my position, in accepting the challenge of those hon. gentlemen, who assert that they have not under-estimated the extent of the country; for I have called them as witnesses, and out of their own mouths I have convicted them. I have shown that not only when time and occasion suited, but at all times, they have exaggerated the cost of building the railway, that they have in the most unpatriotic manner run

down the credit of the country, and under-estimated the extent of the fertile lands in the North West, and that no person has been more keen and zealous in so doing, than the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). As to the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), I hope the next time he quotes anything in history, he will be careful to understand, before he starts, exactly what the story is, for I should gather from his remarks that he could not tell whether Cassandra was a man or a woman. I hope he has found out by this time; and I hope that when he next quotes history, he will previously rehearse it in the room, at the other end of this building. The hon. gentleman said that I would vote for these Resolutions. I tell him that I shall do so with all my heart, believing, as I do, that I am voting in the interests of my country. He said further, that I had stated that we would invoke the Court of Chancery to compel the Company to build the road. What I did say was, in answer to the hon. member for West Durham, who said the Company would build the prairie sections, and abandon the other, I said that the courts would compel them to build both, if proceedings were invoked, and I proved it. I showed conclusively that if the Company accepted the bargain, they must accept it in its entirety. They cannot take the good and reject the bad. But we are not in that position to-day, the Company has not failed to carry out the contract. They have five years to do it, but the wisacre from Huron says: Why they will invoke proceedings in the Court of Chancery; but they cannot do it, it is utterly impossible. I think I need not trouble the House further with regard to that hon. gentleman. With regard to the speech made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), I venture to assert, that when that hon. gentleman read the report of his speech next day he was astonished to see how a man could talk so long and say so little. Then we had a speech from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I would like to say with regard to that speech, if it were parliamentary to say it, that it was the most blundering speech that was ever delivered in this House. If that hon. gentleman were present, I think I could show, even to his satisfaction, that the statements made by him were so much at variance—I will not say with the truth, but with the Parliamentary records—that he would be ashamed of himself when he came to examine them. He said:

"Well, in the first place, as I have said, we made a mistake in making the time too short, and the result of that mistake was, that we had to pay the people of British Columbia a large amount to get an extension of time."

What did we pay them? Who ever heard of it? We paid them in promises. Why, Sir, the hon. member for West Durham, who desired to conciliate the people of British Columbia, said to them: We will give you \$750,000, though we are running rapidly in debt, if you will only give us time. The hon. member for East York, at one time, bought his peace with British Columbia, by promising to give them a railway costing \$3,500,000, and by guaranteeing to expend \$2,000,000 in that Province; and that is all I know of the many promises to pay which were made to British Columbia. The hon. gentleman says again, that the Liberal press have not abused the North-West. In answer to that, let me read what the hon. member for South Huron said:

"As to the Liberal press, he had hardly any words too strong to convey his disapprobation of their conduct towards the North-West and towards the railway. Now, Sir, I am not responsible, nor are my friends responsible, for all that the press of Canada choose to say."

I leave the hon. member for Wellington, and the hon. member for Huron, to settle their difficulties on that question. The hon. gentleman stated further, that the cost of the Intercolonial Railway was \$38,000,000; but if he will turn to the schedule of the Public Accounts, page 24, he will find that it cost \$28,080,650, and that he was astray only to the extent of \$10,000,000. The hon. gentleman said further:

"I notice, in looking over the Public Accounts, that the debt of the Dominion has increased about \$32,000,000 within the last six years."

Now, Sir, if it were a parliamentary expression, I should like to say that that was a "whopper;" but as perhaps that is unparliamentary, he can understand me as having said it. The total debt of the Dominion at the end of the year 1878-79 was, \$179,483,871; and in 1882-83 it was \$202,159,104, or an increase of \$22,675,230, instead of \$32,000,000. If the hon. gentleman had only gone further and given the net debt, he would have found himself still further astray. The net debt of the Dominion in 1878—going back to the 1st of July of that year—though we claim credit for 1874 as belonging to this Government, as they say they have the right to claim 1879 as theirs; but, at any rate, the net debt of 1878 was \$140,352,069; the net debt of 1879 was \$142,990,187; and the net debt of 1883 was \$158,166,714. The net debt had only increased \$15,476,202, instead of \$32,000,000. This shows how close those hon. gentlemen can sail to the wind, and how anxious they are to deceive the country. As I said before, I propose that the antidote shall go along with the poison. But, Sir, the hon. gentlemen gave up the whole case. The only member of that side of the House who has spoken with the courage of his convictions, who had the honesty to declare what his convictions really were, wound up by saying:

"The question of security was also mentioned, but we have not gone into the question of challenging the security, and I do not know where the hon. gentleman has got his information on that point. I have not heard anything on this side of the House upon that point. The whole question has been as to whether it is in the interest of the country that we should go on and make this grant, or whether we should withhold our hand."

The question we consider the most important is the question of the security; but the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that we have all the security necessary, and that they are not now discussing that question. He is the only member who has expressed himself so plainly. Now, let me refer to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming). That hon. gentleman has stated that in the conception of building this railroad it was intended that it should start at Callander and be carried to the Pacific Ocean. The reason was that it was unnecessary, he says, to have a Pacific Railway run further east than Callander, because at that point it would form its connection with the existing railway system of the country. I would like to know where the railways were at that time. The Canada Central was not built that far; and yet the hon. gentleman says the Pacific Railway was to connect with the existing railway system of the country. I think that hon. gentleman also gave up the case as regards the value of the security when he said that the earnings of the Company for the next two years would be \$2,500,000, and \$8,000,000 for postal service, which I think is somewhat exaggerated, but he shows that the earnings will be so great that the debt must be paid off inside of six years. Now, Sir, there is only one other gentleman to whom I shall allude: that is the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). Although he is an old member of this House I am somewhat older than he is in parliamentary life, and I would advise that hon. gentleman that when he wants to make a stump speech, he had better make it in his own county than on the floor of Parliament. When the hon. gentleman falls into the groove of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) and makes the assertion that the expenditure has increased \$10,000,000 in six years, I just wish to ask him to read the speech of the hon. member for South Huron on that question. But when the hon. gentleman says that the Railway Company has employed outsiders and foreigners to the detriment of Canadians, he states what he must know is not true. The hon. gentleman ought to have informed himself on that question before he spoke. If he had, he would have found out that of the 9,000 people at work on

the Pacific Railway in the direction of Port Arthur, there are nearly 7,000 French Canadians, and the hon. gentleman must know that in no season during the last ten years have farm labourers been so scarce as they were last season. Under these circumstances, we can understand the difficulty of obtaining labourers to complete the railway in the North-West. I think the hon. gentleman ought to have posted himself on that question before attempting to enlighten the House upon it. Now, Sir, I propose to allude briefly to the position taken by the hon. member for South Huron upon the financial question. Every speech that the hon. gentleman has made in this House he has prefaced with attacks of the most outrageous character on the present leader of the Government; and I was surprised, that you, Sir, who are so distinguished for fair play and impartiality, should have allowed these infamous attacks on the oldest political leader in this Dominion. I say that nothing will justify the shameful language that hon. gentleman used towards the leader of the Government. In 1873 he went to the polls condemning the right hon. gentleman. He went again in 1878 holding him up as one of the greatest villains this country ever produced; but the country told him: you have foully maligned that man, and we are prepared to follow him. The dose was repeated two years ago, and I say that hon. gentleman ought to be ashamed to repeat those expressions with reference to a gentleman who is entitled to the respect and esteem of every man on this continent. That hon. gentleman declared in this House the other day, that the expenditure had increased during six years to the extent of \$10,000,000. Sir, that assertion was well met by the hon. gentleman who followed him. But I want to send out to the public, side by side with that speech of the hon. gentleman, a speech he delivered a few years ago, which will show what kind of a man we have to deal with. It is true the people thought they had sent him to oblivion a few years ago, but by the grace of Mr. McMillan he sits here again. Now, Sir, if he has any shame at all, I will give him an opportunity of showing it. We have heard of the silver shield, and I asked him the other night while he was making his speech which side of the shield he showed this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite must know that they have among them, as one of their leaders, a renegade from the Conservative party, and they must feel ashamed of his speeches in Parliament. The hon. gentleman's language is:

"I say that hon. gentlemen who support a Finance Minister, who in six years, from 1867 to 1874, added \$10,000,000 a year to the annual expenditure, and left a further liability of \$60,000,000, and who has since added \$8,000,000 to the annual expenditure, should know well what great risks the country runs from such insane expenditures."

When the hon. member denounces in Parliament, the Government, he ought to recollect that, in the year 1872, before he knew whether his talent would be appreciated by the Reform party or not—when he was standing between heaven and earth, as it were, awaiting to see what party would take his wares—he then placed on record his views with regard to the right hon. the leader of the Government. He said: "I am prepared to place in his hands the expenditure of \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land; I am prepared to take his word for it; I have entire confidence in him," yet to-day he has the audacity to stand up here and criticise the hon. gentleman in unmeasured terms. Upon that occasion, a resolution was moved by Mr. Woods and seconded by Mr. Mills, as follows:—

"That all the words after 'be' to the end of the question be left out and the words, recommended to a Committee of the Whole House, in order to amend the same, so that so large a sum as \$30,000,000 of money and so large a quantity of land as 50,000,000 of acres shall not be at the disposition of the will of the Government of the day, and so that the said money and lands shall only be disposed of by specific annual votes of Parliament, from time to time given, as shall seem to appear right and proper, so that Parliament shall not be divested of its most important constitutional function, namely, control over the public expenditure of the country, inserted instead thereof."

Mr. RYKERT.

He had that much confidence in the right hon. gentleman that he was prepared to trust him with the control of \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres, yet to-day he has the audacity to say that that hon. gentleman committed an infamous act and was unworthy the confidence of the people. I was referring to the statement made that the expenses had increased \$10,000,000 from 1867 to 1873, and that it was due to the reckless management of the Government of that day. But what did the hon. gentleman say with reference to that increased expenditure. He said, when Minister of Finance, in his circular, which he sent to the English stock market:

"The whole of the debt has been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility. There has been expended on:

Canals, about.....	£ 5,500,000
Railways, including advances to and the cost of those actually owned by Canada.....	12,000,000
Lighthouses, river improvements, harbours, roads and public buildings.....	2,000,000
Compensation to the various Provinces for property and revenue surrendered to the Dominion, the purchase and organization of territories, and the freeing of lands in the Province of Quebec from the feudal tenure &c.....	5,000,000

He then goes on to say:

"The revenue has shown a continuous surplus during each year since the Confederation in 1867, although it has in the interval been charged with much heavy expenditure of an exceptional kind, such as outlay connected with the several Fenian attacks on the country, the acquisition or organization of new territories, and providing an adequate defensive force for the Dominion. The eight years since Confederation, therefore, exhibit an aggregate surplus of £2,448,111 (not including the Sinking Fund), which has been partially applied in the redemption of debt and partially expended on new works."

That was the circular of the hon. gentleman in England, but what did he do when he came out here? He made a speech a short time afterwards at Alymer, on the 22nd of September, where he forgot all his references to the bright side of the picture, and presented instead this dismal view:—

"Sir, I have asked myself more than once, and I now publicly repeat the question: was this done in sheer brutal ignorance and recklessness? or was it done of malice prepense? Did they design to scuttle the ship after they had plundered it? or was it only the last mad folly of the drunken crew before they had ran upon the breakers? Whatever the cause, that was the position of affairs when we came into office; those were the difficulties to which you have alluded in your address, and with which my hon. friend has been struggling ever since. Now there is no doubt the position was a critical one."

He was then referring to the \$10,000,000 of increased expenditure from 1867 to 1873, which he had formerly characterized as having been expended in public works of great utility to the country, but which expenditure he now characterized as the last act of a drunken crew. Let us see what was the estimate formed of that hon. gentleman by his own friends. We have been compelled upon different occasions to listen to quotations from that side of the House taken from a very distinguished writer in this country, a writer of current events in the *Bystander*. If ever there was a member of this House properly gauged and a proper estimate of his character formed, that was done with reference to the hon. gentleman by that writer, who has so often had occasion to write about different members of this House and the other Parliament. I can point to nothing that, to my mind, more conclusively shows the real position that the hon. gentleman occupies in the estimation of his countrymen. *Bystander* says:

"Perhaps the recent political history of Canada has never been so boldly travestied by one as intelligent audience as the Finance Minister attempted to travesty it at Strathroy. His facts are almost invariably wrong, and his figures—well, his figures are plastic and accommodating. No public man, certainly since Confederation, has less right than Mr. Cartwright to attempt a show of consistency. Whether the *souperon* of personal pique against the Conservative leader, on the ground that his claims as a financier were contemptuously set aside, be true or not, there is certainly a verisimilitude about it, read in the light of the Minister's vindictive speeches against his former chief, which cannot be blinked. The attempt to play upon popular ignorance, or rather popular indifference, not merely to him and his antecedents, but to any party politics more than a year old, is futile. He is now responsible for the financial status and credit of the Dominion, and we have no hesitation in

saying—although there is not the sign of a suitable successor on the other side—that he is not the man to play ducks and drakes with the future of the Dominion. His policy has been all wrong from first to last; he has borrowed money at ruinous rates, when he should have imposed taxes; he blames his predecessors for not imposing taxes when they were not wanted; his forecast of the future has egregiously failed in every year of his tenure of office; and, in addition to all his other deficiencies, he has the foulest tongue, save, perhaps, Mr. Francis Jones, in the Dominion. Incompetency is stamped upon the whole course of his Administration, and if posterity will not say of him what Sir Francis Dashwood expected contemporaries to remark, 'There goes the worst Chancellor of the Exchequer that ever lived,' it will be because they have forgotten all about him. \* \* \* Mr. Cartwright is so eaten up of personal antipathies that he could not do any good as a Minister, if he would."

I think that I can safely relegate that hon. member to the position he ought to occupy in this House and the country. If ever there was a proper estimate of a man's character and ability and financial success, it is the one I have just read. When the hon. Minister of Railways spoke of the increased expenditure being in consequence of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in 1874, the hon. gentleman says it was not true. Let us have the proof. There again I must take a witness in whom I have not much confidence—the *Globe* newspaper. In a quotation which appeared in the *Globe* newspaper, taken from an Order in Council, passed 23rd July, 1874, by the late Government, I find the following language:—

"So anxious, however, were the present Government to remove any possible cause of complaint, that they did take means to increase the taxation very materially, in order to place themselves in a position to make arrangements for the prosecution of the initial and difficult portions of the line as soon as it was possible to do so; and, at the same time, a special confidential agent was deputed to British Columbia for the express purpose of conferring with the Government of that Province, and to endeavour to arrive at some understanding as to a course to be pursued which could be satisfactory to British Columbia and meet the circumstances of the Dominion."

Let me read another quotation from that Order in Council; and I think, when I have read that, the hon. gentleman will be ashamed of himself for having attacked the hon. Minister of Railways, if he has any shame in him at all. This, Sir, is a paragraph I have taken from the Order in Council. I have the documents here, for I generally arm myself with them when I face the hon. gentleman. I will make the quotation from it, and you will be able to see then whether he is right or not in contradicting the Minister of Railways.

"In order to enable the Government to carry out the proposal, which it was hoped the British Columbia Government would have accepted, the average rate of taxation was raised at the last Session about 15 per cent., and the excise duties on spirits and tobacco a corresponding rate, both involving additional taxation exceeding \$3,000,000 on the transactions of the year."

What is the statement here? That they increased the taxation by \$3,000,000. It was not true, said the hon. member facing me. Here are the records of his own Council. Now, I think I may safely let that member take the position he ought to take, and did take, when the electors of Centre Wellington took hold of him at the last election. And let me refer again to the other hon. member for Huron, his mate. He said they were fond of prophesying, and their prophecies were generally correct. Now, the gallant knight from Huron made a prophecy during the last Parliament, when he prophesied in reference to this Syndicate contract that it was not going to turn out as members upon this side expected. He thought he had a real bonanza in it, and the member chuckled over it like a little boy with a piece of candy. He said:

"This Bill would, to us, be a real election bonanza. I have no doubt that some, at any rate, of these gentlemen may expect to find it an election bonanza in quite another sense."

Did he find it an election bonanza? The electors of Centre Wellington knew all about him, they had heard his history, they heard from his own lips, and those electors, intelligent men as they were, said: You are unworthy of the confidence of the people, go back whence you came; and they sent him back accordingly. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am

obliged to make another reference, and there is the difficulty we have in following preceding speakers. I have endeavoured to steer clear, so far, of what other hon. gentlemen have stated, but, after the eloquent speeches of the Minister of Railways and my hon. friend from Cardwell and other hon. gentlemen beside me, I found it difficult to decide upon what points I should address this House. I have endeavoured, so far, to steer clear of what those gentlemen spoke of, and I hope I may leave something for those who may follow me. The member for Huron spoke of the admirable speech of the member of West Durham, of that magnificent, that eloquent speech, which he said was one of the grandest efforts that Parliament ever heard. Well, I am prepared to say it was a very highly polished speech; I am prepared to say that no hon. gentleman could have exceeded him in sailing as close to the wind as he did on that occasion, that no other hon. gentleman could have appeared to meet the arguments and yet have avoided them as he did, and that no hon. gentleman could have strung together the English language in more beautiful style, but, strip the tassel of its tinsel, and you see the ingredients it is made of. That is all I can say of the hon. gentleman's speech. It is composed altogether of side issues, and I defy the hon. gentleman to point out one argument he advanced against the value of that security; I defy him to point out one argument in reference to the resolutions now before this House. He talked about the lack of information, he talked about the Syndicate contract being signed as a finality, he talked about the financial ability of the capitalists, he talked about the enormous expense of the prairie section of the railway, costing \$3,000,000, he spoke about making speed at the expense of cost, he spoke about the Railway Act not being complied with, he spoke of the Syndicate members being members of the construction company as a violation of the Act, he spoke of the law requiring tenders—he made some twenty-six objections which had no more bearing upon the question than upon the building of a railway to the moon. But he did mention one or two points which I shall briefly touch upon before sitting down. One had reference to the monopoly and one to the eastern connections. He says, what right had they to the eastern connection. Where is he going to place them? Is he going to land the Company at Callander, in the midst of a wilderness? Are they to have no eastern connection at all? It was a matter of necessity, surrounded as they were by hostile railways, railways which had no sympathy whatever with the Pacific Railway, that they should in self-defence build their own railways and have an eastern connection. Was it in contemplation, when it was decided to build a line from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, to have a portion of it the Pacific Railway, and another portion something else? Not at all. It was always intended that they should have a railway through, although it is true that in the charter it was stated that they should form a connection with lines at Callander. Passing over the numerous objections of the hon. gentleman, I will take the most important ones to which he alluded, and one is the question of monopolies. He speaks of monopoly as something unheard of in this House. Let him turn to the Act of 1878, introduced by Mr. Mills, and he will find one of the greatest monopolies that could be conceived by any Government. It was handing over the whole of the North-West to lines running in all directions, east, west, north and south, as stated by the hon. gentleman, and giving the control to any body of corporators, no matter who they were, of 6,400 acres a mile. Was not that a greater monopoly than they say exists in the North-West under this Pacific Railway Company? The hon. gentleman says he has no objection if the Government are going to have the railway. If they run it, he says, there is no monopoly. I cannot see the force of that. It is just as much a monopoly in the Government as in a company.

What do the Company do with their lands? We have an evidence. This Company, although they are possessed of 21,000,000 of acres of land, cannot raise a single dollar on the English or American market with which to carry on their enterprise. Were they to hoard up their lands for all time to come? No company would do that. Their duty was to sell their land and make it valuable. They talk about a monopoly in reference to this land in the North-West. Who are these gentlemen who are crying out against monopoly? If any one takes up an Act of last Session and the preceding Session, and will go to the Committee Room and see the Acts of Parliament printed and not carried through Parliament, he will find a whole host of Grit members of Parliament asking for charters over that country, and not one of them placed a single plan before Parliament or said where they were going. They wanted to gridiron that country in every direction. And, because they failed to get charters, they are crying out against the monopoly. These are the men. It is because they could not get the railway charters and could not get control of the lands themselves that they are finding fault. Another class who are finding fault with the monopoly are the great promoters of colonization schemes, and I shall later on refer to these colonization companies. But these are the men who to-day are raising a rumpus in this country, and crying out against the great monopoly which they say is formed by this railway grant. They are disappointed because they could not get possession of this land themselves. We find also that the men who are now complaining of the monopoly in the North-West are the very ones who to-day would place us at the mercy of the United States, men like the member for North Norfolk, and other members of this House, whom I could name, who have interests in the North-West. What do they desire? They desire railways running from the North-West right through to the United States, sapping the life-blood of that territory, drawing the whole trade of the North-West to the United States, instead of bringing it through Canadian territory. Those are the men who are complaining about the landlordism there. Then we find speculators, who are disappointed because they cannot make money there. They are too lazy to make money in a proper way. They are men who have laid out town plots and cannot sell them. Persons who have bought these town plots in every direction are commencing to cry out about landlordism and terrorism—that the Government is trampling on the North-West. These are the people who are to-day villifying the Government. I have had the pleasure of going over the whole length of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I went there as spectator desirous of knowing what the country really was and what were its resources, and the sentiments of the population. Sir, I feel that no member has a right to stand on the floor of Parliament and discuss these important questions who does not know something about that country. What did I find? I know it is reported in the newspapers that I had villified the North-West. I did nothing of the kind. No man ever heard me say so. What I did say was this: In a private conversation in the presence of a reporter I said: "Rather than exchange my own happy home and go to the North-West to take a judgeship, I would rather stay at home; and that I would not sacrifice my own home for the whole North-West." I went on further to say, that I had for twenty-five long years been fighting the Grit party in my own county, and I would not surrender that county for the whole North-West Territory. But they would not publish that statement; if they had published the whole I would not have cared. I, Sir, do not villify my own country; I do not belong to the party that villifies its own country; I do not belong to that nationality that villifies its own country. On the contrary, I have done everything I could to encourage young men whom I found were

Mr. BRYANT.

desirous of going to the West, to go to the North-West Territory, where I thought they would have abundant opportunity for improving their condition. But, Sir, I did not find my own country all bad; I found good land and bad land. I attended public meetings and mingled with the settlers in order to ascertain what were the causes of the grievances of which they complained, and what did I find? A few speculators, a few politicians, who were circulating reports of the most damaging character all through the country. Let me refer to a statement made a few days ago in my own county by a man who was settled beyond Moose Jaw. He told me that before he left that place, about Christmas, he had a gathering of all the friends in the neighbourhood, and 120 heads of families sat down to dinner at Christmas. That did not show anything like the North-West being depopulated. It did not give evidence of the fact that they were crossing the line to the south. There is another thing we have heard complaints about. People are crying out about landlordism and terrorism. Sir, there is a set of speculators in our country, there are men to-day in Canada—I can name several if I choose to do so—men in my own town, who have large tracts in Dakota and Kansas, and who are waylaying every person going to the North-West Territory and trying to induce them to go to Dakota and examine the land. You will find many railway officers who are emigrant agents, so far as those territories are concerned. You ask for a ticket and you will find that ticket to be a prospective land ticket, given to you, either by the Albert Lea Route, or by the Chicago and North Western, to Crookston—no further. They will give you thirty days to go and select land. On these tickets you find that if you go to Dakota and take up land they will pay your expenses. And what is worse than all, I believe that railway companies in Canada encourage the dissemination of literature of that kind, which is doing no good to Canada. We find in every railway station cereals and grain of all kinds, put in bottles, exhibited before the general public, as advertisements of Dakota and Kansas. These are the people to-day who are doing all they can to cry down the country. I will venture to assert that if any right thinking man in Canada would take an impartial view of this question in all its bearings, he would come to the conclusion that the cry of landlordism and monopoly in the North-West emanates from a few disappointed Grit politicians and speculators who have lost the coveted opportunity of bettering their own condition. A great deal is said about the colonization schemes. Sir, these very men who are crying out about colonization schemes are the means of encouraging landlordism in that country—members of Parliament it may be; I see some of them facing me now—are themselves interested in colonization schemes—some of them. Consult the *Canada Gazette* and you will find names by the score of those patriots who are applicants as members of colonization schemes to purchase land in that country; and because the right hon. leader of the Government, as Minister of the Interior, saw fit to refuse their application, those gentlemen are now crying out in their disappointment about the danger of colonization schemes. Now, what are these companies doing? Are they doing good or bad work? Why, Sir, how many have been granted? Only twenty-eight companies have been formed there, with 3,000,000 acres of land and one half that land belongs to the settler. They are simply immigration agents as regards one half of it, and instead of their taking large quantities of that territory and locking it up in colonization schemes, only 1,500,000 acres are so locked up. But in what manner is it locked up? Let me again call hon. members of this Parliament as witnesses. Take an article of a few weeks ago in the *Globe*, November 2nd, 1883, and what do you find? This paper, of course, always says what is right, and it always condemns what is

wrong. Now, speaking about colonization companies, hear what that paper says in the same issue in which they publish a letter from Mr. Armstrong, Managing Director of the York Farmers Colonization Company :

"It appears that this Company has a grant of 175,000 acres. It was projected, not for the purpose of speculation, but with the honest intention of settling up land. It has already placed some 150 persons on the land, and is doing everything in its power to make them comfortable. The whole of these companies, save about a score of them, were projected with purely speculative intent."

Now, only twenty-eight of these have acts of incorporation although hundreds applied for same, and among these speculative gentlemen—let me read you the list, and you will see what noble patriots they are. You will see how disinterested they are, when it comes to a question of their own pockets. I see an hon. gentleman staring in my face now who has been speaking about landlordism in that country, and who is disappointed because he could not get all he wanted there. It is, perhaps, well that while these colonization schemes are held out as creating landlordism—it is well, I say, to know who are the gentlemen applying for them, and who occupy positions as stockholders. First, we find on the list, the partner of the leader of the Opposition, Mr. J. K. Kerr. We also find the amiable member for Kingston (Mr. Gunn)—I only wish he had five colonization companies; every member in the House desires him to have good luck, no matter where it is. Then we have our esteemed, our venerable brother, our noble friend, from Perth, James Trow, M.P.

Mr. TROW. I never applied for an acre in my life, and never got an acre.

Mr. RYKERT. Your name is there. Now let us see. You will find in the *Canada Gazette* an application made by the High Wood Ranch Company, among the incorporators of which are Alexander Gunn and James Trow, M.P.'s. Now, I am quoting from the *Canada Gazette*. We find, going further on, the Settlers' Colonization Company, John Dryden, M.P.P. Then we find the leader of the Reform party in the city of Toronto, William F. McMaster. Then we find Carroll Ryan, of the *Free Press*, Ottawa, who was not satisfied with one Company—he goes the whole hog or nothing. He was not satisfied with the Birch Hills' Colonization Company, but he also had to strike for the Saskatchewan Forks Company. We find Charles W. Mitchell, proprietor of the *Free Press*, Ottawa, and John Cameron, editor of the *London Advertiser*—all high-minded and disinterested patriots when it suits their own interests. And yet these gentlemen are villifying the country when it suits their party interests. I also find, as stockholders, the names of Alfred Jaffray, of the *Globe*, H. S. Howland, the hon. member for North York, W. Mulock, M.P., the hon. David Reesor, and that noble patriot who sold himself—I won't say for a mess of pottage—the hon. R. W. Scott. We find all the opposition there is in this House to these schemes comes from gentlemen who were disappointed in their little enterprises. Many of them have succeeded; they have got their hands on that land which is going to result in a monopoly, and a stamping under foot of the people of the North-West. Sir, it is just as well the House and the country should know the exact kind of people we have there. Why it is put down as of untold value? I do not know whether the hon. member for Perth is responsible for this, but he is father of the pamphlet at all events. I find in a certain pamphlet sent out to the electors, with Mr. James Trow's compliments, this remark with respect to the question of monopoly :

"With respect to the transportation monopoly of the North-West for twenty years, the value is unknown, but it is greater than the whole cash bonus."

That is another reason why I say that if we are compelled to pay \$22,000,000 to-day, out and out, for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and take it off the Company's hands

and get rid of this gigantic monopoly, it is worth, according to the pamphlet, \$25,000,000. Why should we not make haste in building the road? If we make haste and build the road in two years, we save a monopoly for five years. That must surely lighten the burdens of the country somewhat; but hon. gentlemen opposite do not see it in that light. There are other objections raised to which I shall not allude, because, no doubt, hon. members who will follow me, will be able to take up points I have omitted. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, I think, in a manner not creditable to them as members of the House, or members of the Reform party, stigmatized members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as men almost worse than scoundrels. They have spoken of Mr. Stephen's great work, and of the large amount he has spent in building a dwelling house. I know no member of the Company personally, but I do say that the best estimate I can form of their character is derived from the estimation in which they are held by the country. In the commercial world these men stand high, their record cannot be impeached; but hon. gentlemen have the audacity and meanness to criticise them as scoundrels and robbers, because they come here and state that they are in a position of financial difficulty, brought about not by their own conduct, but by men who have undertaken to decry and depreciate the position of the Company. It is unfair and unmanly to abuse men after that fashion. I have spoken of Mr. Hickson, of the Grand Trunk Railway, as a gentleman who has distinguished himself as one of the greatest railway men in Canada. I do not know him personally, but at the same time I have the highest admiration for him, and he is perfectly right to promote the interests of the great corporation of which he is the head, but at the same time he must not trample on the rights of our people or encroach on the rights of Parliament. I come now to ask myself, among other questions, have the Company shown satisfactorily what has brought about the present state of affairs? I have briefly alluded to the fact that the Company has been placed in an unfortunate position. They say that on account of the depression in stocks, which has prevailed since December, they have been unable to raise the amount of money they require. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, why does not the Company go to Europe and raise the money. It would be useless to go to England, as did Sir Hugh Allan, only to fail. It is the duty of the Company to show that they are not responsible for the present state of affairs. Have they done so? We find by reference to the Grand Trunk pamphlet that that Company have been most determined opponents to the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have been fighting the Company in every direction, and if the Government were able to take away from their lips the seal of secrecy, they would acknowledge that the Grand Trunk, backed up by leading men in England, had done what they could to decry and depress the Canadian Pacific Railway stock. We find in a document from Mr. Van Horne, other evidence of what was being done to depreciate the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. A telegram is in the following words:—

"LONDON, 4th February, 1884.

"Most determined opposition. All Canadian Pacific and kindred securities being organized in press and other places here on account Government money being used to help former to compete with Grand Trunk by Ontario and Quebec. Are Pacific authorities still unwilling to enter into any arrangement with Grand Trunk for joint working of Ontario and Quebec? Think we might negotiate for joint lease. This is different to former proposal for sale of road absolutely to Grand Trunk. If reply favourable, would send out experienced man to negotiate when thought necessary."

So we see that the Grand Trunk is not leaving a stone unturned to depress the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Then we find the leading organ of the party decrying the credit of the Company and the credit of this railway company, doing everything possible to depress

the stock by saying that they would not pay a dollar of the guarantee of the stock, but that the directors would put the money into their own pockets. What more do we want on this point than the opinion expressed in Bradstreet's circular, which is a high authority in the commercial world. On November 3rd, 1883, that circular, which, to my mind, clearly gave a very strong reason why this House should not hesitate to declare that the Company has given a sufficient reason why it is not responsible for the present state of affairs. The circular of 3rd November says:

"One stock has sprung into prominence this week which, since it was placed on this market a year ago, remained obscure until this time. This is Canadian Pacific. The circumstances attending its manipulation reflect extreme discredit on the Canadian Government officials at Ottawa, who must certainly have acquiesced in this business, and must infallibly have a very prejudicial effect on all Canadian securities. The stock had been greatly advanced in price by the clique who work it, and, at the proper time, they caused a despatch to be sent from Montreal stating that the Canadian Government had guaranteed 3 per cent. dividends on the stock for the period of ten years. Upon this they evidently expected to be able to sell out, and, by well-recognized tricks of the stock market, they made quite a hurrah over it; but the tricks were exposed in time to prevent their being successful. A great deal of mystery seems to surround this guarantee business, but the only thing which does seem to stand out clear is that no such guarantee can be given without the sanction of the Canadian Parliament, which does not meet for a month or two. The misrepresentations made, and the evident control the Canadian Pacific Syndicats have of the Canadian press and the party in power at Ottawa, are matters of grave import to the Canadian people. It is quite evident that reform is urgently needed there. Wall-street is used to the tricks of corporations, and knows how to discount them; but the introduction of a Government as a factor in stock speculation is something new. Meantime, investors had better leave Canadian Pacific severely alone. Things seem to be shaping for an explosion up north."

That is one reason why the Canadian Pacific stock is not so high as it should be on the American market. We find also our own papers expressing antagonistic views. The *Shareholder* of February 15th says:

"There seems to be no power to galvanize Canadian Pacific upwards, the highest price reached this week being 55½, and so little is the demand that on Wednesday there was not a single transaction in this much-shunned stock."

The same journal went on to say, at another date, February 1st:

"Those numerous and influential London and New York papers, which so frequently reproduce our comments on the Canadian Pacific line, may now be able to judge how far they would be justified in recommending the particular stock in question to their readers while the present gloomy state of things prevail."

Hon. gentlemen will see from this, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, from the outset have been met on the stock market by the most outrageous statements, made by persons supposed to be high in authority, statements of a character which certainly could not meet with the approbation of right-thinking men. But we find further that these gentlemen are constantly crying down the country. I do not wonder that they should feel it necessary to speak about their patriotism, for they know right well that on no occasion has any party but their own rejoiced to know that Canada was not prosperous. Last year the member for South Brant was making his speech on the finances, when he was occupying the position, which no doubt will be occupied in a few nights hence by the gallant Knight from Huron; and he looked forward to the time when Canada would not be prosperous. He used the following language, which, I say, is unworthy of any parliamentarian, or any man having a respect for his own country. He said:

"This country will, as I have said, pass through a period of stringency and trade depression as well as of prosperity, and I venture to prophecy that in two years from now, the hon. Minister, if he still retains his position as hon. Minister of Finance, will find that he will be compelled to offer apologies; he will explain how this factory and that factory was closed; how wages in this department were lowered, and how it occurs that the exports have declined. I believe this, and I am confirmed in my views by writers in commercial journals, equally well informed with the hon. Minister of Finance. And then we, on this side of the House, will have the satisfaction of knowing that though we may have had to wait a few years, till a period of trial came round, yet it was bound to come at last."

MR. RYKERT.

These are the sentiments of a budding Finance Minister, and I repeat, that they are unworthy of a gentleman occupying a position in this Legislature as a representative of the people. I find, further, that the organ of the Grit party in this city, in order to cry down the credit of the Government, says that the expenses of the Government increased in one year by the sum of \$30,000,000. The writer of that article knew very well that he was telling what was untrue; he knew that the Government were simply exchanging one security for another, that is, 4 per cent. securities for 5 per cents., and yet this writer was mean enough, and contemptible enough, to try to make the people believe that the Government had increased the expenditure of the country by \$30,000,000 in one year. History repeats itself. Let me quote from the hon. member for West Durham, and I think the House will acknowledge that it is a parallel case. It was complained, and with reason, that the Company under the Act of 1874, was not in a position to put its stock on the market, and to raise funds to carry on its affairs. In 1881 we find that the hon. member for West Durham used these words:

"The collapse of the Northern Pacific Railway has occurred, and has precipitated a general collapse of credit in that country. That collapse had principally affected railways and railway enterprises, so that it was almost impossible to get European capitalists to look at a railway—at any rate in the United States. I do not believe I exaggerate when I say that hundreds of railways in the United States defaulted in the payment of their bonds; scores of them fell into the hands of receivers and were foreclosed, such was the discredited state of railway enterprise on this continent. There was a general crisis and depression. There was, therefore, a scarcity of capital available for such enterprises, even if they had not been discredited by the circumstances to which I have alluded. These were then the circumstances to which the hon. gentleman, more slightly than I did, allude as clearly bearing on the non-success of the tenders at that time."

He was speaking of the failure of the hon. member for East York to get tenders from the people of England to enable him to build that railway, and he gave as a reason, that railway enterprises in the United States had failed, that commercial bankruptcy had followed, and that these roads were in the hands of receivers. To-day we find that the stock of the Northern Pacific road, which brought down one of the richest men in America—that stock which sold in November, 1865, at 60 or 70, is now selling at 40 and 41, which is an evidence of what the people in the stock markets in the world think about the stocks of the country. I again ask myself whether the country will be benefited by the granting of this concession, and I may say that it will be benefited by opening up a direct communication across this continent without crossing through American territory, thus preventing immigrants from being deceived and decoyed by the American people. I say further, that while some people speak of Ontario as being sacrificed, no other Province is so much benefitted as that Province will be. I find that from the records of Parliament, out of the \$14,000,000 which have been spent on the North-West Territories during the last two years, \$6,000,000 have been drawn out, and that we have received on our money expended in that way 40 per cent., and yet they say Ontario is being sacrificed. The result of its construction would be that it would form feeders for all our railways. In the Local Legislature years ago, that Province was called upon to pass charter after charter for railways running in the direction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the country through which they pass, instead of being a rough and rugged country, the home of the wild cat and the hyena, as predicted by the hon. member for East York a short time before, is possessed of enormous resources; that its agricultural and mineral resources are being developed to an astounding extent, and the building of the railways will open to the Ontario Government a tract of land comprising at least 15,000,000 acres. I believe that instead of Ontario being sacrificed, that road will afford a safety

valve for that Province. Let me call another witness on that point—I mean the hon. member for South Brant. This is not the first time we have heard of Ontario's interests being sacrificed. In Parliament, some years ago, this question was discussed, and I find in the *Hansard* of 1875, when some members on that side of the House were speaking in a depreciatory way, and saying that Ontario was going to be sacrificed, the hon. member for Brant spoke in these words:

"He failed to see where Ontario's interests had been sacrificed. Were they to be told that a subsidy for the construction of 180 miles through Ontario was opposed to Ontario's interests? The construction of that road would develop a country not now settled, but which would be settled, and the scheme could not be adverse to the interests of Ontario. \* \* \* Looking at it from an out point of view he saw a railway was to be constructed for 200 miles through a portion of his Province which has never been opened up, and which was fit for settlement."

The late Government placed in their Estimates no less a sum than \$6,500,000, in aid of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the railway on Vancouver Island, surveys, and a portion for the line north of Lake Superior through the Nipissing district, in spite of the resolution passed in 1872, declaring that they should not raise the rate of taxation to carry on that road. On that occasion, when the hon. member for West Durham was complaining of the amount which was being uselessly spent on the railway, as he claimed, the hon. member for Brant came out, as I have stated, in favour of Ontario. I say that the more you analyze that question the more you will find that Ontario will not suffer, but that it will get the lion's share of what is coming from the North West. Now, Sir, the next question I come to consider is, how shall we stand if this road is surrendered, as predicted by hon. gentlemen opposite? We shall have the completed road, worth \$28,000,000; surveys, \$5,000,000; the Canada Central, \$1,500,000; telegraphs, \$500,000; and the subsidy in cash, \$25,000,000; making a total of \$60,000,000. In addition to that, we shall have from the land sold, \$8,858,024, making a total of \$68,858,024, which has been expended in the building of that road; and if we add to that this loan of \$22,500,000, as a bonus, the road will have cost us \$91,358,024, a road built which hon. gentlemen opposite themselves have said would cost \$103,000,000, and which other gentlemen have alleged would cost upwards of \$150,000,000. I say that if the Company fails to redeem this loan, we shall receive the following:—

Completed roads.....	\$28,000,000
Main line completed.....	23,563,564
do to complete.....	27,000,000
Branch lines.....	3,827,092
Improvement of Government line.....	353,601
Equipment of line and branches.....	8,638,306
Callander to Brockville.....	3,203,050
Material, rails, etc.....	4,025,604
	\$98,611,217
21,246,600 acres, at \$2.....	42,493,200
	\$141,104,417
For an expenditure of.....	91,358,024
Or an excess of.....	\$49,746,393

I have omitted vessels and some other articles from this calculation, but I think it is sufficient to show that the security will be ample. Now, as regards the value of that road, I do not think I need say very much, but I will call into the witness box some gentlemen from the other side of the House. We find that in the Reform manifesto issued by these hon. gentlemen to the Reform electors, the value of the road independent of that gigantic monopoly was placed at \$147,415,397. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute their own statements, and I am sure my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) would not, with his honest countenance, get up on a public platform and state that the security for this loan is not sufficient, in the face of the declarations of his own party as to the value

of the road. We have also the testimony of the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman, speaking of the Syndicate contract, said:

"The ascertained profits for the work in the prairie section, as far as we can gather them, are then a cash subsidy of \$10,000 per mile for about 600 miles; 6,000,000 and 5,000,000 acres, which sold at an average of \$2.68 an acre, \$20,000,000 aggregating \$26,100,000—while so far as we have been able to gather, the cost of the prairie section is \$7,000,000, leaving a profit of say \$19,000,000, apart from certain specialties to which I have already referred and which would add considerably to that profit."

Speaking of the value of the land and of the various assets of the Company, the hon. gentlemen, in the same speech, stated that the Company would be worth \$135,000,000, and that they would have a profit, as between their expenditure and the value they were to receive in cash and lands and works, of from \$37,000,000 to \$42,000,000. If the property of this Company is so valuable, I venture to say that no hon. gentleman will assert that this country has not a fair security for the money we propose to advance. Then, we have the opinion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who is always strong in his views. That hon. gentleman, speaking of the land grant, in 1881, said:

"If the Syndicate land grant is, as I assert it is, worth double the grant of land per mile made to the Union Pacific and Canadian Pacific, then we have an advantage of the Syndicate of 6,250 acres per mile, which at \$4 amounts to \$25,000 per mile, or at only \$2 to \$12,500."

The hon. gentleman goes on further to say:

"Well, we have seen such reference to the management and the aid granted this railway that practically the aid would amount to a sum sufficient to build the road, and leave the Company \$73,000,000 to speculate upon in other directions, as duty, taxation, &c."

The hon. gentleman further says:

"The grand outcome will be, that the Company will have 2,700 miles of railway clear of cost and from \$48,000,000 to \$73,000,000 to boot."

Now, Sir, can any person, in the face of that evidence, dispute the value of the assets and securities which the Government have in making this loan to the Company? Now, Sir, I come to consider the last portion of my proposition. I propose to consider, are we in a financial position to make that loan? If, in 1874, we were able, in the state of our finances at that time, to make a grant of \$29,777,000, and to guarantee 4 per cent. for twenty years on at least \$4,000 per mile, or \$11,980,000, besides granting 55,940,000 acres of land—it, in addition to all that, we were able to build a line of railway on Vancouver Island at a cost of \$3,500,000—surely at this late date, when the prosperity of the country is notorious, and when our credit is higher than it ever has been before—surely we are able to go on and build this railway. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) speaking of the railway at that time, said:

"He did not propose to do anything but what he believed they could do, and he did not propose to do anything but what he believed to be within the preamble of the Bill of last Session, which was to the effect that the tax of the people, as it was when the original agreement was made, should not be increased."

We have there the positive declaration of the leader of the Government, that the country was in a financial position at that time to build the railway at an enormous cost. Then we find the organ of the party stating, on March 31st, 1878:

"The expenditure annually of two millions in the Province during the progress of the railway is another item in the new terms, and we are disposed to believe that this will not in practice be found to have imposed any greater burden than can be met by our present rate of taxation."

We also find the Finance Minister of that day, the member who represents Mr. McMillan in this House, stating:

"My advice is in view of these contingencies which always occur in a country like this, that we ought to consider the natural growth as a fair offset against the inevitable expenditure which must occur in the Dominion."

I would ask you if in the great march of commercial progress, the great march of the development of this country,

as shown by the vitality it has displayed during the last two years, whether we are not in a position, with our capacity and our population of 4,000,000, to carry this out in 1885. The Minister of Finance went on to say:

"We have completed the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway, and are therefore free to turn our undivided energies and attention to the task of enlarging and improving our canals and constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have succeeded in making such arrangements with British Columbia as, though involving us in very considerable liabilities, are yet quite within our power to perform, and may add that although many of us thought from the beginning that the demands made upon us by that Province were unreasonable and unduly onerous, we are, nevertheless, prepared to discharge our obligations fairly, provided they can be brought within due bounds and in accordance with the spirit, if not indeed the true letter, of that contract. I have no doubt, therefore, that, if we persevere in the course I have indicated, in a very short time we shall be in a position of the highest credit. That such an enterprise is one which will require our utmost energies, I do not for one moment deny; but although I admit this, and admit also that while engaged in its prosecution we must be willing to forego other works of much greater immediate advantage, yet I hold that it is far better we should do so than even seem to fail in meeting the obligations to which I have referred. I believe that every man who has paid any serious attention to the future of Canada knows right well that with us this matter is a struggle for the possibility of carving out a distinct national existence."

These were sentiments applauded by every hon. member in this House, and they were expressed with a deficit of \$1,900,000 staring them in the face. Yet they were not able to say no. I think that I have shown abundant evidence of our financial ability to advance the \$22,500,000 without increasing the rate of taxation, but I will go further. We have, as a test of our financial position, the debt we have incurred since the Conservative Government came into power in 1878, amounting to \$15,476,537. During that time we have expended in public works no less than \$37,949,904. Is not that evidence of vitality and financial ability? Take, as a contrast, a corresponding view of the position of this country when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. In that brief space of time they increased the public debt by \$34,665,623, and they expended on capital account \$33,812,000. It seems to me, that if the question is considered in all its aspects, we must come to the conclusion that we are able, financially, to bear this burden. Let us look to this great North-West, which was spoken of so disparagingly by the hon. member for West Durham when he went down by the sea a few years ago and coquetted with the Maritime Provinces in the hope of gaining their support. The North-West, he said, is the cause of our deficits. I pointed out that instead of the North-West being the cause of our deficits, it was, I considered, the safety valve of this Dominion. In five years of Grit rule, the sum of \$14,855,459 were expended, and we received back \$1,499,472; in four years under Conservative rule the expenditure was \$23,411,195, and we received back \$7,526,158; or in other words, during the five years the Grits were in power they received 10 per cent. back for the money they invested in the North-West, whilst during the four years we were in power 33½ per cent. was received back of the amount expended. Does not that speak volumes for the North-West? showing, as it does, an increasing ratio of revenue, year after year, so that we can rely on their gradually not only meeting the disbursements we are called to make, but to pay the loan back. We find that while we have expended in the North-West \$14,097,880 in two years, we have received back \$6,247,190; or, in other words, we have received enough to pay off the interest at 4 per cent. on the whole investment and still have \$5,683,315 towards the principal. It seems to me that at the rate we are going on in the North-West, the increased revenue which, in a few years, will amount to four or five million dollars, ought, in the course of five or six years, to pay off the whole loan of \$22,500,000. The more that is analyzed the more it is evident this country has a great future before it. Those hon. gentlemen opposite loudly protested, they were

Mr. RYKERT.

going to appeal to the people. But hon. gentlemen know their protestations are but empty form. They have no desire to appeal to the people, and if they did they know what the result might be. They appealed in 1878, and with what result we all know. What was the answer they got from the people? The people said to them: You are constitutional grumblers; we gave you an opportunity in 1873 of distinguishing yourselves, of showing what you could do to build up your country; we placed you in power with a full Treasury, after a succession of surpluses, you were in a favourable position to carry out your measures, but the moment you got into power, with all your professions of sincerity and economy and honesty, you began to increase the expenditure, and in two years your extravagance had increased our expenditure by over \$1,000,000. At the end of the five years you said you were nothing but flies on the wheel. Trade was paralyzed, the country was discouraged, and you took no means to build it up. The people soon found out who composed the crew that was bringing the ship to destruction. The hon. member for Grey then said he rejoiced that the hon. member for Lambton had an opportunity of holding the reins of power to put in practice his economical professions. He, like the rest, went down before the face of an indignant people. He, like the rest, who had given their subservient support to the Ministry, who proclaimed loudly their professions of economy, who pointed out the fact that the men who had preceded them, had increased the expenditure by \$10,000,000, had the gratification of seeing it increased by another \$1,000,000. Two years ago, we were told by the hon. leader of the Opposition he wanted a chance to come before the tribunal of the people. That hon. gentleman sent to the country a manifesto showing exactly what the position of affairs was. That hon. gentleman stated that the record of the Conservative party was a record of extravagance, a record of debauchery, a record of corruption. He went to the country crying out "Pacific Railway," but the very moment they took the hustings, the very moment the member for South Brant, and the member for Grey, and the member for Perth took the hustings, they did not proclaim the extravagance of the Government or refer to the Pacific Railway; but, instead of arguing the Pacific Railway question before the people, or saying how recklessly they had acted in giving the contract to the Syndicate, they changed their tactics, and shouted: "Ontario is invaded, Ontario's rights are in danger, the autonomy of the Province is destroyed, you are going to vote for a Government which put a veto upon the Streams Bill, a Government which is going to rob Ontario of its best interests, a Government which has refused to ratify the boundary award." Well, the people heard all the facts, and we have the results—there. I think these hon. gentlemen must be satisfied that, when they went to the country, they went with false cries and false promises, and that an intelligent people took a proper gauge of what their position really was and of what their promises were worth in consigning them to a position which they will occupy for a number of years to come. I regret having occupied the time of the House so long, but I felt that the occasion was one of such great importance that I should, before casting my vote, express to the people whom I represent, through this Parliament, the reasons for the course I felt called upon to take upon this occasion. I feel justified in saying that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have come to this House and made out a good case, that they are in a position of financial embarrassment so that they cannot possibly carry out this road in two years under present circumstances, that they are not responsible for the causes which have brought about that unfortunate state of affairs, that they have shown sufficient assets to justify us in loaning them our money, and I think we are justified in saying we will add this money, if neces-

sary, to our capital account, and will lend them this money, for a term of years, and without adding to our taxation. I feel that I am justified in going to my constituents on these grounds, and that, if the vote were to be taken again to-morrow, the people will be satisfied, as they were two years ago, that the course which has been adopted is one in the best interests of the country. I have felt it my duty to consider the question, not in a political point of view, but in the best interests of the country. I believe this country has a noble future, I believe that, in the march of progress, this country has taken gigantic strides, and that, working alongside of our American neighbours on the other side of the line, with a less number of people, we have shown greater capacity than they have, and have proved that we are capable of doing more for the advancement of the best interests of our country. We are a people characterized by our industry and independence, and the future of the country will be great if we pursue the same course as in the past. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot do better than vote for the Resolutions, in regard to which everyone will say that we have redeemed our credit and acted in the best interests of our country.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been fully discussed for several days, and, I think, thoroughly discussed on both sides. Of course, the Government is in the hands of the House, but I think, in a measure of this kind, there must be some understanding across the floor as to when the vote shall be taken and we shall go into Committee. I think we must come to some understanding upon that. I would like very much to hear from the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition on that point.

Mr. BLAKE. What does the hon. gentleman propose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to-morrow—in the course of to-morrow's session. I think I shall be obliged to ask my friends to remain in the House until the Resolutions are carried. It is too important a question. It has been fully discussed, and the whole operations, or much of the operations, of the road are paralyzed until this question is decided one way or the other, whether the House is going to adopt the Resolutions, the relief proposed by the Government, or not.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman who spoke a few days ago laid down the rule that each speaker ought to answer the speech of his predecessor, the gentleman who spoke before him. If it is expected that that should be the case to-night, I shall, for once in my life, have to show the white feather, and admit my inability to do so, not because I am afraid of the job, but because I am not the fortunate possessor of a scrap-book. And at this late hour of the morning, even if I had the last ten years' files of the *Globe* and *Mail*, if I were to attempt to read a fair equivalent of what we have listened to, it would be a burden too great for the House to bear. In the few remarks with which for a few minutes I am going to take up the attention of the House, I shall confine myself altogether to the Resolutions before the House, and to one or two of the arguments which have been advanced in favour of those Resolutions, and which, in my humble opinion, are faulty. I wish to say that, so far as I am personally concerned—and I think I feel about the same as the other gentlemen on this side of the House—I for one have no personal feeling against the Syndicate. Almost every gentleman on the other side who has addressed the House has either stated in so many words, or assumed, that all who vote against these Resolutions are the declared enemies of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I wish to say more than that. So far from being opposed to the Company, so far from feeling any enmity, any dislike to the

Company, I feel well disposed towards it. More than that; for a long time I have looked upon the acquisition of a road up through Ontario as the only hope we had of relief from the monopoly of the Grand Trunk Railway. More than that; I was one of a few individuals who felt that monopoly so bitterly that I was induced to spend a great deal of money and great deal more of valuable time in order to get a charter to relieve us from that monopoly. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has entered into an agreement to carry out that charter and build us our road, and, of course, if these Resolutions fail, our road will not be built. More than that; I see a draft of a Bill before the House in which that same Company ask for a charter to carry their line on to the other end of the Province, and that is intended to run through the constituency which I have the honour of representing. If these Resolutions fail, and the Company fail, that must be abandoned; and, were I to consult my own personal feelings, or the money benefit of those whom I represent, I would be induced to vote for the Resolutions. But it is quite possible, although gentlemen on the other side do not seem to understand—seem as though they could not understand—that a man may be no enemy to that Company, it is quite possible that he may be a well-wisher of the Company, and yet love his country better. And, Sir, it is quite possible that not only a man but a party may feel that the interests of the country are paramount to all other considerations—to the interests of any corporation or any body of men; and, so far as I know the hon. gentlemen with whom I am acting on this side of the House, that is exactly the position they are in now. Well, we have no enmity against the Company. While we wish them no embarrassment, we feel that the interests of the country are paramount to the interests of the Company. Now, Sir, I shall give a few reasons why I do not intend to support the Resolutions, but on the contrary to vote against them. The first is, that I am one of those who believe that the Company has received enough already, all that they are honestly entitled to. Let us see how much it is going to cost this Company to carry out their undertakings. The hon. Minister of Railways made rather merry over the leader of the Opposition the other night, because, as he said, he had made a very great mistake in estimating the cost of building the railway. He said that the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), had also been even more astray in his calculation—that these two gentlemen had put the figure a long way above \$100,000,000. We have heard various statements, various estimates, of what this road is going to cost. I saw one made by the president of the road himself in January, 1884, in which he estimated the actual cost of the road at \$85,700,000; and we have the assurance of the hon. Minister of Railways, that that included the equipment of the road; that it not only included that, but it included a very large sum of money that had been expended in making connections to the east to secure an outlet for that road; not only that, but it included some millions that had been set apart to pay dividends on the stock. I am speaking subject to correction, but as I understood him that is what he said. So it seems the road will actually cost the company a long way below \$85,000,000, somewhere between \$60,000,000 and \$70,000,000 of actual outlay for the Company. Now let us look for a moment at what that Company has received. They received 25,000,000 acres of land, which has netted for the portion sold, \$2.36 per acre. Supposing that it is all sold at the same price, and when the railways are built and the country is settled up—we have no reason to suppose the remainder will sell for any less—it will yield an aggregate sum of \$59,000,000. They have received a cash subsidy of \$25,000,000; add to that what they have received in road finished and handed over to them, \$28,000,000, making

a total of \$112,000,000—far more than the road would ever cost them. It has been pointed out again that when this contract was given to this Company, the chief reason of the Government for giving them such liberal terms was the fact that when the road was finished the Company would have to run it for several years at a loss. It was stated on the floor of this House, it was stated on a hundred platforms, and reiterated by the newspapers, that the simple and sole reason why the Government had given this enormous amount was because, for many years after the road was constructed, they would have to run it at a loss, and therefore it was absolutely necessary that the Company should have sufficient to enable them to do it without pecuniary loss to themselves. But, Sir, that reason does not hold good now. We had a statement from the hon. Minister of Railways the other night, that from the very start this road was not only going to pay working expenses, but going to pay a large profit besides. For fear of misrepresenting let me just read what he did say :

"That the road, when constructed, will be a valuable property, there can be no reason to doubt. That the road, this coming year, will earn a very large amount of net profit over and above expenses of its operation, there cannot be a question; and when opened from end to end it is perfectly obvious that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be placed upon a complete and thoroughly sound foundation, as one of the best lines of railway communication that is to be found in the country."

So that there is no reason why the already enormous grant to this railway—nearly one and a-half times what the railway is going to cost the Company—should be implemented now. Then, Sir, there is the other objection, that this Company is giving no security, that they will not come back in a year or two and make a similar demand for increased subsidy. Now, we have been assured that this is not the case, that we have sufficient guarantee that this sum is going to finish the road. Well, Mr. Speaker, the same assurance was given when the charter was first granted to the Company. We were assured that beyond all peradventure, beyond all contingency, enough was given to the Company to finish the road and to run it during the time they would have to run it at a loss, that the Company would never be asking again for another cent. Now, I state my firm conviction that if these resolutions are carried, as I have no doubt they will be, we have no guarantee that before twelve months are passed the same demand will not be made to Parliament. Not only that, Sir, but the main reason given for coming to Parliament now and asking for this increased subsidy is that doing so will enable the Company to finish the contract in two years, and we are told that if it is not given they will have to fall back on the original terms of the charter, and take till 1891 to finish the road. Well, Sir, if time is all they want, we on this side of the House are quite willing to give them a little time. So far as I am concerned, I cannot see, after the reasoning I have heard, that the country is going to suffer any great detriment if the road is not finished for two or three years after the time mentioned. It has been pleaded that this assistance is necessary in the interests of the North-West, that it is necessary to have that country settled up as rapidly as possible. I admit it is necessary that that country should be settled up, but I question whether the rapidity of the completion of the road in two years is going to hasten the settlement of that country. I go a step further, and I say that from the knowledge I have of the sentiment of the people of this country, I do not believe that the rapidity of construction which we have had on that road through the prairie section has been any advantage to the North-West. We all know how necessary it is when people are settling in a new country, that they should have the aid and sympathy of neighbours, not only in developing the resources of the country, but from a social point of view.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

They need schools, they need churches, they need one another's assistance in carrying out their labours, and above all, they need a market. Therefore, Sir, I hold that instead of having settlers scattered here and there over 1,000 miles, it would have been far better if they had been congregated together somewhat, both from a financial and a social point of view, which would have been the case if the road had been built more slowly. It has been argued that its immediate construction is necessary in order to secure the Asiatic trade. But the Northern Pacific has been finished for a considerable time; both of the other Pacific Railways have been in operation for nearly twenty years. Trade has therefore got as firmly established in those channels as it can possibly get. When the Canadian Pacific Railway is finished, whether in two years or in five years, it will have to draw trade from other competing lines. So that argument falls completely to the ground. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) advanced an argument that I have not heard any hon. gentleman notice or attempt to answer. He said that British Columbia—if I quote his words correctly—is entitled to have this road finished at that time. I admit that British Columbia has a considerable grievance of which to complain. I admit that owing to the manner in which she has been treated, she is entitled to compensation. Let us look back at the circumstances of the case. In 1871, when British Columbia came into the Confederation, as one of the terms on which she came into Union, the Government agreed to build the road in the short time of ten years. I do not hesitate to declare my firm conviction that that was the most insane bargain that any Government of a civilized country ever made. What are the facts? Over 3,000 miles of a wilderness, an unknown country most of it, had to be traversed. It took the greater part of ten years to find if it were possible to build a railway through it. It took more than the balance of the time to find what was the best route on which to build the railway. I say again without hesitation, that it was one of the most insane bargains into which a Government ever entered, and it is a pity that the faith and honour of this country should have been so trifled with. But so far as British Columbia is concerned, that Province was a party to the bargain, and it has a legal right to insist that the bargain shall be fulfilled, otherwise that it shall be compensated. As I understand the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), the completion of the road within two years was going to be the compensation afforded to British Columbia. I have a document here which purports to be a report by the Minister of Justice who visited British Columbia for the express purpose of ascertaining the compensation to which they were entitled for the failure to build the road within the prescribed time. Allow me to read what the Minister of Justice says on that subject. After reciting what was to be done, he says :

"The above includes all to which there is any dispute or difference between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of British Columbia, and when carried into effect, will constitute a full settlement of all existing claims on either side, or by either Government."

Then this is to be embodied in legislation. An Act is going to be introduced and carried through, and I will have great pleasure in voting for it. In the preamble it is stated :

"And whereas, for the purpose of settling all existing disputes and difficulties between the two Governments, it has been agreed as follows."

It winds up in this way :

"This agreement is to be taken by the Province in full of all claims up to this date by the Province against the Dominion, in respect of delays in the commencement and construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in respect of the non-construction of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, and shall be taken by the Dominion Government in satisfaction of all claims for additional lands under the Terms of Union,

but shall not be binding unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of British Columbia."

So we see, as regards British Columbia, that a claim for compensation does not enter as an element into the case at all. I desire briefly to notice a matter upon which much stress has been laid since the discussion began. We have been charged, over and over again, with being unpatriotic, because, forsooth, we have found fault with the Government land policy in the North-West and with the actions of the Syndicate. We have been called unpatriotic, not only by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), but also by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who stated that the whole blame for the trouble and excitement prevailing there was chargeable to members sitting on this side of the House, and to the Reform press of the country. I hope, as regards both of those hon. gentlemen, that it was rather a slip of the tongue than a deliberate statement, because if it were a deliberate statement it would do more credit to their imagination than to their judgment. But supposing it were true—and I admit and I glory in the fact, that we have a press and a party which are not afraid to speak out when they see abuses existing in Governments and corporations: I have read that eighteen hundred years ago there was a class of men that hated the light, because their deeds were evil. That class was not confined to that age. There never has been a time in the history of the world when men who found fault with wrong-doing, especially wrong-doing in high places, were not denounced as traitors and unpatriotic men, and been persecuted and put to death itself for a manly vindication of the right. It is about time that the press and the party spoke out. What has been the course of the Government with respect to land settlement in the North-West? They have ground down the people with taxes. A man who goes there must, in making a start in life, pay from \$400 to \$500 taxes to the Government. The Government thus discourages settlers. It has long been known by the House and the country that when a man goes in and settles on a new farm and improves it, he pays enough for that farm. We, who have settled in Ontario, have found that to be the case. We entertained the hope that the Government would take warning by the Canada Land Company in Ontario, by the seigniorial tenure in Quebec and by absentee landlordism in Prince Edward Island, and have avoided the blunders committed a century ago. But no; for a long time, instead of the Government holding land for the benefit of the settler, it seemed as though it were given up to speculators and land companies until it became almost impossible for a man who went into the North-West and honestly desired to obtain a farm to find a place on which to rest the sole of his foot. But, Sir, it was just because the party press pointed out the abuses that the Government were compelled to change the regulations, and at last to re-open the railway belt and southern Manitoba for settlement. Has the same not been the case so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate is concerned? It is only a short time since public opinion, expressed through the press of the country, and at meetings of the inhabitants of the country, compelled them to lower the almost prohibitory rates that they were charging. Yet we are told that we are unpatriotic, that we are to blame, and that it is the party and the party press that is stirring up the feeling in Manitoba and the North-West. Do these hon. gentlemen mean to say that these men in the North-West are such fools, that in the middle of the winter they can be induced to leave their homes and travel hundreds of miles in order to discuss imaginary grievances; or that they sent a deputation to Ottawa to talk about evils which existed only in their imaginations? One more statement I wish to make, and that is, that the present is a most inopportune time to incur such an additional responsi-

bility as the one which the Government is seeking to impose upon us. The hon. member for Cardwell—and I have a great respect for his abilities as a financier—stated the other night that this proposition was not going to add anything to the debt of the Dominion. More than that, he said that it was going to deduct an enormous amount, something like half a million of dollars, from our debt. For fear, however, that I should be accused of misrepresenting him, I will quote what he did say:

"It is true, the hon. the Finance Minister has to go to England, but he goes there to redeem \$33,500,000 of the debt of Canada which bears to-day 5 per cent. He will be able to make an arrangement by which it will be no additional charge upon the country. It is simply a transfer of 4 per cent. for 5 per cent., and if he succeeds in doing it, he will further reduce the annual charge upon the people of this country by \$131,470 by that transaction. Is that the thing to be alarmed at? Is that an evidence that this country is overburdening itself, is increasing its debt in such a way as seriously to imperil its future? On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, as regards \$33,000,000 of that \$50,000,000, to obtain which the hon. Finance Minister will have to go to England, it will not be an increase of our debt—measuring our debt by the annual charge upon the people, which is the true and proper way to measure it. It is actually a transaction by which we are to reduce, by over \$100,000, the charges of that debt upon the people of this country; and as to this \$22,500,000—the balance of this money—that is a sum for which we are actually to receive 5 per cent. I attach no importance to the fact that we may be able to borrow money at 4 per cent. and loan it at 5 per cent. That may be an incident of this bargain. But what I do attach importance to is, that this advance of \$22,500,000; that this \$34,000,000 which has to be borrowed on the English market; that this addition to our debt of \$50,000,000, which we are asked to contemplate with horror by hon. gentlemen opposite, is an addition to our public debt which, so far from increasing our annual burdens, will reduce them by about \$500,000."

Such is the statement which the hon. gentleman for Cardwell challenges us to controvert. What is the state of the case? Hon. gentlemen will have noticed how careless he is in handling his figures—four or five or even thirteen or fourteen millions are nothing to him; and thirty three and twenty-two and a half millions together make fifty millions according to his loose calculations. It is evident to every hon. member that if the Finance Minister can go home to the old country and borrow money at 4 per cent, instead of 5, he will save exactly 1 per cent. on \$33,500,000, which amounts to \$330,000. But, Sir, the interest on \$22,500,000, at 4 per cent., amounts to \$9,000,000. All he can save is \$330,000; and instead of deducting from the yearly burdens of the country, the transaction adds to our yearly burdens \$570,000, in the interest he will have to pay. I admit that by replacing our 5 per cent. securities by 4 per cent., the change would be one which would be a great boon to the country; but we must always bear in mind that suggestive word "if." We must bear in mind that our securities are constantly falling due, and that during the last three or four years there has been an unprecedented cheapness in the money markets of the world. In Canada we never had money so cheap before. Six per cent. county debentures, which six or seven years ago, were selling at 90 cents on the dollar, have been sold at 112 and 113. Not only so, but farmers and labouring men throughout the country, who were forced to encumber their property by mortgages, during the past three or four years, up to a recent date, were able to get money in many cases as low as 6 per cent., while they formerly paid 8 or 10. But all that has changed; and it is a notorious fact that in Ontario, at least, you can hardly effect a loan on first-class farm property, short of 8 per cent. Not only so, but there is a general stringency in the money market; and if hon. gentlemen want to know how it has been caused, I reply it has been caused by the National Policy, by means of which, money which should have gone to carry on the legitimate business of the country, is locked up and lying idle in various manufacturing enterprises, and it must lie there, because the banks dare not attempt to realize upon it. Well, Sir, I ask, in view of that fact, have you any right to assume that when our Finance Minister goes home again to

borrow money, he will be able to obtain it at 4 per cent. And even supposing he will, is the argument of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) a correct one, that the simple fact of lowering our interest is equivalent to lowering the debt of the country? Would a farmer, for example, who has a mortgage of \$3,000 at 8 per cent. on his farm, in the opinion of any sane man, not have increased his liabilities if he had changed his mortgage for one of \$4,000 at 6 per cent? Suppose he went into the markets of the country to effect a further loan upon it, would he find any use in the plea that his debt was no higher now than when the mortgage amounted to only \$3,000, because he was paying no more interest? Is that the way the public creditors of the country will regard our position? No; they will look at the sum total of our debt. Then, so far as the amount on that debt is concerned, I need not tell you that it is now nearly as high per capita as the debt of the United States. In twenty years after the people of the United States finished their tremendous war, we find this difference between them and us, that while they are paying off their debt so rapidly that they have decreased it one-third, we are increasing ours as fast as we can. I am convinced, and I believe the people throughout the country feel also, that next to dishonour, the most dreaded thing for a nation is debt; and, Sir, it is not the part of patriotism, under these circumstances, to do anything to increase the liabilities of the country. On the contrary, it seems to me that it is the part of patriotism now for us to ask the question, whither are we drifting? In view of the fact that the prediction uttered a year ago by the hon. Financial Minister that we had seven years of inflation and of plenty before us, has already been falsified, and that we are on the verge of a crisis through over-production—in view of these facts, I say, it is the part of patriotism to consider whither are we drifting, and to see to it that we are adding no unnecessary burdens to an altogether over-burdened country.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland), moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only repeat what I said before, that I hope we shall be able to come to a conclusion on this question to-morrow, and with the consent of both sides, we should be able to do so. I feel it my duty to urge upon the House the importance of coming to a conclusion on this question as soon as possible.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think there will be any difficulty in coming to a conclusion on Wednesday, but I think there will be in doing so to-morrow night.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:25 o'clock, a. m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 19th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at a quarter to Four o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### THE HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, before any business is proceeded with, I desire to call your attention to the fact that it is more than three-quarters of an hour past the usual time of opening the House. I think this unusual delay in opening the House deserves remark, particularly on an evening when there is such an important debate in progress, and we are told that it is to close before we adjourn. I know that

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

the responsibility does not rest upon you, Mr. Speaker, but on hon. gentlemen opposite, but I feel bound to protest on the part of independent members against the time being wasted in this manner.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

The Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Charles Tupper, "That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions (page 84) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway," and of Mr. Cameron's (Huron) motion in amendment (page 359) being read,

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). The few observations, Sir, which I propose to make on this question may not add anything to those which have already been advanced. I am well aware, Sir, that, at this stage of the discussion, it would be quite impossible that anything which I can say should throw new light upon this subject, or give even any additional weight to the views which have already been so ably presented. This discussion, however, Sir, has taken a somewhat wide range, a number of matters have been introduced which, to my mind, at least, have not had any direct bearing upon the question at issue, and it may, under these circumstances, not be considered amiss if I do nothing more than remind the House, lest any present have forgotten it, that the question we are considering is the desirability of making a loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and, before we vote upon this question, take one more glance at some of the leading features of this transaction. It is important, Sir, in considering a question of this magnitude, that we should look at it from every possible standpoint, that we should look at all the results which may flow either directly or indirectly from the action which we take at the present time. But it is also of equal, if not of greater importance, that we should direct our attention chiefly to those matters which are of primary and vital importance, and give to other considerations the relative weight to which they are fairly entitled, if we wish to arrive at a correct and intelligent decision. For these reasons, Sir, I shall not review many of the remarks which have been made by the other speakers. I shall not weary the House—and I am sure the House will thank me for this—by repeating the figures and the numerous calculations which have already been submitted to them. I may, in some cases, refer to the results of those calculations, but I shall endeavour to give a short and simple statement of this matter, and to refer to some considerations which I consider of importance, and by which I feel our judgment should be chiefly influenced. It is important, Sir, at the outset, that we should fix clearly before our minds the position of the Government, and the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and their relations to each other. When this question arose, you remember the main provisions of the contract that was entered into between them, and which still exists, by which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company undertook to complete the construction of a line of railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, to do it within a specified time, and for which they were to receive from the Government a fixed consideration. At the present time, a large portion of that work has been completed. Three years of the specified time have elapsed, and seven remain for the completion of the contract. It is under these circumstances that the Company have approached the Government with the proposition which is now before us, a proposition which may be briefly stated as follows: An offer to complete the work in two years from the present date, instead of seven, and that the Government, to enable them to do this, should make them a loan amounting to some \$30,000,000. This they offer to repay in seven years, and for its repayment they offer security and a fair rate of interest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with that simple proposition before us, what are the propositions of first and vital importance which we, as a Parliament, are called upon to consider? I take them to be these: Whether it is in the interests of this country that we should make this loan; whether the advantages which may reasonably be expected to result from the more speedy completion of this contract are such as to justify the Government in granting the aid asked for; secondly, whether the position of the Government as one of the original contracting parties is in any wise affected or prejudiced by the arrangement that is now proposed; and thirdly, whether the security offered is sufficient to insure the repayment of the loan, and protect the Government and the country from ultimate loss. Now, Sir, with regard to the first of these questions, the advantages which we may expect to follow the vigorous prosecution and rapid completion of this work—these have already been pointed out; indeed they have been most exhaustively discussed by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. Among the more important of them I have noted these: The impetus that will be given to the trade and commerce of the country; the wealth that is always created where a line of railway is built and operated; the increase of population that follows the numberless domestic industries that spring up as if by magic all along the line, the early and rapid settlement of the country, the development of its resources, and the consequent increase in both our inter-provincial and our foreign trade. Mr. Speaker, with the history of the last two years fresh in our memory, I had supposed that every gentleman in this House would have admitted that these results must follow the vigorous prosecution of this work. Why, Sir, there is no one who has the least knowledge of the principles that govern trade and commerce but must admit that to arrest the progress of this work at the present time would be most disastrous to the trade of this country. We must all know that our progress and our prosperity in the immediate future are largely dependent upon, and must be proportionate to, the speed with which we push forward this great work to its completion. Our own experience in the last two years, the history of railway enterprises throughout the world, are lost upon us if we fail to recognize these facts. And yet, Sir, hon. gentlemen who have addressed this House in opposition to this measure, have suggested that we make progress at a less rapid rate, that we wait for slower growth and more gradual development. I will do these gentlemen the justice of stating that they express those views with a cautiousness and timidity that, to my mind at least, betray a want of confidence in the cause they are advocating; and I will say, Sir, that if there are hon. gentlemen in this House who entertain such views, I take direct issue with them upon this point. I counsel in this emergency no wavering or hesitating policy. The policy which has been propounded by the hon. Minister of Railways, though it has been assailed from every quarter, has not been shown to be either reckless or dangerous. It is a wise, prudent and progressive policy; the measure that has been submitted is a plain, practical and business-like transaction. It may be of advantage to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; it is at the same time a great advantage to this country. It is a policy which fully meets the emergency with which we are now brought face to face; it is a policy which insures permanence to the prosperity which this country now so happily enjoys, and as such, Sir, it is fairly entitled to our support. Then, with regard to the second question,—whether the position of the Government is prejudiced by this arrangement. I do not find, Sir, that it is affected or changed in any essential or important particular. Reference has been made to the fact that the \$1,000,000 originally deposited by the Company to insure the performance of this contract, is to be withdrawn. But, Sir, that is not in consequence of, or in any way con-

nected with, the transaction we are now considering. As has already been explained by the Minister of Railways, that is done in accordance with a principle that has been adopted in other contracts of this kind—that of returning the deposit to the contractors as the work progresses. Reference has also been made to the fact that a change is to be made in the mode of paying the subsidy. The mode that it is now proposed to adopt is that which hon. gentlemen opposite contended should have been adopted when the original contract was entered into; they should not object to its adoption now. But, Sir, it is not the mode of payment, but the amount that we are to pay, which is the important question for us to consider in this case; and, Sir, I find that that has not been changed to the extent of a single dollar, nor has the amount of work which the Company has to perform been diminished in the least degree. The main provisions of the original contract remain unchanged. The Company is relieved of none of the responsibilities which it then assumed; it assumes the additional responsibility of engaging to effect the earlier completion of this important work. Then, Sir, I pass to the third question, the question which, perhaps, above all others, demands from us careful and close consideration—that is, the nature and extent of the security that we are offered. Let us glance for a moment at the principal items in this security. First, we have the land. Various estimates has been made as to these lands. We have the estimates based upon former utterances of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, estimates which have received the sanction of the public press, representing both the political parties in this country. We have had better estimates still, based upon the sales of land which have actually been made; and these estimates all tend to show that this land, at a fair estimate at the present time, is worth the full amount that we are asked to vote the Company. Indeed, had the Government submitted to this House a proposition to purchase back these lands, to take them from the Company for the sum we are asked to loan, the price would have been equivalent to about \$1.50 an acre. I do not believe, I cannot believe, that there would have been a voice raised in this House against it. Had this proposal been to pay the Company in cash the estimated amount required to complete their contract in lieu of the 21,000,000 acres of land they are yet to receive, I believe, Sir, that such a proposition must have received universal approval and sanction throughout this country, so well known, and so definitely known, is the value of these lands at the present time. Then we have the line of railway itself with its branches. The value of this as a security, I admit is a subject which may give rise to considerable discussion. It is a subject upon which there may be difference of opinion, depending as it does upon the value of this undertaking as a commercial enterprise. Let us see, Sir, what evidence we have upon this point. We have the evidence which has already been given in the estimates before the House of the prospective traffic of the road, in the figures which have been submitted to show that the surplus products of the North-West will be sufficient to furnish it a profitable traffic. We have also had our attention drawn to the advantages which it possesses and which place it in a position to become a successful competitor for the great trans-continental trade that must in the future be developed. We have had also estimates based upon the experience of the last two years, statements submitted to the House in respect to these, showing that the net earnings of this road now average some hundred thousand dollars monthly, and that the earnings of 1883 have been largely in excess of those of 1882. We have still further evidence in the same direction, evidence which may be drawn from the very nature of the transaction we are now considering. It is well known, Sir, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have thus far been engaged in

the construction of the least costly and most remunerative portions of their line, that the more costly and difficult and less profitable portions remain to be constructed; that it is to enable them to construct the latter that they are now making application to Parliament for aid. Now, Sir, I ask hon. members to consider whether the Company would place themselves in this position, whether they would come before the House with the proposition now submitted, if they had not the fullest confidence in the ultimate success of their whole line. Is it reasonable to suppose they would assume the responsibility of completing and operating the more difficult and costly and least profitable portions of their line, five years in advance of the time they were obliged to do so under the original contract, if they had any reason to suppose they would prove a burden upon their resources or that they would not at least be self-sustaining at an early date. Why, there are no persons in the world to-day in so good a position to form a correct opinion of the financial character of this great enterprise as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves, the men who are at present charged with its construction and its management. The fact that they have come to Parliament with the proposition before us; the fact that they are ready and willing to assume the responsibility to which I have referred; the further fact that in order to obtain the means to accomplish that end they are willing to offer, and do offer to pledge all they have on this great enterprise, the whole capital stock of the Company, the subsidies they are to receive from the Government, the entire land grant under their contract, the branch lines they have constructed and the property they have acquired in steamships and in connecting lines of railway—the fact that they submit this proposition is the strongest evidence which they can furnish of their confidence in the eventual success of the enterprise in which they are engaged. And here, Sir, it may not be amiss to direct attention to the wonderful change in public sentiment shown during the last few years on this point. We all remember when we dare scarcely hope that the receipts would be sufficient to meet the ordinary expenditure; when fears were entertained, and I believe honestly entertained, and opinions were openly and publicly expressed, that even if the road were built, the cost of operating it would be such as to involve the whole country in financial ruin. But to-day all this is changed. There is a confidence in the future of this country, and a corresponding confidence in the future of this great work; and I am glad to say that confidence is each day growing stronger. Then if we have before us such evidence as this of the sufficiency of the security which is offered, if we have good reason to believe that this will prove in the future a profitable investment, if we have reason to believe that the stock of this corporation will have a future value in the great stock markets of the world, if the lands, at a fair estimate, are worth the whole amount Parliament is asked to loan, if the position of the Government under the original contract is not prejudicially affected by this loan, if the advantages which we may expect to receive are so numerous and important as they have been shown to be, we have ample reason to justify us—more than this it becomes the duty of this Parliament to sanction the Resolutions which are now before the House. I do not intend to reply, at any length, to the arguments which have been used in opposition to this measure. I will merely refer to them to point out one or two important particulars in which their line of argument is defective. In the first place, while they ask us to reject this measure, they have not submitted any alternative proposition to ensure the speedy completion of this great work. They have taken a wide range in this discussion. They have criticised the original contract, they have offered objections to some of the details of the arrangement which

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

is now proposed; but they have not assailed the position of the Government in regard to either the one or the other in any essential or important particular. And, Sir, they have not suggested, or attempted to suggest, any better method by which that most desirable object, the speedy completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway could be accomplished. And, Sir, their line of argument is open to another and even more serious objection, and that is its weak, indefinite, do-nothing character. The position which they assume is simply this: That in this emergency we take no action whatever, that we let the contract stand and ask the contractors to work it out as best they can, and when they can, regardless of the consequences to themselves or the country. It is admitted that it is desirable this great work should be speedily constructed; but they raise objections to the plan proposed. It is, no doubt, true that disastrous results would follow if the progress of this great work were stopped; but they ask us to wait and investigate. And after we have investigated, they tell us that it is impossible to state what may happen in the future. It is possible these estimates may not be accurate; it is possible the sum asked may not be sufficient to complete the line; it is possible the Company may return to Parliament at some future time for further aid. These are serious matters; this is a great responsibility to assume, and upon the whole they decide it is not wise to interfere; let matters take their own course, no doubt they will all come out right at the end, at all events let us hope so. That is about the line of argument which hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued upon this great question, this question which is of such vital moment to the people of this country. But, Sir, I am bound to say that that is not a new line of argument, for that is their general policy on questions of this kind. Sir, we must all have observed in the course of this discussion, the striking similarity between the policy which is advocated now, and the policy which those hon. gentlemen followed, when they were in power. During those years when the cloud of commercial depression spread darkness in the country, when business was almost at a standstill, when our industries were paralyzed, when our revenues were not sufficient to meet the annual expenditure, and our debt was yearly increasing, we were told the same story. In reply to every suggestion which was offered, we were told that the Government were powerless to afford relief; that it was unwise to attempt it, it was dangerous, it was impossible. Indeed, we were told it was necessary to pull down the whole fabric which political science had taken centuries to build, before it would be possible, by any legislative action, to remedy or improve the existing state of things. Under the circumstances which then surrounded them, they deliberately resolved to adopt, as they would have us do now, the policy of the illustrious Micawber, of waiting for something to turn up. They waited, then, and something did turn up, for when the people had an opportunity of expressing themselves on that policy, they denounced it in language so emphatic that it will never be forgotten. They hurled hon. gentlemen from power, and they have not since expressed any desire to reverse that verdict. My hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), in his address, referred to the many warnings which had been uttered in the course of this debate. I venture to utter one more, and only one. I will warn the Liberal-Conservative party to beware of following the policy which hon. gentlemen followed then, and which they are advocating now, if they wish to escape their fate. Now, with regard to the reasons which may be urged in favour of adopting these Resolutions. There are some in addition to those I have already alluded to. Besides the favourable financial features of this transaction, there are other considerations of an important character, which should not be overlooked. The influence of the railway policy of this country is not correctly estimated, if we regard

it only in its effects in our material prosperity, if we measure it simply by the wealth it creates, and the number of immigrants it brings to our shores. It has exerted in the past, it is exerting now, and it will exert in the future, a most powerful influence on the national life and the national character of this young country. Twenty years ago the Provinces which are represented here to-day, in this common Parliament, were comparatively strangers to each other. The Union was happily conceived and successfully accomplished. The construction of the Intercolonial Railway followed, and it has become the strongest among the many ties, commercial, social, and political, which unite the older Provinces at the present time. Since then there is no one event to which we can point in the history of this country, which has contributed so largely to create a national feeling among the people of Canada, which has done so much to foster the growth of national pride, and a spirit of national independence as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. And, Sir, we may well regard with pride a work so grand in its conception, that the people of this country entered upon with so much courage, and in the face of so many difficulties, which has been prosecuted with so much vigour, and brought so near completion, and which promises such great results in the future of this country. Why, Sir, there has been created from east to west, through this whole Dominion, a feeling that in this great work we have a common interest, and that for its success we must lay aside all sectional prejudice and all local interests; that it is a work of such magnitude as to be worthy of our ambition as a people, and demands from us united action. It has done more. It has fixed upon this country, hitherto comparatively unknown, the attention of the world, and it has gained for Canada a fame and influence abroad which we have never had till now, and of which we justly may feel proud. Shall we then, Sir, I ask, venture to arrest the progress of this great work at the present time? What, I ask, would be the effect upon ourselves—what the effect upon the world? Shall we venture to wound the pride of the people of this country, to mar the reputation, and prestige we have gained, by hesitating now? The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) in the eloquent address which he delivered at the opening of Parliament, said that the feeling in the country was that the Canadian Pacific Railway must be built, and built as speedily as possible. I endorse that opinion. I feel that that hon. gentleman has rightly voiced the public sentiment of Canada. The people of this country loyally supported this undertaking at its inception, amid the difficulties and doubts which then surrounded it. They watched its progress from that time to the present with unabating interest, and with daily increasing confidence in its success, and they are looking for, and will demand, its completion without unnecessary delay. I have alluded, Sir, to the railway policy of the present Administration, as a progressive policy. I have alluded, also, to some of the results which have been achieved. But, Sir, there remains much yet to be accomplished. I feel, Sir, that we have in this Dominion advantages which place it in our power to take a leading part in the future development of the railway system of this continent; and, Sir, these advantages are slowly but surely being forced on the recognition of ourselves and of the world. One year ago, a company of foreign capitalists submitted to this Parliament a proposition to construct a line of railway to connect Montreal and the great West, by the shortest possible route, with St. John, Halifax and Louisburg. It was claimed, by the promoters of that scheme, that, were that line constructed, they would be enabled to materially shorten the time required for the journey between the great business centres of Great Britain and America. With that advantage over their competitors, they claimed that they could command a great volume of travel between

this continent and the old country. The fact, Sir, that the amount of aid asked from the Government of this country was but a small proportion of the amount required for that great enterprise, and that the Company were willing to invest largely of their own capital in that scheme, was a strong proof of their confidence in its success. I am not aware that the statements which were made at that time have since been contradicted. I am not aware that the theory which was then advanced, and upon which the success of that scheme rests, has since been called in question. On the contrary, Sir, since public attention has been directed to that project, there has been a feeling created in its favour, and, there is to day a growing conviction in the public mind that the scheme has in it the essential elements of a sound commercial enterprise. It has been said that it may be unwise to connect our railways with the railway system of the great Republic to the south of us. I, Sir, for one do not apprehend much danger from that quarter; for I feel, with the facts to which I have referred before us, that it will yet be found that we have in this Dominion, not only those vast fertile plains which are capable of affording a profitable traffic to more than one great line of traffic, but that we have in our seaports upon the Atlantic coast advantages which will yet attract within our borders the mail and passenger service, as well as a fair share of the freight traffic of this great continent. It has been stated also in the course of this debate, that in these great enterprises speed means cost. From the standpoint from which I look at these questions, delay means loss, the full extent of which it is impossible for us to estimate. I was glad to learn, Sir, from the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways, in opening this debate, that he had already directed his attention to the important scheme to which I have just referred—that, with his usual quickness of perception, he has fully recognized the advantages we possess, and is alive to the importance of rendering them available at an early date; and, Sir, knowing as we do the great ability with which he deals with questions of this magnitude, knowing the decision and promptness with which he enters upon these great enterprises, and the untiring energy with which he carries forward to successful completion every scheme to which he is committed, I feel that this Parliament and the country may confidently expect that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be completed within the time now promised, and that we may also look for an early and rapid development of railway extension eastward, as well as the development of every other important portion of our railway system.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should apologize to the House for occupying its time in this discussion which has already dragged along at such length, and which is so thread-bare; but I trust, Sir, to be able to present a few thoughts in an original line, and perhaps to bring to the notice of the House some points which have not already been elicited in the course of this discussion.

Before entering upon the line which I have marked out for myself, I may be permitted to refer very briefly to some of the points made by one or two of the speakers who have more immediately preceded me. I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) last night, and I crave the indulgence of the House while I refer to a few points made by that hon. gentleman. Perhaps it is unnecessary for me to refer to his somewhat jocular allusion to my visit to Kent. I did visit that riding, Sir, and gave to the electors there, I think, some good advice, and I am fearful that the effect of that advice was counteracted by means the reverse of the character that I used to influence the electors. However that may be, the question now before the House was not an issue in that contest, and no disgrace attaches to the Reform party for failing to carry a riding which has long been a

distinctively Conservative one. The hon. gentleman also referred to a speech made by me in 1876 with regard to the development of the North-West by railway construction. The Reform party have always been favourable to that policy, and the difference between them and hon. gentlemen who sit opposite is not as to the policy itself, but as to the mode of developing the country, as to the character of the measures best adapted to the purpose we all have in view. The hon. gentleman also spoke of the exaggerated estimates of the cost of this railway made by leading Reformers in 1873. Exaggerated estimates then made simply prove that the nature of the country was to a great extent unknown in 1873 to those who were speculating as to the cost of the road. It also proves that the calculations at that time, based upon the cost of the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific, to a large extent were made in ignorance of a certain matter which has since been developed, that is, the science of watering stock, which was brought to perfection by the gentlemen who constructed those roads, and which made the nominal cost nearly three times as great as the actual cost, and we based our calculations upon that nominal cost. The hon. gentleman also alluded in complimentary terms to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), to the hon. leader of the Opposition, and to several other hon. members on this side of the House, because their estimates of the quantity of arable land in the North-West were below the mark. Well, Sir, estimates of the quantity of arable land in the North-West were made at that time on the best data then obtainable, and based upon that data those estimates were correct. The hon. gentleman referred to my calculation of 95,000,000 acres of arable land, and proceeded to show that that calculation was incorrect. Well, Sir, we have assertions as to the quantity of arable land in that country, but these are mere assertions which are not based on ascertained facts to any great extent. It is true that as we open up the country we find that there is more good land there than we had expected; but what the extent of it is I hold that we have at present no means of knowing, and any estimates of its quantity are merely guess-work.

The hon. gentleman then had a fling at the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) who, he said, was prepared to support the hon. leader of the Government in 1872, and is not prepared to do so now, and is therefore inconsistent in his conduct. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong as a matter of fact. The hon. member for South Huron was not prepared to support the policy of the Conservative Government in 1872, but had for years ceased to be a supporter of that Government. In a speech delivered in the town of Simcoe, in my own constituency, in September, 1877, the hon. gentleman used this language:

"If I did support Sir John Macdonald in 1863, I supported him when his cause was desperate, when every man with a gleam of political sagacity knew that he had not a chance of bringing back a dozen members from Ontario at the general election in 1864. When I left him, remember that it was in the zenith of his power—when, if he had exercised common prudence, he would not in all human likelihood have been dislodged from the position he occupied in 1869 and 1870 for many years. It was at that time that I chose, publicly and openly, to withdraw my support and allegiance from him."

He left, not when his fortunes were falling, and it was becoming apparent that he was losing power; but, as the hon. gentleman says, when he was in the zenith of power, when there was no inducement for him to leave the Conservative party, in hopes of another party coming into power. The circumstances under which the hon. gentleman left that party are honourable to him, because he cannot be accused of expecting to receive place or power in consequence of his defection from their ranks. So much for the assertions of the hon. gentleman. As I do not wish to detain the House I will pass over other points

Mr. CHARLTON,

made by the hon. gentleman, and only refer to them incidentally in the course of my remarks.

I may compliment the hon. gentleman who has spoken to-day most sincerely upon the logical and well delivered speech with which he has favoured the House, and on the whole, I must say, he confined himself to the question pretty closely. He did however digress on one or two occasions. In the matter of the National Policy, he descanted upon the condition of things that existed in this country at a time when the whole world were labouring under a great commercial depression, from 1874 to 1878, condemning the policy of the late Government and implying that that depression was due, not to the world-wide stagnation in trade that then existed, but to the policy of the Government. It is a singular circumstance that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) during all those years, was a supporter of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He actually presided at a meeting held, in 1881, by the hon. Edward Blake, leader of the Opposition, and his conversion is certainly of a more recent date than 1878. The Finance Minister shakes his head, I may be mistaken as to the matter of fact that the hon. gentleman presided at a meeting held by the leader of the Opposition.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is quite true.

Mr. CHARLTON. That was in 1881, yet that hon. gentleman stands up here to-day and talks of the evil results of the policy of the party which he supported from 1874 to 1881. The hon. gentleman also tells us that we asked this House to reject the measure now under consideration, but have submitted no alternative proposition. There is an alternative proposition. There is a motion in your hands, Mr. Speaker, calling, not for the rejection of this measure, but for a postponement of action until more definite information can be obtained by this House as to the character of the operations of the Company; until we can obtain information as to whether they have used the funds placed in their hands judiciously and honestly, and are entitled to the confidence of this country or not. That is the alternative proposition, and no reasonable man can deny the justice of the demand made by the Opposition in the resolution formulated that a committee of investigation shall sift to the bottom the affairs of the syndicate which was endowed with grants sufficient to enable it to accomplish the purpose it contracted with this Government to accomplish.

So much for the points made by the two speakers who have immediately preceded me; I will proceed now to consider some of the points at issue in this question. In doing so, I shall endeavour to confine myself to the question, and avoid diverging into a wider field. But I may be permitted to say at the outset that the tactics used by the hon. gentlemen opposite are calculated, and, in my belief, designed to mislead the country. They make glowing appeals to the country—appeals based upon the importance of opening up the North-West. But the North-West is already opened up. It is penetrated by a railway traversing it from the Red River to the base of the Rocky Mountains, and is connected by a railway line from the frontier of the United States with the whole American railway system. The North-West is as accessible to-day as it would be if the eastern section of the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior were constructed, and so far as the necessity exists of having a line to take our immigrants into the North-West, without passing through the United States, that can be done now. Immigration does not flow in during the winter season, and during the rest of the year we have our steamboat lines, connecting with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Port Arthur, which gives us ample facilities to pour into that country hundreds of thousands of immigrants, through our own territory, if they choose to go in there. The argument, therefore, that additional expenditure is

necessary for the purpose of developing the North-West is a fallacy because the North-West is thoroughly developed already, so far as the railway is concerned. We are told of the importance of securing the trans-continental trade which shall flow over this road when it reaches the Pacific Ocean. That is the merest bosh. The American Pacific railways, the Union Pacific, the Central Pacific, the Northern Pacific and the Southern Pacific—all these roads get an insignificant portion of their traffic from the Chinese and Japanese trade, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, so far as the trans-continental trade is concerned, will never be benefited to any material degree. But, they say, it is highly important to reach British Columbia. No doubt, it is important. When we reach British Columbia we reach 20,000 people who will give additional business to this road. Yet the people of British Columbia were content with the provisions provided in the contract for the completion of the road in 1891. Their representatives in this House voted for that contract. They are not grumbling now because they cannot get the road sooner, and it is not, I believe, in the interests of the people of this country that the road should be constructed so rapidly as proposed. This question must be discussed on its own merits and not on side issues. Hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to divert our attention from the real question at stake by raising a number of side issues. They raise the question of depreciating the value of the stock and of outside investments; they raise the question of dividends guaranteed on land grant bonds; they raise the question of making outside investments and sustaining outside investments; they raise the question of the construction company. We have the figures of this Canadian Pacific Railway Company presented to us, manipulated by skilful hands in such a manner as to mislead us and conceal the truth, and it is evident the intention of these parties, in presenting their case, is to mislead the people and divert their attention from the main facts.

There are certain leading facts that should be kept constantly in view, and by keeping which in view it is an easy matter to arrive at a just and proper conclusion. We made a contract, as a Government, with a syndicate to perform certain work, and we agreed to give the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate certain aid to enable them to perform that work. It will be found, when we examine into the case, that the syndicate have stepped outside of the line in which they contracted to act; it will be found that they are doing more than the Government asked them to do; it will be found that the aid the Government bestowed upon them was ample to enable them to do that which they contracted to perform, and that in appearing before this House and asking additional aid they are simply asking the Government to give them the means of carrying on a gigantic speculation outside of their contract. They are simply asking for the means of establishing a railway monopoly in the whole Dominion—a railway monopoly east of Lake Superior as complete as that which the charter grants them west of Lake Superior. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, a few nights ago, told that both parties were committed to the construction of this road in the same method and by the same mode. The Reform party were not committed to the construction of this road in ten years from 1871, as was provided by the articles of admission of British Columbia; they were not committed to the method and mode for the construction of the road adopted in 1872, when the charter for its construction was sold for the purpose of securing funds to be used in corrupting the electorate of Canada. They were not committed to that method and mode and to that scandal which resulted in the falling from power of hon. gentlemen opposite, and which resulted further in a still greater scandal, in a scandal which showed that the people of this country were debauched, morally, by twenty-five years of political corruption—that the apathy existing

in the public mind was so great that crimes against the public interests such as that could not arouse it, and that men guilty of this failure to perform their duty and discharge their trust were returned to power. The Reform party were not committed to the method and mode adopted in 1881, when this contract was made without advertising for tenders and made under circumstances that exposed the Government to grave suspicion and on terms most onerous and oppressive to the people of this country.

Much has been said in the course of this debate about the policy of the Administration that preceded the Administration now in power, with reference to this railway. The Act of 1874 has been quoted and the attempt has been made to prove that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), in the policy he adopted, was acting not in the interest of the country, but acting in a manner which was imposing heavier burdens, and securing the construction of this road at a greater expense than under the present contract. The Act of 1874 contained two permissive alternatives. That Act permitted the Government of the day to build that road under contract upon certain terms, putting a limit to the bonuses in land and money that might be paid to a company; or, the Act of 1874 permitted the Government to proceed with the construction of that road as a Government work. Now, the plan adopted by the Government was not to build that road under contract, not to contract with a company for the construction of the road, but to proceed with the construction of the road as a Government work; and when the gentlemen now in power came into power, they proceeded at first to carry out that plan, with certain modifications. The first proposal, in 1879, was to carry on the construction of that road, but to lessen the burden upon the people of Canada by procuring an Imperial guarantee. In 1880, they came down with a new proposal, still proposing to carry on the construction of that road as it had been carried on under the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, and setting apart 100,000,000 acres of land, the sale of which was to form a fund for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. One year after that time, they adopted the plan of constructing it by contract, and they made a contract, and let the country bear in mind that they made that contract in violation of the law, they made that contract in violation of the Railway Law of 1871, they made that contract in violation of the Public Works Act of 1867. The one provided that no contract should be let upon the Canadian Pacific Railway without tenders having been first advertised for. The Public Works Act provided that no contract whatever should be let for a sum of more than \$10,000 without tenders having been advertised for. But, in violation of both those Acts, in secret, without letting the country or Parliament into the secret, these gentlemen made a contract which, on the 11th December, 1881, they laid before the House; and I venture to say that there was not a supporter of the hon. gentleman who was not astounded at the extravagant, at the outrageous provisions of that syndicate contract. Sir, subsequent developments showed that the hon. gentlemen, in making that contract without advertising for tenders, had not discharged their duty or acted in the interests of the country, for, in a few short weeks after the terms of the contract were made known, they received an offer to build that road upon better terms.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hear a derisive "hear, hear." I say that the Government received an offer to build that road for \$3,000,000 less money and for 3,000,000 less acres of land, and it was an offer from a more responsible company, a company higher in character, a company possessed of greater means, and a company who had, not as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed to put up a deposit of \$1,000,000, but who did put a deposit of \$1,600,000 as

evidence of their good faith. If that was a bogus company, as was said, why did not the Government offer to take them at their word, why did they not offer to close with them, and so demonstrate the bogus character of that proposal, and permit my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, to sweep that \$1,600,000 into the Treasury to swell the surplus? No, Sir, it was a *bona fide*, honest offer, an offer too high in itself, but an offer that was much better than the other, and I quote it to show that it was an offer which demonstrates that the Government in making this contract without advertising for tenders, failed to make as good a bargain as they might have made, and failed to do their duty to their constituents and to the country.

Referring to the plan adopted by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and to the procedure under that plan, I may say that he was proceeding to give the North-West railway communication. Before he left office, he had completed a line from Pembina to Selkirk, he had also placed under contract, or provided for the construction of a road from Port Arthur to Selkirk, he had also placed under contract 100 miles of line from the Red River westward into the prairie region. Now, I propose to show—and this is a point which I believe no previous speaker has alluded to—that the natural result of the policy adopted and pursued by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) would have been to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway for many millions less than the plan which was adopted. The line from Port Arthur to Pembina is estimated to cost, with the branch from Emerson to Selkirk, \$16,261,000. That is the estimate placed upon that work in the Department of my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways. I estimated that it would cost the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) \$17,000,000, but it would probably have been better constructed, because I believe some money has been expended in order to complete and perfect that line. This road would have been continued westward—it was being continued westward—and the question which would have arisen here, when we reached the Red River, would have been how rapidly we should proceed westward. I have always held that the building of a road with extreme rapidity through a wilderness is injudicious and unwise, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway had been constructed and pushed into the interior from the Red River in advance of settlement, it would have been pushed with sufficient rapidity. If it had afforded to the settlers who poured in there, railway facilities, the means of reaching market with their products, and the means of getting to their farms, the Government would have discharged its duty in affording railway facilities to that country. In 1881, when we were discussing this syndicate contract, I presented a plan to the Government. I do not know if my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, will recollect it or not—I urged upon the Government the advisability of constructing the prairie section first; I pointed out to them that probably a bonus of 2,000 acres of land per mile would secure the construction of the road from the Red River to the Rocky Mountains, with the road from Port Arthur to the Red River added to the bonus; I pointed out to them that, when the road had reached the Rocky Mountains at that moderate cost, the country would have been partially developed, the difficulties which beset the enterprise, those difficulties which were imaginary would be shown to be imaginary, and that the construction of the balance of that road—the portions from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific and from Port Arthur to Callander—could have been procured in five years at greatly less expense than at that time. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not recollect that I urged that proposal. It was a policy of precisely this character which was being pursued by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He was pushing the road through the prairie section,

Mr. CHARLTON.

he would have continued to push it through the interior to the mountains, and, as that road progressed through the interior towards the mountains, it would have developed a large trade, the Government would have been encouraged in carrying it on, because the road would have paid from the outset. Let us see what would have been the probable result of this policy. Bear in mind that the North-West was already opened; bear in mind that that country was accessible; bear in mind that the land policy of that country was in the hands of men who would have been governed by common sense ideas, who would have adopted regulations calculated to promote the immigration to the settlement of that country, who would not have been guilty of such an insane policy as to place the price of public lands in that country 75 cents an acre higher than the price in the United States, our rivals for the immigration to the West, who would not have hampered the settler in his attempts to reach that country, who would not have imposed taxes upon his lumber, or upon his agricultural implements, who would not have handed him over to the tender mercies of a monopoly for the prices he would have to pay, outward for the carriage of his productions, and inward for that of what he would have to buy. And bearing in mind the differences that have existed between the policies of the two parties, and you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the greater rapidity with which the North-West would have been settled under the auspices of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Well, Sir, under the impetus that would have been given by this common sense policy to the settlement and development of that country, this road would have progressed towards the mountains. We will suppose the Government had continued to construct this road until it reached the mountains, that it had built the 1,000 miles to the mountains, that in the meantime it had constructed lateral branches of 500 miles in length, and along with the Thunder Bay and Pembina line, with the 500 miles of branches wholly equipped, let us see what that road would have cost. We will allow \$12,000,000 to have built the 1,000 miles to the mountains. The Minister of Railways once estimated the cost, at the utmost, at \$13,000,000, probably \$10,000,000—we will call it \$12,000,000. We will estimate the cost of the 500 miles of branches at \$10,000 per mile, or \$5,000,000; the Thunder Bay and Pembina section at \$17,000,000; we will estimate the cost of the equipment of the 2,000 miles of road and branches from Port Arthur to the mountains, at \$6,000,000 and we would have \$40,000,000 representing the cost of road from Lake Superior to the mountains, with a connection with the American system of railways, with 500 miles of branches, and with ample equipment. Now, when that point had been reached, when that road had been pushed to the mountains in advance of settlement, say, in 1885, do you believe that the natural outcome would not have been that the Government could have secured the construction of the eastern division and of the western division by bestowing this road equipped, by giving a road costing the Government \$40,000,000 as a bonus for constructing the rest? Why, Sir, we are told that the Canadian Pacific Railway last year, although pushed through the prairies, although bridging great distances where there are no settlers, although a thousand miles of road had been constructed to afford facilities to the settlers that might have settled along 200 miles of that road, that notwithstanding all that that road last year earned, including transport of materials, \$5,420,000; and that its net earnings the last nine months were \$978,000, if that were the case the road built under the circumstances I have named, a road equipped in this manner, a road paying handsome dividends on the cost of \$40,000,000, if offered as a bonus in 1885, would inevitably have secured the construction of the rest of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There would have been no difficulty about it at all; and had my hon. friend the Minister

of Railways listened to the advice that was given him in 1831, when the contract was under discussion, and had he proceeded to construct that portion of this road that crosses the prairies before he had arranged for the construction of the rest, he would have saved to this country scores of millions beyond a shadow of a doubt. Now, Sir, what would the balance of the road cost? By present estimate it would cost about \$43,000,000—that is if we bestowed a road costing \$40,000,000, and a paying road, it would have secured the construction of the balance of the road costing \$43,000,000 more. No difficulty whatever would have been experienced in securing the building of the balance of the road upon those terms. The road could have been secured in the following five years and would have been ready by the year 1890. What would have been the saving under this plan? Well, Sir, we give to the syndicate \$25,000,000 in cash; we build for the syndicate \$23,000,000 worth of road—and those estimates, I fear, are likely to be exceeded; that represents \$53,000,000. If, by pursuing the policy I have laid down, we had built this road to the mountains, and then give it as a bonus worth \$40,000,000, we would have secured the construction in this manner of the balance of the road from Callander to the Pacific Ocean in 1890 at a cash expense of \$40,000,000; we would have saved \$13,000,000 in cash, and the entire land grant of 25,000,000 acres. Now, Sir, this calculation is a reasonable one; this calculation, I have no doubt, would have substantially been realized, this result would have been attained, had the policy that was being pursued by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) been continued by him, or by his successors, up to the present time.

Having made this digression, which, I think, is a pertinent one, having pointed out to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, how he himself might have saved the country \$13,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land, my next question is: What did this Syndicate contract to do? We have this Syndicate before us to-day asking for millions of money to enable them to buy lines in the United States, to buy lines in Quebec, to buy lines in Ontario, to lay the foundations of a syndicate empire extending over the whole of this Dominion. It is for these purposes they require the money, not for carrying out the contract made with this Government. What did they contract to do? Why, Sir, they contracted to build a line from Nipissing to Port Arthur, and they contracted to build a line from Red River to Kamloops. They contracted to complete this road by 1891, and the estimated cost of performing this contract was \$50,000,000. They contracted, furthermore, to maintain and operate a line from Nipissing to Port Moody, when it was completed, for ten years. These are the simple provisions of that contract; these are all the stipulations that the syndicate made; all that they undertook to perform; all that they were bound to perform by that contract. And, Sir, what was the Government to do and to permit in return for this? The Government was to give the syndicate the benefit of all the surveys, amounting to \$5,000,000; it was to give the syndicate 707 miles of completed railway—all but about 200 miles in the most difficult portion of the road—the 707 miles costing \$23,000,000; to give in cash \$25,000,000; it was to give 25,000,000 acres of land, which my hon. friend the Minister of Railways estimates at \$50,000,000; it was to give to the syndicate a monopoly of transportation in the North-West for twenty years; to give exemption from taxation and from duty on material; it was to give the syndicate the privilege of dividing 10 per cent. dividends on capital; but it neglected to make any provisions or restrictions as to watered stock. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways says this was a magnificent subvention; truly, it was, Sir, I shall be able to show that this subvention was more than sufficient to build the entire road; I will be able to show that this subvention was mil-

lions more than the syndicate required to carry out the terms of the contract they made with this Government. They were to expend \$50,000,000 to complete a portion of the road for themselves. They were to receive from the Government in cash \$25,000,000; they were to receive in road completed, \$28,000,000; they were to receive in land, \$50,000,000; total, \$103,000,000. Now, deducting from this the entire cost of the road, and the syndicate would have a road from Nipissing to the Pacific with \$25,000,000 in their pockets. These were the conditions. This was the condition upon which the syndicate contracted with the Government, and this was the amount of aid that they were to receive. Now they had additional resources. In addition to the land grant, in addition to the cash subsidy, in addition to the expenditure by the Government of \$28,000,000, they had the power to issue bonds upon their road to the amount of \$10,000 per mile, a source from which they could have realized \$26,000,000. They had power to issue preference stock to the extent of \$26,000,000. They had power to issue ordinary stock to the extent of \$25,000,000. From these three sources they could have realized \$77,000,000, in addition to the \$25,000,000, over and above the cost of the road with which the Government presented them, making a total of \$102,000,000 of resources in the hands of the syndicate in excess of the amount the entire road would have cost them, less the amount of equipment. Or, if they confined themselves to the issue of \$25,000,000 in common stock and issued neither bonds nor preferred stock, they would still have the road clear of cost with a balance of \$52,000,000, counting the land at \$2 per acre. Now, were these resources sufficient to enable the syndicate to carry out their contract? Is the Company with that magnificent subvention, as the hon. gentleman termed it, a subvention \$25,000,000 greater than was necessary to build the entire road, without counting on their powers to issue common stock or bonds of preferred stock, justified in coming before this House to-day and asking for further aid to the extent of \$22,500,000 in cash and the postponement of payments due to the Government? I maintain they are not.

What did Canada contract to pay for under this bargain? Did it contract to pay for a road from Nipissing to Montreal? It did not; and it was unnecessary for the syndicate to secure such a road until they required an outlet. Any road running in that direction would have been glad to have made terms with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to carry their traffic. It would have been an easy matter in the case of the Canada Central to have made a consolidation, and to have taken that road in as part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system after the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed. It was premature to purchase the road in advance of the time when the Canadian Pacific Railway required an outlet. Did we contract for a road to Portland, in the State of Maine? We did not, and it was unnecessary for the syndicate to have acquired such a road. Did we contract with the syndicate to acquire a road to Brockville? We did not. Did we contract with the syndicate for a road from Ottawa to Detroit? We did not. Did we contract with the syndicate for a road from Toronto to Owen Sound? We did not. Did we contract with the syndicate that we should back them up in making war upon the Grand Trunk and become a party to that conflict? We did not. Did we contract with the syndicate to establish a railway monopoly east of Lake Superior as perfect and galling as the monopoly existing under that contract west of Lake Superior? No; that was not a part of the contract. Did we contract with the syndicate to build a palace for its president, and endow its members with millions of dollars for investment in stocks in England, and other enterprises? We did not. Did we contract to stand sponsors for the ambitious and far-reaching designs of railway kings, to make the whole Do-

minion subsidiary and tributary to them? No, we did not. We are not parties to any such contract; but it is to carry out a contract of that character, to aid them to realize their designs, that they come and ask Parliament for an additional subvention to the amount of \$23,500,000. Were the syndicate able to carry out the contract stipulations? The syndicate were able to carry out their contract; they were endowed with ample means to carry it out. What have they expended? What did the Minister of Railways tell us the other day they had expended—expended on legitimate portions of the work which they contracted to perform? The hon. gentleman told us they had expended on the main line: Nipissing division, \$3,249,791; Lake Superior division, \$2,299,783; western division, \$17,529,175; equipment, \$6,130,792; being a total of \$29,209,549 as the amount expended by the syndicate upon the legitimate contract which they made with the Government. How much of that is water we do not know. Of that \$17,529,175 presumed to represent the cost of the prairie section, we have reason to suspect that millions of dollars are represented by water, that that portion of the road cost millions of dollars less than represented, and that the actual *bona fide* expenditure given as being over \$9,000,000 would probably fall short of \$25,000,000. But what have they received from all sources, admitting they have honestly made this expenditure? They have received, cash subsidy \$12,289,000, bonuses \$250,000, sale of town sites \$1,000,000, net earnings during the last nine months to January 15th, \$978,000, sale of land bonds \$10,000,000, deducting land sales \$8,858,000, \$1,142,000, land sold \$3,858,000, the proceeds of \$55,000,000 stock sold \$25,300,000, loan on \$10,000,000 stock pledged—I do not know where, I should like to know where—\$4,950,000, making in all the total cash receipts of the syndicate \$54,247,000, while the expenditure upon the legitimate portion of the contract only amounts to \$29,209,541. It appears therefore that the syndicate have received in excess of the amount they have expended on the main line, being the work covered by the contract, \$25,037,459. The figures are incontrovertible. They may show what they please as to certain expenditures outside of the main line, as to expenditures on railways in the United States, on railways in Ontario, on railways in Quebec, on terminus sites, on palaces, on investment in funds; but keeping the leading fact in mind that the syndicate contracted with the Government to build the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and received a subvention to enable them to do that; that upon that contract they have expended \$29,209,541 and have received from all sources in cash \$54,247,000; keeping in mind the further fact that they have received \$25,037,459 more than they have expended on the work professed to be performed—I say it is an outrage on the people of the country and upon this Parliament that the Company which have already received \$25,000,000 more from the Government than they have expended on the contract, should appear before this Parliament and ask for \$22,500,000 more.

Sir LEONAD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Finance says "hear, hear." I suppose his financial ability so far transcends that of ordinary mortals that he is able to see the propriety of this transaction. I am unable to see it. And, Sir, the position of the road is even more favourable than I have indicated, because a portion of the expenditure, or the money counted as expenditure, was made on unfinished portions which are entitled to draw both land and cash subsidies so soon as the sections partially completed are entirely finished. The estimated cost of completing the road upon which this expenditure of \$29,000,000 odd has been made is, we are told \$27,000,000. We will accept that estimate. They have received in excess of the amount they have ex-

Mr. CHARLTON.

pendent, as I have said, \$25,037,000. They are entitled to receive when the road is completed in cash \$12,700,000 more, which brings up the amount to \$37,737,000 to cover an estimated expenditure of \$27,000,000. Clearly, Sir, the syndicate are not under the necessity of calling upon this House or this country to furnish them the means to complete the road, when they actually have in hand, or will have in hand, in cash when the road is completed \$10,747,000 more than the main line is to cost. And in addition they will have the unsold lands of the land grant amounting to 21,241,000 acres. And if they require more funds they have power to bond the road for \$10,000 per mile, to issue preferred stock to the extent of \$10,000 per mile; they have \$35,000,000 of the unissued common stock to place on the market; and these amounts with the surplus from the main line, \$10,747,459, make a total of \$97,747,459 in cash, without trenching on their resources, when the road is completed. So much for the ability of the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate to carry out their contract. Why, the position of that Company was so strong when the contract was made, that with the cash subsidy, with the \$25,000,000 of stock issued at par, and with \$25,000,000 of bonded debt placed on that road, they would have been enabled to build it, and have \$25,000,000 with which to equip it. There is no excuse for this Company—no reason why they should be in financial difficulties, no reason why they should be compelled to come to this House, seeking help to bridge over these difficulties. Their resources were ample and abundant. They had millions upon millions in excess of the sum required to enable them to discharge the contract which they made with the Government of Canada.

To what then, Sir, are these embarrassments due? As I have said, one cause of this embarrassment is the desire to own the entire railway system of this Dominion. They have reached so far towards a realization of that desire as to own all the roads in this Dominion, except those belonging to one particular system, and that system they are now making war upon with a desire to sweep it into the great maw of this all-devouring maelstrom. I say it was a mistake to deposit \$8,710,000 with the Government to guarantee future dividends. Why, Sir, if that was a good policy, it would have been better policy to have deposited the whole proceeds of the bonds, in order to secure dividends for a longer term of years, or at a higher rate of interest. They locked up this \$8,710,000, which they required to use, and should have used, for other purposes. It was bad policy to pay dividends on capital before they were earned, for they used their capital to the extent of \$2,128,000 with which to pay dividends. The haste with which the road has been constructed has involved the Company in difficulties; the recklessness of the Company, and their hostility to other roads, have also involved them in difficulty. They have acted the part of an Ishmael, whose hand was against every other road, and they may expect that the hand of every other road will be against them. They are involved in difficulties in consequence of their Credit Mobilier transactions, and the suspicions that are attached to them, because the men connected with the Company were not above suspicion, and because the country had fears that they intended to unload upon the innocent stockholders, and slip out with millions upon millions of dollars. It is for these reasons that this Company with its magnificent subvention—a subvention of \$25,000,000, of money, land subsidy and railway completed, more than was required to build the whole road—it is for these reasons that this Company with its ample resources, is to-day a mendicant, knocking at the doors of Parliament for \$22,500,000. Sir, are we called upon to pay for this wild career of extravagance? Are we called upon to uphold this monopoly creator? Are we to endow these railway kings with the millions they now possess, and the added millions

they expect hereafter to possess—are we to pay the cost of their incapacity? Are we to launch out millions more because these men have proved totally inadequate to the task they had before them, and have demonstrated their incapacity to every railway and business man in the Dominion?

I propose to examine more fully the claims of these gentlemen to public confidence, but before doing so I have a few words to say about a species of rascality that these men have perpetrated upon this country—a species of rascality for which the perpetrators deserve the condemnation of every honest man. I refer to stock-watering.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) ever heard of the operation called stock-watering? I understand that he once watered the stock of a company somewhat different from a railway company. In 1844 a Bill was introduced by Mr. Gladstone, and passed by the English Parliament, prohibiting dividends of more than 10 per cent. being paid by railway corporations. The origin of the operation called stock-watering, was an attempt to evade that law in England, by increasing the amount of stock, so that dividends of more than 10 per cent. could be distributed to stockholders by the nominal increase of the stock. This was the origin of the modern science of railway stock-watering. That sort of thing, like almost all kinds of rascality, has been improved upon in the United States. It has been carried on there to a vast and almost unlimited extent, and our friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate are apt scholars, and have shown that they comprehend the system thoroughly. They have not only learned the lesson, but they have learned to act upon it, and they did act upon it. I propose to call attention to a few examples of stock-watering. At this juncture they will no doubt, be interesting to the House and to the country. They will also be instructive to the country, and they will show the magnitude of the crime which has been perpetrated against the interests of the country, perpetrated with comparative impunity until recent years in the United States, but perpetrated here by the syndicate, with the connivance and knowledge of the Government.

An hon. MEMBER. With their assistance.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, with their assistance.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg pardon, Mr. Speaker, if in stating a fact I have transcended the limits of parliamentary propriety. I shall first call attention to the Western Union Telegraph Company of the United States, and invite the attention of hon. members to the figures I am about to give them. It affords one of the most prominent examples of stock-watering ever known in the history of corporations. That company has been manipulated by men fully the equals, in ability to manipulate things, of the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Jay Gould was one of them, and I might recount the name of several eminent men of the same kind. In 1857 the Western Union took over the Ezra Cornell Company telegraph line, which cost \$150,000, and they stocked it at \$2,000,000. That was a pretty fair degree of watering. They next purchased the Pittsburg, Cincinnati and Louisville line, costing \$400,000, which they stocked at \$5,000,000. They next purchased a Pennsylvania line, and one from New York to Buffalo by way of Albany, and they issued three shares of stock for each share of cost. They next bought the Atlantic and Ohio line, at a cost of \$200,000, and they stocked it at \$800,000. They next absorbed eight small lines in Ohio, which cost \$200,000, and they stocked them at \$600,000. In 1863 the capital stock was increased to \$11,000,000. The plant had actually cost

\$2,250,000, and they proceeded to issue scrip dividends for 100 per cent., thus doubling the stock, and making it \$22,000,000 upon an actual outlay of \$2,250,000, and they went on to pay 8 per cent. on the watered stock. They then purchased the Pacific and Atlantic Company's telegraph line, at a cost of \$500,000, and they paid interest upon \$2,000,000. They then leased the Southern Atlantic for 99 years at a cost of \$250,000, and they issued bonds, paying 5 per cent. interest on \$9,500,000. In 1877 they purchased the Atlantic and Pacific line belonging to Jay Gould, which cost \$1,000,000, paying for it \$9,000,000 in stock of the Western Union. They next bought the American Union line for \$15,000,000 in stock, it costing less than \$4,000,000. They next issued to the original stockholders of the Western Union, to compensate them for their steals in these various companies, \$15,500,000 in stock. At this time the stock stands at \$80,000,000, no less than \$6,000,000 of which was watered, and the whole plant of the Western Union could be replaced for \$22,500,000. Now, Sir, we in this country have the privilege of paying tribute to this gang of thieves—for they are nothing more or less, and the people of the United States are paying 8 per cent. dividends from year to year upon stock of which \$63,000,000 out of \$80,000,000 is watered. They are paying these men \$5,040,000 every year upon fictitious stock. This interest compounded amounts to \$63,000,000 in nine years, and then the people commence paying the sum again, so that the long suffering people of the United States and Canada are paying these plunderers this large amount of money over and over again in each recurring cycle of nine years. This stock-watering it is thus seen becomes a permanent tax on the people. Now, I propose to cite to the House one or two instances of stock-watering in connection with railroads in the United States. The New York Central Railway has to-day a capital stock of \$89,428,000, of which experts say that \$53,000,000 is water. The public are paying to the New York Central Railroad 8 per cent. dividend every year upon \$53,000,000 of stealings, and every nine years if these dividends are compounded, the people are paying the whole amount over again. The original cost of the Erie Railroad was \$16,500,000, and it has added to this the enormous amount of \$30,500,000 of watered stock. By whom was this stock of these roads watered? Why, by Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jay Gould and other swindlers, who are only different from ordinary swindlers in the greater amount in which they swindle their victims, and that is the policy that is being adopted by this Canadian Pacific Railway Company with the concurrence of this Government. I may read some extracts from a report of the New York Chamber of Commerce, with regard to this great abuse that exists in the United States. In the report of the Committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce on railroad transportation, for the year 1881, I find the following:—

“This practice of creating fictitious values in public enterprises is perhaps the most detrimental to the public interest of all the abuses attending the uncontrolled management of railroad and telegraph corporations. It is accomplished by many different methods. Construction or development companies are a favourite method. The Credit Mobilier, in connection with the Union Pacific road, is a case in point, and a more recent instance is illustrated by the following, from the *Graphic*, of March 16th, 1881. The Central Construction Company is now paying at its office, No. 80, Broadway, a final dividend in Western Union Telegraph Company, new stock at par of 150 per cent. on the \$5,000,000 of subscriptions made last year for the construction of the American Union Lines. With the previous dividend of 150 per cent. in American Union Stock, this gives to the subscribers the equivalent of 300 per cent. in a New Western Union Stock at par on their investment. This was the first of the construction companies established by Jay Gould, and whose subscriptions have been so eagerly sought by the wiser class of investors. The others are said to promise to pay fully as well as this, capitalizing surplus earnings in another form of stock watering, which is described by the Legislative Committee of 1878, which investigated the coal combination, as follows: ‘During the receipt of these enormous profits many of the coal corporations, as was

the case with railroads not engaged in the coal carrying trade, unable, under their charters, or for other reasons, to declare dividends upon their stock that would absorb their unexpended surplus, issued additional stock to the stockholders, for which they paid nothing—in-argued what is commonly known as stock-watering, or a capitalization of surplus earnings, which is in substance exacting money from the people, creating an indebtedness representing the same, and making this the basis for forever asking the public to pay interest upon their own money so exacted. Even stealings have, in the past, been capitalized, prominent examples of which are found in the former management of Erie and New York and New Haven Railroads. The Schuyler frauds of the latter were at one time famous. The president of the road, Mr. Schuyler, issued and sold a large amount of bonds, applying the proceeds to his own use. It might be thought that the stockholders would have assessed themselves to make up the deficiency caused by the unfaithfulness of their own servant, but instead of doing this they increased their capital, or in other words issued and sold stock enough to cover the fraudulent bonds, and since that time have maintained rates high enough to pay dividends, generally of 10 per cent. upon the whole amount of stock thus inflated. What would be thought of a merchant making a bad debt who assessed the amount upon his paying customers? and even this would not compare to the injustice of the other, for when the bad debt had been assessed and paid, that would end it, but in the case of the increased stock of the New Haven and other railroads, it remains a burden upon the public so long as rates for transportation are maintained high enough to yield dividends upon it."

But, Sir, it is unnecessary to multiply examples. I have given enough details to show to the House and the country the character of these manipulations, and I wish now to present, in one general view, the result of their manipulations in railway property over the whole United States. I find by Poor's Railway Manual for 1883, that for the three years ending December 31st, 1882, the increase in capital and indebtedness of the railways of the United States was \$2,023,646,000; and that the actual cash expenditure was \$1,050,000,000. The water represented in this expenditure was \$973,646,000, or 48 per cent. of the assumed capital and indebtedness of the roads constructed in the United States those three years. Well, Sir, if we apply the same ratio to the entire capital of the railways in the United States, what do we find? And with reference to that ratio, I presume it is below the actual fact, for during the last three years public attention has been awakened to this subject, and the difficulty of watering stock has become somewhat greater than it was in previous years. Yet, applying the ratio of 48 per cent. to the whole railway stock in the United States, I find that at that time the total number of miles of railway in the United States was 112,412, and that the total amount of money invested in railways was \$6,895,663,000. Of this, \$3,456,078,000 was capital stock, \$3,184,415,000 funded debt, and \$255,170,000 was floating debt. This represented an average cost of \$61,342 per mile. Taking 48 per cent. of this as water or \$29,444 per mile, the actual cash cost per mile was \$31,898; so that the total amount of water in railways of the United States on the 31st of December, 1882, amounted to the almost incredible sum of \$3,309,918,000, and the actual cash investment was \$3,585,745,000. Now, the net earnings upon the nominal investment for the year 1882 was 4½ per cent.; and upon that basis, Sir, the people of the United States were paying upon the water included in the stock of the various railway corporations \$148,946,000. Sir, it is something stupendous that frauds of this kind should have attained such a great magnitude in that country as to impose an annual tax of that enormous amount upon the people. This is the irresponsible and dangerous power that the hon. Minister of Railways gives. What may become of the condition of the country if the people are not alive to their interests, if the rulers of the country are not honest enough to guard the interests of the taxpayers in place of playing into the hands of syndicates and monopolies, it would be difficult to predict. Railway manipulators are willing to pay liberal sums for aid. There is one instance in which they paid a bribe of \$150,000 to one member of the New York Assembly. These corporations are willing to pay for privileges that enable them to tax the country. \$148,000,000 a year was worth something, and they were willing to launch out money enough to put these schemes through. I

Mr. CHARLTON.

find in the same annual report of the Chamber of Commerce that I quoted from some time ago, a quotation with regard to the designs of these railway corporations in thwarting the ends of justice. The quotation is in reference to the denunciation by President Stanford, of the Pacific Railway who, in unmeasured terms, denounced the decision of the Supreme Court, in the Central Pacific Railway case—a company which possessed a property valued at \$186,000,000, built altogether out of funds supplied by the people. The president of that company had the effrontery to assail and denounce the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Railway interest came dangerously near securing the appointment of Stanley Mathews, the most prominent railway attorney in the United States, as one of the judges of the United States Supreme Court. This article says:

"It may, however, account for the recent attempts to place upon the Supreme Court Bench a prominent railway attorney, and in the face of such utterance it behooves all patriotic citizens to jealously guard against the preferment in any department of our Government of men who have been the servants of great public corporations, who are likely to sympathize with these corporations to the detriment of the public interests."

Have we any men in this House who are the servants of great corporations, who sympathize and whose interests are identical with great railway corporations? I do not give the answer, I ask the question; the country will ask the question; the country will weigh the evidence with regard to the question and arrive at a conclusion on this matter. In the United States public sentiment has been keenly aroused on this subject. The people there are alive to the fact that they are paying millions upon millions upon watered stock in the shape of charges upon transportation. I find in this same report of the Chamber of Commerce that David Davis, a United States Senator, says in reference to this matter:

"The rapid growth of corporate power and the malign influence which it exerts by combination upon the National and State Legislature, is a well-grounded cause of alarm. A struggle is pending in the near future between this over-grown power, with its vast ramifications all over the Union, and a hard grip on much of the political machinery, on the one hand, and the people in an unorganized condition, on the other, for the control of the Government."

That struggle which is pending in the United States is a struggle from which we are free. It has never come here. The struggle as to whether the people or the railway corporation should control the Government in the United States is not at issue here to-day because one great railway corporation in this country does control the Government of this country. They have dictated their terms and the Government are their creatures, if we can judge by their acts and their subserviency. We have no such disturbing element in our politics, unfortunately for the country. But this question will be discussed in the Legislature of this country. We will discuss it, although we are few in numbers; and although we can exercise no influence upon that majority that wait at the back of the Government, we may, perhaps, in some small degree, arouse the people of this country to a sense of the danger impending over them. But whether we may or not, we will at least discharge the duty that devolves upon us of protesting against this outrage on popular rights. I hope the press will discuss this, and I hope that public sentiment will ultimately be aroused, even if there is a degree of apathy existing now which is discouraging to those who have the best interests of their country at heart.

I spoke a few minutes ago on the enormous bribe paid in the Legislature of the State of New York of \$150,000 to a member for his vote and influence. That is but a specimen of the influence exercised by these railway corporations upon the legislative bodies of the United States. I do not know whether we have anything of that kind here, and I am fain to believe that we have not, for the simple reason, perhaps, that there was no necessity to use such pressure for the purpose of obtaining privileges that the Government seem only too will-

ing to accord. But I think I will be able to show, whether undue influence has been used or not, that the Government have accorded this Company privileges far exceeding any bonuses or any privileges granted by the legislatures or the Congress of the United States to any railway corporation in that country. The Government themselves are stakeholders in the ventures of this Company. They have in their hands to-day \$35,000,000 of stock unissued, waiting for manipulation that will enable certain rings to take it at perhaps 5, 10, or 15 cents on the dollar; the Government has played into the hands of this corporation by giving it a monopoly clause and by allowing it to expand the limit of its common stock four-fold in order that they might secure four times the dividend that they are authorized to secure under the 10 per cent. dividend limitation of the contract. The Government have allowed the Company to expand their \$25,000,000 of stock to \$100,000,000. The first \$5,000,000 was placed at par under the provisions of the contract; the next \$20,000,000 was taken at 25 cents on the dollar. That was a pretty fair degree of water; we do not know whether anything was ever paid on that stock, and that is one of the things we would like to have a committee enquire into—to ascertain whether this \$25,000,000 of stock was placed in the hands of men who paid nothing on it, or what amount they did pay. \$30,000,000 were placed at 61, making a total issue of \$55,000,000, on which was realized \$25,300,000. \$10,000,000 of stock has been pledged to secure an advance of \$4,950,000. What is this North American Construction Company of which we have heard so much? It is four-fifths syndicate and one-fifth water. If this construction company had been enabled to carry out their designs, the result would have been that they would have secured \$35,000,000 and \$10,000,000 or \$45,000,000 of unissued stock at 15 cents on the dollar and \$100,000,000 of stock would have been floated, representing the resources placed in the hands of the road, of \$30,000,000 of cash and \$70,000,000 of water; this water representing something more substantial than wine, but the process of converting it from one to the other performed not by beneficent miraculous intervention, but by a disgraceful piece of rascality, and, upon this water, this \$70,000,000 of water, the business of this country would pay annually, in 10 per cent. dividends, \$7,000,000, and at the expiration of every seven and a-half years, they would have paid the whole \$70,000,000, and would commence paying it again, and so *ad infinitum*, if Providence permitted the Syndicate to exist long enough. And, Sir, as I said before, the Government is an accomplice in this matter; the Government is playing into the hands of these men, the Government is enabling them to do this. They authorized them to raise their common stock from \$25,000,000 to \$100,000,000, presumably for the express purpose of enabling them to water their stock, and enabling them to saddle upon the people of this country \$70,000,000 of water, for the people of the North-West to pay dividends upon. Sir, is there any surety that the thing will stop here? Is there no possibility that this is no more than the commencement? Have we not the possibility in the future of farther swindles? Are not further swindles possible in the issue of preferred stocks? Are not further swindles possible in connection with the placing upon this road of bonded debt? Are not further swindles possible in connection with further increases in the common capital stock of this Company? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is practically no limit to the outrages, the betrayal of the interests of the people in this matter, that may be perpetrated. The watch-dogs of the flock are ranging the hills with the wolves; the flock is scattered without a protector.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Bow-wow.

Mr. CHARLTON. Somebody says "bow-wow." Well, it may be well enough; that is what the dogs say, and it

comes from the dogs' side, those who watch the flock. But they are saying "bow-wow" in the wrong direction; they are not "bow-wowing" at the wolves, but at those who are attempting to protect the interests of the country.

The next thing I wish to refer to is, the war which this Company is making upon a rival institution. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that we have any connection, or that there is any need that we should have any connection with the rivalries of railways. Railways will have their rivalries, and cut rates, and it is proper for us to leave them to settle those rivalries as best they may. But we protest that the Government should back one of the combatants in one of these rivalries. We hold, or I hold, that with the Grand Trunk placed in the position it is, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, seeking to drive it to the wall and entering the lists as its competitor, the Government, is taking an unfair position as to the Grand Trunk Railway, when it becomes the backer and sponsor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, as it were, enters the field itself as a combatant against the Grand Trunk. The Government is worthy of condemnation for this, and I have shown that the difficulties of the syndicate result largely from its rivalry with other railway lines. The chief difference between the two roads is that one is an example of successful management, an example of retrieving itself from great difficulties through the best use of the means at its command, and the other an example of falling into difficulties through recklessness, incompetency, and want of ability to perform successfully the task entrusted to it. That is the difference between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, owing to its unfortunate position in consequence of incapacity, the Canadian Pacific Railway feels called upon to appear before us to-day to ask us to give it aid. It may be held that the construction of a line from Ottawa to Toronto, a parallel and competing line is a great benefit to the country. I wish to say a few words about certain fallacies which exist as to the construction of parallel lines. The construction of a parallel line may temporarily afford to a country lower rates, but, so long as the business of a section of a country can be performed by one line of railway, if a parallel line is constructed through that country, the result must inevitably be that the business of that country must pay the cost of the management of two lines instead of one. There is no possibility of preventing the ultimate combination and consolidation of parallel and competing lines, and the experience of the United States has shown that, in all cases where parallel lines have been constructed for the purpose of doing business which one line can perform, the ultimate result has been to the detriment of the public, it has been consolidation with the necessity imposed upon the railway of charging rates to enable it to maintain two or more lines to perform the work which one line could perform; and the consequence is that the adoption of a policy which will lead to parallel lines being constructed through Ontario or through any other part of the Dominion, so that there will be two or more lines to perform the work which one is competent and adequate to perform, will result, in this country, as in the United States and all countries where it has been tried, to the detriment of the people themselves, by placing upon them the necessity of paying the rates necessary to maintain one or more useless lines.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, at the time you left the Chair, I was just about to consider that most modern, that latest refinement of railway chicanery—the construction company. I wish, Sir, to direct the attention of the House to the manipulations that have been performed under the operation of construction companies in the history of various

railway lines, and to draw certain inferences as to the operations of a company of that character in the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. And, first, Sir, with reference to the construction of the Central Pacific. I shall to-night refer to but two American roads—the Central and Union Pacific. I find, in this report of the Committee on Railway Transportation of the New York Chamber of Commerce for 1880-81, reference to the operations of the company which constructed the Central Pacific Road. In that report, I find the following language:—

"Nor can the necessity of securing a fair return for the money invested by the Central Pacific Railroad owners be urged in explanation of their extraordinary charges. When they began the construction of the road, they paid taxes in the aggregate of property of all kinds amounting to less than \$150,000. To-day their railroad property alone with the indebtedness standing against it deducted, is valued by them at the enormous sum of over \$185,000,000, but it cannot be shown that they ever advanced money enough from their own pockets to build a single mile of the road. The bonds of the Government and the subsidies and gifts of the people were more than sufficient to build and stock the road entire.

"The original incorporators paid in 10 per cent. on \$1,000 a mile for 115 miles, the estimated distance from Sacramento to the Nevada line. 1,250 shares of stock were subscribed at \$100 per share, of which Messrs Stanford, Huntington, Hopkins and Crocker took 600 shares. Assuming however, that they advanced the required 10 per cent. on all the shares subscribed, and their original investment did not exceed \$12,500 all told. On this small investment the gentlemen have done well—so well, in fact, that in 1877 President Stanford reported the property of the Central Pacific to be worth \$187,003,680 66, while Mr. Crocker, president of the Southern Pacific, valued the property of that road at \$115,354,011 94, making a total valuation of \$302,362,692 64. The indebtedness of the Central Pacific was given by Mr. Stanford at \$85,391,350 64, and the indebtedness of the Southern Pacific was placed by Mr. Crocker at \$ 0,415,392 45, making the total indebtedness of the two roads \$115,806,683 59. The account then stood as follows:—

Value of the property of both roads.....	\$302,362,692 64
The indebtedness of both roads.....	115,806,683 59

Assets over liabilities.....	\$186,556,009 05
------------------------------	------------------

"A part of the wealth of these railway gentlemen two years ago consisted of \$54,000,000 of watered stock of the Central Pacific, being an aggregate of \$90,000,000 in stock, which cost them only the cost of printing, and upon which they are compelling the public to pay them 8 per cent. yearly in dividends."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the manipulators of this scheme, the gentlemen who, on an investment of \$12,500 have made a fortune of \$186,000,000, are the gentlemen who are about to build a short line of railway for my right hon. friend, are to build the Island Railway upon Vancouver Island; and I shall point out to you that these gentlemen although the result of their investment has been so vastly profitable, although upon an insignificant investment of a few thousands they have accumulated a fortune of \$186,000,000—I will point out to you, I say, that the opportunities afforded to these gentlemen by the Government under which they constructed the Central Pacific Railway, were inferior to the opportunities afforded to the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate. I will point out to you that the terms accorded to them by the United States Government were not as liberal as the terms accorded to the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate by the Government of this Dominion. They received a land grant of 12,800 acres of land to the mile. That land grant extended along the entire line of road. It was in alternate sections, but much of that land grant was worthless. The Central Pacific Railway passed over the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and continued for a long distance through an alkali country in the Humboldt Valley, and the land grant was of comparatively little value as compared with that of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, selected in the fertile belt. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company receives 12,500 acres of selected land to the mile; the Central Pacific Railway received 12,800 acres to the mile, taking it as it comes whether in mountain, or alkali plains, or in the fertile belt of the Sacramento Valley. In addition to this land grant the Central Pacific Railway received United States Government bonds to the amount of \$25,885,000 upon 883 miles of road which amounted to about \$29,000 per mile. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway will

Mr. CHARLTON.

receive in cash \$25,000,000; subsidy in money expended by the Government in building 707 miles of road, \$28,000,000; it will receive in cash from these two sources an amount for 2,000 miles of road which exceeds the number of miles they will receive in cash by \$26,500 per mile. This, in their case, is a gift. The \$29,000 per mile to the Central Pacific Railway was a loan, a loan that that road is called upon to repay, a loan that it is regularly paying interest upon, which is a lien against the property of that road; it is an asset of the Government of the United States which will be paid. Then the Central Pacific Railway, on terms actually \$29,000 per mile worse than the terms received by the Canadian Pacific Railway, have accumulated a fortune of \$186,000,000 upon an investment of \$12,500. Yet this Company, endowed by this Government, this Company with a subvention so much greater than the Central Pacific Company, where such vast results have been obtained, this Company is here asking for an additional grant. Now, Sir, how did the Central Pacific Company succeed so admirably in its operations? Well, while building the road, while expending the subsidies of the Government, they did not reach out to acquire other railways. They contented themselves, first, with building the road they had in hand, as the Canadian Pacific Railway ought to have done. Having built a road from Sacramento to Ogden, 883 miles, and having equipped it, then they were ready to undertake other enterprises, to undertake one after another until the result is that shown in this quotation, until the result is the accumulation of \$186,000,000. Had these men shown the incapacity and the recklessness of the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate, they would have ruined their prospects at the outset, as the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate have done. Now, Sir, with reference to the Union Pacific Railway—that also was a road aided by the United States Government. It was a road which received a grant of \$26,000 to the mile for 1,038 miles, making a total of \$27,236,000. Here, Sir, was a Company that received less, even supposing the bonds were given, than the Canadian Pacific Railway does; because it is to be borne in mind that these bonds at that time were payable in depreciated currency; their gold value was not more than 80 cents on the dollar, perhaps not as much. The Union Pacific Railway Company, then, with a grant of 12,800 acres to the mile, much of that land in a sterile country, with that loan of bonds to the extent of \$26,000 to the mile, which that Company will repay and is repaying—that Company also went and accomplished great results. That Company built at first the line from Omaha to Ogden, 1,038 miles. It then proceeded to build a line from Cheyenne to Denver, a distance of 100 miles. It afterwards built from Denver to Kansas City, some 900 miles, and built branch lines in various directions, all belonging to this corporation, all the result of that grant made originally by the United States Government of 12,800 acres to the mile, and a loan of \$26,000 to the mile in bonds. Neither of these roads were aided to the extent, neither of them were endowed so magnificently, as has been the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Now, Sir, having referred to the results that have been accomplished in these two cases, showing what might have been done by proper business management by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with the subvention and aid it has received, I proceed to the consideration of the question of the manipulation and performances of construction companies. We find in the case of the Union Pacific Railway Company an exemplification of the operations of companies of this kind. The construction of that road was undertaken by a company called the Credit Mobilier. It was a ring within a ring. It was something like the construction company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, four-fifths syndicate and one-fifth something else. The Credit Mobilier was composed of directors, the manipulators, the owners of the Union Pacific

Railway. I find in an article of Charles Francis Adams, junior, railway commissioner of Massachusetts, some information relative to the operations of this company, an extract from which article I will read. I would commend this extract to the attention of this House, to the attention of this country, for it exposes the true inwardness of operations of this kind; it shows what are the manipulations of construction companies like that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the operations of which I am bound to say are permitted by this Government, the operations of which are shielded by this Government, the operations of which this Government is not prepared to condemn. Charles Francis Adams says, in relation to this:

"Whoever originated this anomalous corporation, it is currently reported to be the real constructor of the Union Pacific."

This article was written while this company was constructing the road. It continues:

"And now to have got into its hands all the unissued stock, the proceeds of the bonds sold, the Government bonds, and the earnings of the roads, in fact, all its available assets, its profits are reported to have been enormous, reported only, for throughout all this there is nothing but hearsay and street rumor to rely upon. Sometimes it has been stated that the dividends of this association have amounted to forty per cent. a month, and they have certainly exceeded one hundred per cent. per annum; at any rate, it has made the fortunes of many, and perhaps of most of those connected with it. Nor are these profits temporary; every dollar of excessive dividend of the Credit Mobilier is represented by a dollar of indebtedness of the Pacific Railroad, with both principal and interest charged to income, and made payable by a tax on trade. Who, then, constitute the Credit Mobilier? It is but another name for the Pacific Railroad ring. The members of it are in Congress; they are trustees for the bondholders, they are directors, they are stockholders, they are contractors; in Washington they vote the subsidies, in New York they receive them, upon the plains they expend them, and in the Credit Mobilier they divide them. Ever shifting characters, they are ever ubiquitous—now engineering a bill, and now a bridge—they receive money into one hand as a corporation, and pay it into the other as a contractor. Humanely speaking, the whole thing seems to be a species of thimble-rig, with this difference from the ordinary arrangement, that, whereas commonly the little joker is never found under the thimble which may be turned up, in this case he is sure to be found, turn up which thimble one may. Under one name or another a ring of some seventy persons is struck, at whatever point the Union Pacific is approached. As stockholders they own the road, as mortgagees they have a lien upon it, as directors they contract for its construction, and as members of the Credit Mobilier they build it. Again, what is the community to pay for it? That they will pay many-fold what the work need to have cost many have long suspected; that, however much they may pay, they will pay more than it is materially worth, few will assert. Here, however, is every vicious element of railroad construction and management; here is costly construction, entailing future taxation on trade; here are tens of millions of fictitious capital; here is a road built on the sale of its bonds, and with the aid of subsidies; here is every element of cost recklessly exaggerated, and the whole at some future day is to make itself felt as a burden on the trade which it is to create, and will surely hereafter constitute a source of corruption in the politics of the land, and a resistless power in its legislature.

Sir, were the operations of the Union Pacific Company an evil? If so, is not the adoption of the same sort of tactics in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway not likely to prove an evil? And is the Government that permits this, is the Government that is in league with the operations of a construction company, as well as being a partner and party to the watering of the stock of the road to the extent of millions on millions, not deserving of condemnation at the hands of the people of this country?

A few words as to our own North American Construction Company, the name for our Credit Mobilier. What did it propose to do? It proposed to complete the eastern section for \$14,100,000 and \$20,000,000 in stock. How much would it have divided on the transaction? As near as I can arrive at the amount it would have been as follows: The stock was supposed to cost less than \$5,000,000, or 5 cents on the dollar. It proposed to build the eastern part for \$17,880,000, and \$25,000,000 in stock. How much did the stock cost. It is supposed not to have exceeded \$1,500,000, or not more than 6 per cent., on the face value of the stock. And what would have been the result? The result would have been that the construction company would have been the possessors of the \$35,000,000

of unissued stock, and of the \$10,000,000 of stock pledged, at a cost of about \$6,500,000, or about 15 cents on the dollar. Are the people of this country prepared to sanction an arrangement of that kind? Were the Government ignorant of that arrangement? They were not; they were fully cognizant of it, and they must accept the responsibility of this scandalous state of affairs existing, as we have shown. The contract with the construction company, we are told, was annulled. It took into its number one or two Americans, giving them sufficient interest to float its bonds. They were unable to perform their duty for the contractors, and consequently the contract of the construction company was annulled and dissolved. But the construction company is in existence yet. The construction company is prepared at any time to make a future bargain. Have we any reason for supposing that when the construction company makes an arrangement with itself, makes an arrangement with the construction company under the guise of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it will be less mindful of its own interests and more careful of the public interests than it has been in the past? We have no right to suppose so. On the contrary, the Company will make all they can; but we have a right to condemn the Government for permitting that state of things to exist. Not only may the construction company monopolize the \$45,000,000 of remaining bonds, but there is no limit to the bonds which may yet be issued by the Company. All they require is to get this complacent Government which consented to a four-fold increase in the capital of the Company, to consent to a still greater increase, to a two-fold increase, to an increase to \$200,000,000 instead of \$100,000,000 or the Company may issue preferred stock, or manipulate its bonds. Positively there is no bar to the extent of manipulation that may be performed by the Company if the Government of the day, who are custodians of the public interest, do not discharge their trust and check the Company in its proceedings.

One word with respect to the fate of the participants in the American Credit Mobilier. There was not a public man connected with that scheme who was not driven from public life. The vice-president of the United States, Schuyler Colfax, had subscribed for a certain number of shares of that stock and paid \$500 upon his subscription. He afterwards ascertained what the character of the scheme was, and he informed Mr. Oake Ames, the manipulator of the affair, that he would go no further, that his connection with it would cease, and that he would forfeit the amount he had paid. And he did forfeit that amount. There appeared, however, in Mr. Oake Ames' private memorandum book an entry, "S. C. \$1,500." No one claims that Mr. Colfax had received money, and that little memorandum was the only circumstance to cast suspicion on the character of Mr. Colfax, who was one of the foremost men in the United States. Yet it led to the downfall of Mr. Colfax. He has never been invested with public honours or has the confidence of the people of the United States been reposed in him since that time. So sensitive is public opinion there that when a breath of suspicion was cast on the character of the vice-president, he was driven from public life. A senator who was proved to have had connection with the Credit Mobilier was expelled, and there was not a public man in the United States who was proved to have had any connection with the transaction who was not placed in his political grave. We act very differently here. If the same degree of jealousy existed here, how many Ministers of the Crown would remain in their positions in this House? If the same degree of jealousy existed here, how many members of Parliament, when they returned to the people for re-election, would be rejected in consequence of their connection with circumstances just as scandalous as those attending the operations of the Credit Mobilier?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CHARLTON. I see this does not suit my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House, but the parallel is a perfectly just one. The public sentiment that drove men from public life in the United States is a public sentiment of the same kind as would drive scores of men having seats in this House from public life if they were to appear before the people and ask for their support, sanction and endorsement.

My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) last night made reference to the difficulty of floating railway securities, owing to the depression in the stock market. There is a depression in the stock market. There is a depression in the stock market arising from the general belief among capitalists and investors that railway stocks and railway bonds are the toys and playthings of monopolists and scamps who place the securities upon the market upon a fictitious basis. The fact that 48 per cent. of the railway stocks of the United States are watered, and the further fact that \$3,000,000 out of the \$80,000,000 of the Western Union stock is watered, are arousing alarm in the minds of investors in the United States and England. They have discredited the railway securities of the United States; they have discredited the railway securities of Canada, and that suspicion, and that discredit, is growing day by day. Day by day the difficulty becomes greater in placing loans on the market, for while there is a superabundance of money seeking investment, the suspicion which exists with regard to these manipulations, manipulations precisely the same as those indulged in by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, renders the floating of railway securities more and more difficult. And what will be the effect, in all human probability, of the alliance of this Government with the railway syndicate? If the securities of railways, in consequence of these acts of rascality, are depreciating in value, will not the same result happen to the securities of a Government which becomes the tool of this syndicate, and a partner in one of the worst specimens of railways of this class? I think that will be the effect, and I think, therefore, that the proposition that the Government should advance \$22,500,000 on a loan, and take a mortgage on the road, is one which should not meet with the favourable consideration of the House.

I wish to refer to a matter to-night for the special benefit of my right hon. friend the First Minister, though I do not know that is pertinent to this question. That hon. gentleman—although I am sure he could not have felt what he said—was not above appealing to the prejudices of the members of this House against me, last Session, on the score that I was an American. This was an appeal which, I think, the hon. gentleman must have considered rather beneath his dignity, but one which, perhaps, produced a certain effect. I wish to point out to him, what is the character of the staff of this road to which he proposes to lend \$22,500,000. If it is a prejudice to a man to be an American, I call his attention to the fact that there is rather an undue proportion on Americans to the staff of that road. I have a letter from a correspondent in Winnipeg, written on the first of February, which reads as follows:—

"Sir,—Now that the Canadian Pacific syndicate are on the eve of receiving some twenty-two and a half millions of dollars out of the pockets of the Canadian people, it might not be amiss to let the general public of the Dominion know the manner in which Canadians are treated on the western division of the road. Out of the fourteen principal offices of the division, ten are held by American citizens, and the balance by Canadians. The general superintendent, two out of the four assistant superintendents, the auditor, the superintendent of bridges and buildings, &c., and his four assistants and the general storekeeper are all Americans, whilst the positions of assistant traffic manager, the two remaining assistant superintendencies, and that of the fuel agent are held by Canadians. Were this caused by a scarcity of Canadians competent to fill the positions, no blame could attach to the syndicate, but such is not the case, hundreds of Canadians being at present out of employment in this Province, many of them perfectly capable of fulfilling the duties of any position of the road, whilst in nearly every instance where Americans

Mr. CHARLTON.

are the heads of departments, they are merely nominally so, the duties of the positions having to be performed by some one of the few Canadians under them, and who receive small salaries therefor, their more fortunate American cousin, from the mere fact of their nationality, having, no matter how incompetent, to be well remunerated for holding the office, if only in name. The positions of the two divisions under the control of the American assistant superintendents are almost completely filled by American citizens, a Canadian, Irish, English, or Scotchman being a *rara avis*, whilst if on the two remaining divisions they do not outnumber, they at least equal in numbers all the four last named nationalities combined."

As I said before, I do not know that this matter is worthy of being referred to, but still it strikes me that it indicates that this syndicate is essentially an American corporation, that it is under the control of Americans, which, I believe, is the case; and I point out to my right hon. friend that if he is not above a reference to the fact that a member of this House has the misfortune to have been born in the United States, certainly he should look after the staff of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Now, Sir, one word as to the antecedents of the gentlemen who compose the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate. I am sorry to say—perhaps my language may be rather strong, because I feel strongly on the subject—that I cannot characterize the methods adopted by these men as honest. The fact that they have watered the stock of the road, the fact that they have organized a construction company for the purpose of building that road at a rate nominally much greater than its actual cost, and various other facts in connection with their operations in the matter, leave me under the necessity of saying that I do not believe that their manipulations of the matter are honest. Now what are the antecedents of some of these gentlemen? I am sorry to have to refer to anything in the character of these men which must be discreditable to them, but we are dealing with questions in which it is our duty to enquire carefully into the character of the men making this application, because we are acting in this matter as the trustees of the people of Canada, and as \$22,500,000 are at stake, it is our duty to act carefully and to see that the money is dispensed judiciously, and in accordance with the interests of the people and not in accordance with the interests of the applicants. A member of this Company was once President of the Bank of Montreal—a responsible position. When in that position he took \$8,000,000 from the chest of the Bank of Montreal, without the consent or knowledge of the directors of that bank—at least he is reported to have done so. He is reported to have invested it in the St. Paul and Minneapolis Railway. Now, supposing this gentleman when he removed this money from the bank and invested it, had lost the money, he would have been a defaulter to the extent of \$8,000,000; but I hold that, though the investment was successful, though he was enabled to return the money, morally, his conduct in this matter was just as reprehensible as if he had lost every cent. I say he had no business to take \$8,000,000 belonging to a corporation of which he was president, without the knowledge of the directors, and use that money in any speculation whatever. He is reported to have invested that money, as I have said, in the St. Paul and Minneapolis Railway, and, through collusion with the Receiver of that road, it is said he procured a report as to the conditions of its affairs which was sent to Holland, where the stock was held, which report induced the Dutch bondholders and stockholders to part with their interest in the road at less than it was worth, thus enabling them through this collusion to buy the road at less than its value. And having used the Receiver as his tool, he forgot the old adage that there should be honour among thieves. He is charged with having forgotten to give the Receiver his share of the plunder, and the Receiver is said to have brought suit in the United States Court at St. Paul. The Court refused to entertain the suit on the ground that it would not degrade itself by giving a decision as to how plunder

should be divided among the different members of a gang. This is one of the gentlemen the Government wish to aid to the extent of this loan, one of the gentlemen upon whose figures we are asked to make up our opinion.

Now, I hold that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, has already received too much. I have shown that it has received too much. I have proved that the subvention that it has received from the Government was more than sufficient, by many millions, to enable the Company to carry out the contract which was made with the Government—to wit, to secure the construction of a railway from Nipissing to the Pacific Ocean. It may be said that the Company is not able to go on. Great stress has been laid on the alleged fact that the interests of this country would receive a severe blow if the syndicate were unable to prosecute the construction of the road. Suppose they are unable to do so, what then? I do not know that it would be a very great disaster if we were to take back the road. What would follow? It would follow that we would be released from the monopoly clauses, that this watered stock swindle which has been issued, and which may put a tax of \$7,000,000 a year on the people contributing to the business of the road, would be wiped out. It follows, Sir, that we should be released from the grasp of a clique of railway kings. It follows that untold difficulties and troubles in the future in connection with this road would be avoided. It follows also that a demoralizing alliance between this Government and a great corporation would come to an end. I say, if these men were unable to proceed with the road, it would be a godsend to the people of the country. If they are unable to go on, let them disgorge, and if they do not propose to do that, let them go on.

It is noticeable, Mr. Speaker, that whenever this Government are about to perpetrate anything particularly bad, they raise the cry of patriotism. What a cry was raised, Sir, in 1880-81 when this syndicate contract was under consideration—why, the unworthy men who opposed that beneficent measure came in for unmeasured rebuke and condemnation. We were unworthy sons of Canada; we were not deserving of being considered as citizens of this country—why? Because we did not wish to see the Government grant to a great railway syndicate vast powers and privileges and franchises that were sure to prove detrimental to the best interests of the people of Canada for all ages to come. Because we said that that contract was a bad bargain for the country, our patriotism, our loyalty were impugned, we were condemned as men unworthy of seats in this House of Commons; and to-day, when this Government propose to give to this same corporation \$22,500,000 more, the same cry is raised; when objections are made on this side of the House, again we are disloyal, again we are lacking in patriotism, again the people of Canada are called upon to repudiate and condemn us on the ground that we are standing in the way of the progress and prosperity of the country. Sir, when the leader of the Opposition in his matchless manner points out the mistakes the Government have made, when he criticises their policy, and shows that it is detrimental to the interest of the country, do they thank him for his advice? Do they treat him with the courtesy to which he is entitled? No, Sir; wild attacks are made upon him and his followers as men who desire to drag Canada down, who, in pointing out the bad features of the Government's land regulations and railway policy, are, forsooth, playing into the hands of the United States.

Sir, whither are we drifting? We may not be drifting to ruin, but we are drifting in that direction. We are spending the people's money by millions; we are creating a great railway monopoly and increasing its privileges, and to-day it stands on the threshold of its vast designs, and threatens to establish a monopoly over this whole broad country. And the Government of the day are

playing efficiently into the hands of these men who, finding that all the millions they have already received are not sufficient for the accomplishment of their designs, come down to Parliament and ask for \$22,500,000 more; and if that proves to be insufficient to carry out their purposes—purposes which are inimical to the best interests of this country—I do not doubt that hon. gentlemen will be ready to supplement all these grants by \$22,000,000 more. Early in the course of my remarks, Sir, I lamented that apparent degree of apathy that exists in the public mind of this country. It is time, Sir, that the suspicion and the hostility of the people of this country had been aroused at the reckless policy of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. In the United States in 1882, although the sins of the Government there were venal and trifling, compared with the sins of the Government here, although the trouble consisted of a few frauds in Post Office contracts, called star route frauds, and of a little trouble with what is called bossism—that is, of rings composed of Conkling and a few others controlling the patronage of the Government—although that was all, yet the people rose in their might, and by a popular majority of 587,000, gave notice to the Government that those sins must cease. The State of New-York, which had been republican in 1881, went democratic by 197,000 majority; and for the first time thousands voted the democratic ticket to show that they would not stand any nonsense of this kind. If we had an element of that kind in Canada, these men on the Treasury benches would be more cautious in the measures they bring before Parliament; but it seems, in the apathy that exists, that they have no fear before their eyes, no twinges of conscience, and their acts are such as they are. I might hope that there was some political honesty in the huge majority at the back of these hon. gentlemen. I might hope that there are men among them able to rise above party considerations on such an occasion as this. I know that there are men who know that this policy is wrong, who cannot fail in their own consciences to condemn the act the Government are about to perpetrate, but these men are not able to act as statesmen. They must come down to the low grovelling level of partisan politicians. They are afraid to lift themselves up above the mere requirements of party and act from statesmanlike and patriotic motives. For that reason, this measure, which every man must deplore, which every man must know is not conceived in the interest of the people, but in the interest of a great corporation, is likely to pass.

Now, Sir, there are certain things about this matter that we know. We know that a construction company was formed for the purpose of vastly increasing the cost of that road, and of putting the increased cost into the pockets of a ring of speculators. We know that the stock of this Company has been watered most scandalously, and that the result is that the people of this country will be called upon to pay 10 per cent. in perpetuity upon all the water injected into that stock. We know that this Company have stepped out of the limits of their contract, and have engaged in various undertakings that their circumstances did not warrant. We know these facts, and we know many other things; but there are things about this Company that we do not know. We do not know what rings there were within rings. We do not know what has been paid upon the stock that has nominally been sold. We do not know what the resources of this Company are. We do not know what the officers of this Company have put into their own pockets as the owners of the Canada Central which was sold to them as the owners of the Canadian Pacific. We do not know what has been done with the \$600,000 which the construction company owe to the railway Company. We do not know what the members of this Company may have drawn out of the funds of the Company and appropriated to their own use. These are a

few things that we do not know but that we require to know, in order to give an intelligent verdict upon the proposition before the House. In 1881 when the syndicate contract was before this House, the whole power of the Government was exercised in order to force that in quitous contract through Parliament without delay; and to-day, when that same syndicate are here again, asking for \$22,500,000 more, again the power of the Government is brought to bear, again the determination of the Government is manifested to force these Resolutions through with indecent haste, again the Government refuse to allow the House to become possessed of facts that the House is entitled to possess, in order to be able to give an intelligent verdict upon this question. Sir, there is something about this syndicate matter that I do not understand. How is it that this syndicate exercises such unbounded power over this Government? How is it that the syndicate issues its dictates and the Government seems bound to obey? Does the syndicate possess some secret which, if breathed to the public, would blast the reputation and blacken the characters of its servants who are pushing this scheme through at its dictation? I will make no such charge, but I say the indecent haste manifested by the Government, the refusal of the Government to consent to a full investigation upon all points demanded by the Opposition—the refusal of the Government to agree to this demand is an outrage upon popular liberties and the rights of the people. For this reason I shall vote for the resolution of my hon. friend demanding that full investigation shall be made with reference to all matters in connection with this Company, before the House be called on to act upon this proposal and grant the Company the further aid of \$22,500,000 in cash.

Mr. DAWSON. Although the question now before the House has been discussed in nearly every possible way, still I believe there are some points that have not been sufficiently dwelt upon. At all events, many hon. members are no doubt desirous to state their views in order that their constituents may be in a position to judge of the action they have taken in regard to this great question. There have been many estimates made by writers in the press and by hon. members, but they have all differed very widely. None of them agree, and no one has suggested anything better than the Resolutions before the House. When this question was before the country and before the House in 1881, the then Opposition brought forward a scheme which enabled hon. members supporting the proposition of the Government to see how far their views had gone astray, and it turned out that the difference was just 3,000,000 acres of land and \$3,000,000 in money. They brought forward a scheme essentially the same as that which the Government proposed. There was no difference in it except in the amount, and hon. members then supporting the Government saw how far they had gone astray in the opinion of the Opposition. There was as much eloquence expended on the subject then as there is now and as there has been in the past few days. However, I will say this, that in the discussion on this subject there has been a great deal of able argument and a great deal of sound reasoning, but I think that some hon. members, and among them the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House, went a little too far in the matter of denunciation. I shall, however, go on to notice the remarks made by several other hon. members of the Opposition before adverting further to what he said. Now the other day the hon. member for West Lambton proved, to his own satisfaction at least, if not to that of the House, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had not expended from the first a single dollar of their own money. His speech was filled by what was very aptly termed "ancient history," by another hon. member. He went back to the early history of the Pacific

Mr. CHARLTON.

Railway, a history which has long since been pronounced upon by the country, and dwelt upon that for a considerable time. I do not think, although his speech was very eloquent, that the hon. gentleman enlightened the House much on these old matters. The hon. Member for West Huron made a very able speech yesterday in which he dwelt on a great many things. For fully an hour he spoke on everything possible under the sun before he once alluded to the subject of the Resolutions. He was exceedingly witty, or at least tried to be so, and, as he said himself, he wanted to skin the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Finance. Whether he succeeded or not, I do not know, but they look none the worse for it. He referred to ancient prophecies which he rather mixed, and we found figuring in his speech Cassandra, Agamemnon, Jeremiah, and I know not what besides. But in the exuberance of the hon. gentleman's mirth, he had a fling at the physiognomy of the hon. the Finance Minister. Now when he did that, I turned to admire his own, and I must say that it was rather too bad of the hon. gentleman to whom nature has been so lavishly beneficent, in regard to physiognomy, to try to ridicule the visage of another. He referred to the exodus of Canadians to Dakota and Minnesota. Now that is all very easily explained. When did the exodus occur and what was the cause of it? Hon. members of the Opposition attribute it to the land regulations in the North-West. I say that it was due to an entirely different cause. From 1875 up to 1879 and 1880, immigrants were sent into our North-West by way of Minnesota, and in passing to Manitoba, they had to go through land in the valley of the Red River—a belt of the most beautiful land—similar to what we have at Winnipeg, and that extending to a considerable distance on each side of the river, and they were naturally attracted by that land. There were agents of American companies and land agents in any number trying to induce them to settle there, and I believe a great many of them did settle there. But that has been stopped long ago. The tide has turned and is now the other way. At what time was it that that exodus, as it is called, was at its height? It was in 1875, 1876 and 1877, at the time the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and it ceased and began to flow in another direction when the works on the Pacific Railway were begun. I have a letter here which, perhaps, may throw a little light upon it, and I shall read a short extract from it. I find this in the *Thunder Bay Sentinel*, of the 9th instant:

"We always find a pleasure in perusing the *North-Western Lumberman*. Its columns are always full of well selected news, and the skill with which statistical matters is arranged makes the paper a reliable, indeed an invaluable one to lumbermen. In the last number to hand the editor says: 'Woodmen from Canada have met with much disappointment in the States this season. Formerly, all they had to do to obtain higher wages than they could get at home was to cross the line. Now, it is different. There are some men in the woods who are working for their board, and many others receiving from \$14 to \$15 a month. We hear of several Canadians who failed to obtain work and returned home.' If the writer of the above were living on this side of the line, he would hear, not of several, but of a good many who returned from under the wing of the eagle from the same potent cause."

Now, Sir, that shows clearly that the exodus is not from Canada alone, but that there is an exodus from the United States to Canada, and I believe that a great many people have come over from the United States to Canada within the last few years. The member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), in winding up his speech—and a very eloquent speech he made—in what I suppose he intended to be its very climax, said that it was absolutely insane, absolutely wild on the part of the Government, in 1872, to say that the railway could be completed in ten years. Now, we see that there was a possibility of that. The Pacific Railway Company has shown in how brief a time the work can be done, and I positively believe that, in ten years, such a Company as is now at work would have completed it from one end to the other. Then [he says] the country was unknown, was

not surveyed. Was it surveyed when the Pacific Railway Company made their line? They have not availed themselves of one yard of the surveys previously made. Those surveys were mostly thrown away, as far as the line is actually concerned. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) made the suggestion that, in his part of the country, supposing that the whole amount of \$22,500,000 were divided among the different constituencies, and that the constituencies were asked to warrant the outlay, it would be rejected by his constituency. Well, perhaps he may be right, but I have information from gentlemen connected with that constituency and who are evidently tolerably well acquainted with it, who say it would be accepted by that constituency. It is said that American contractors and workmen are chiefly employed on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I shall have something to say on that subject by-and-bye. In the meantime, I would make a few remarks on the speech of the hon. member who last addressed the House. He says it is not in the interests of this country that the road should be rapidly constructed. I differ with him entirely in that. I believe that rapidity of construction means economy of construction, and, from long experience in seeing works carried on in a wilderness, I think I could establish that. He has thrown out a good many insinuations in his very eloquent speech, and says that the matter has been so manipulated as to conceal the truth, and that, if the road is carried on, they will establish a monopoly east of Lake Superior. I do not believe that any railway company can establish a monopoly east of Lake Superior, because there is a water communication which will compete with the railway, in summer at least, and I doubt very much if any railway can be built that, during the summer months, will compete with that water communication. It would be impossible to establish a crushing monopoly such as he spoke of, to the eastward or northward of Lake Superior. Then he goes on to relate things about Pacific scandals and all that, ancient history, as the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) called them. Then he went on to show how much better it would have been if, when the present member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in power, his schemes had been carried out. I believe that, in that part of the line between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg, the hon. the then Premier of the Government, was on the right track at first, but he left it and made an immense sweep round by Rat Portage—it was a hasty location, notwithstanding all the surveys—which now lengthens the distance for all time from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg by thirty-five or forty miles. If the water stretches and the lock at Fort Frances had been adopted as a temporary expedient to supply the road as it went on, and a more southerly route had been taken by the head of Rainy Lake and crossing at the Narrows of Lake of the Woods, where there is an excellent crossing, the line would have been thirty five or forty miles shorter; but he left his own line and took another. It is very easy to expatiate, Mr. Speaker, on what they would have done, but they were five years in power, and the question is not what they would have done, but what they did. What did they do? They were five years in power, having the whole control of everything. That is a great deal more than the length of time it has taken the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build 1,300 miles of road, and the result was the Pembina Branch, which was a very necessary one, and the other two sections between Lake Superior and Manitoba. I think that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) expressed himself in a manner that is rather peculiar—rather unusual even in this House—when men in the position of the members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are described by him as mendicants knocking at the door of Parliament. It is all a matter of taste. I suppose it does not affect these gentlemen very much. Again, he talks of a great many swind-

les and things of that kind, and goes on to tell of American lines. We have a very interesting array of figures, hundreds of millions, in connection with American lines and watered stock, and things of that kind without end. Then there are imputations thrown out that the Government is in league with the Company, that everything is very scandalous, and that is about all his speech amounts to. A great many figures and estimates have been laid before the House; we have estimates from the leader of the Opposition, who delivered a very eloquent speech in opposition to the Resolutions, and by others; but they differ very widely. They are founded in a great measure on conjecture. Now, Mr. Speaker, I prefer facts to conjecture. I prefer estimates which have the sanction of Government, which have been investigated by the Government and laid before the House. These show that the total expenditure on the main line was \$45,539,304, being \$23,745,305 over all the Company have received. But, they have expended \$3,759,793 on branch lines showing a total expenditure over all they have received from Government of \$27,503,000 west of Callander, chiefly, no doubt, from foreign capital. What influence this may have had on the prosperity of the country, it is easy to understand. It is, no doubt, from outside sources that this capital came, and it has, had a very great influence in bringing about the good times we have recently enjoyed. On the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, they have expended \$3,270,351, or a total expenditure between Montreal and the summit of the Rocky Mountains of \$54,728,500. Deduct from this \$22,687,874 received from all sources, and you have a balance of \$32,040,620 expended by them over and above what they received from Government. But including the lines leading to the seaboard they have expended in all \$58,695,365, against cash received from Government and all other sources, amounting to \$22,687,876, showing a balance of expenditure over receipts of \$36,007,491. Now, Sir, the Opposition have challenged the accuracy of these figures. Not a member on the Opposition side of the House has spoken who has not challenged these figures and tried to show that the Company have not expended a dollar of their own money. Figures have been put into every possible shape to show that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have expended none of their own resources at all. But, it is clearly evident that they have brought into the country and expended in the country, \$36,000,000, and who shall say how much the expenditure of that sum, and the manner in which it was expended all over the country, has had to do with the prosperous times which we have enjoyed. Sir, we have evidence of the accuracy of these figures which cannot be impugned. Is it to be supposed that men who have grown gray in the public service would enter into a league to conceal facts, and deceive the public? Certainly not. The Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, were sent down to investigate the books of the Company, and what do they report? They report that these books were admirably kept, and that the statements before the House truthfully show the condition of matters as exhibited in these books. Sir, I prefer to take statements of that kind, verified by men of high position, whose honour has never been impugned; I prefer them to the vague and wild statements which we have heard on every side for the last few days in this House. In a work so great as this there must always be something to cavil at. In a work which embraces a line of railway extending from ocean to ocean, and, with all its branches, has a length of over 3,300 miles, it is surprising that there is so little to cavil at, instead of so much. Really when you come to look into the matter the objections raised vanish away. The whole question resolves itself into this: Are we getting value for the money? Is the country getting the value of

the money? Is the security ample and sufficient? That it is ample there can be no doubt. They offer to make over to the Government every mile of the railway, the rolling stock and everything they possess, and surely such ample security as that ought to be sufficient. But, Sir, there is a further security which, of itself is ample, and that is that not a dollar of this \$22,500,000 is to be handed over to them except as the work proceeds. It will only be paid for work done. The money is not given to them to spend on any other project, but as the engineer reports a certain amount of work done, this money is to be handed over. Surely that of itself is a security which ought to satisfy the House. Now, the Minister of Railways has given us an interesting account of the increase in the revenue arising from the outlay on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and from the population which has been drawn into the North-West by its construction. He shows that as fast as the country is laying out money on the railway, it seems to be getting it back from other sources. But, there was one little item which was not brought to the notice of the hon. Minister, and I may be pardoned, perhaps, for drawing attention to it now. The Minister showed the receipts from Customs duties and otherwise, at the Port of Winnipeg. But, there is another little point which he omitted, and that is Port Arthur. If the House will bear with me for a moment, I will read the official returns from that port.

STATEMENT of vessels entered inwards at the port of Port Arthur during the navigable season of 1883.

CANADIAN VESSELS.		
	Registered Tons.	Crew.
52 Paddle-wheel steamers.....	23,874	1,538
171 Screw steamers.....	133,616	4,532
216 Screw steamers, coastwise.....	46,179	3,016
46 Schooners.....	11,939	21
AMERICAN VESSELS.		
83 Screw steamers.....	38,989	1,156
105 Schooners.....	46,302	779
<b>673</b>	<b>302,899</b>	<b>11,392</b>
RECAPITULATION.		
	Tons.	Crew.
485 Canadian vessels.....	217,608	9,457
188 American vessels.....	85,291	1,935
<b>673</b>	<b>302,899</b>	<b>11,392</b>
	Value. \$	Duty. \$
Goods entered at the port during the above period and duty collected on same.....	1,079,930	115,321 10
Other revenues collected.....		271 51
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,079,930</b>	<b>115,592 61</b>
Goods exported.....	\$31,878	

This port formerly gave a revenue varying from \$10,000 to \$12,000 per annum; but here is a statement as to the present revenue, and I am informed there is now a sufficient quantity of goods on the way to raise the amount of duties by the end of the fiscal year, 30th June, to \$240,000. The development arising from the opening of the line has not been confined to the North-West, but has been felt in that part of the country also, and settlement is going into the back country there, a country very often described in this House as being exceedingly barren. A branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that going down to Algoma Mills, is entirely within my constituency, and let me assure hon. gentlemen that there is a great deal of good land in that section, that of late years population has been pouring into the country on the north shore of Lake Huron, which is a country admirably adapted for wheat growing, and we

Mr. DAWSON.

have now between Sault Ste. Marie and the lower end of Manitoulin Island, which latter point is oppos to Sudbury Junction, an agricultural population of 20,000 souls. The wants of such a large population will of themselves furnish considerable traffic to this branch to Algoma Mills. Algoma Mills is admirably situated for taking the trade of Lake Michigan and a large portion of the trade of Chicago; it is now said that the steamers are not to run there, but that the branch will be extended to Sault St. Marie. When the railway is extended to the navigable waters of Lake Superior, at Sault St. Marie, an immense traffic will be brought down to that point. There are 400 miles of navigable water on Lake Superior, which extends to Duluth, and almost taps the wheat lands of Dakota and Minnesota, and the day will come when a vast quantity of wheat and produce will find its way across Lake Superior to the foot of the lake, from which it will take the shortest route to the ocean. So that the Algoma Branch, which is so much criticised, will eventually prove to be one of the best paying portions of the Canadian Pacific system. It could not be within the power of a Government to carry on the work with the vigor with which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are now pushing forward the railway. A Government cannot always put the right man in the right place, but this company does so; and it is astonishing to see, and I have been over a portion of the line, how every officer is so fully conversant with his duty—a man of long experience; in fact, they are all veterans, as it were. According to the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways, the Company have at present an army along the line, the number at present working on the road, being placed at 9,000. To my own knowledge there are from 6,000 to 7,000 men at work on the different sections between Nipigon Bay and the Pic; they are pushing on the work with the greatest possible vigor. To disband that army or stop in any way the rapidity with which the railway is being constructed would be like stopping an army on the march to victory; and it is actually an army marching to victory, a victory against the opposing forces of nature, such as forest, swamp, rock and mountain, and if they are supported a little longer, there can be no doubt that within two years, as they themselves specify, they will carry the railway to completion. We have large areas of good land along the line in Algoma, and I am sorry to see how members on the Opposition side, and indeed on the Government side, have spoken of the country north of Lakes Huron and Superior as a rocky and wild country. Let me tell the House that there are large areas of the very finest land in that country. Before coming down here last fall I met the chief officer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a man of great energy and experience, who is carrying on the work in that quarter with a vigour I never saw equalled. I happened to mention to him about the character of the country and the general reports that the land was poor. "Why," said he, "you have an immense extent of the very richest land. I have been travelling for the last six days in the valley of a river, the Pays Plat, which falls into Nipigon Bay, and it is one stretch of level land as far as I could judge. I asked him what the extent would be—whether there would be enough for a township. He said there was enough for half a dozen townships there of the very finest land. And it must be remembered this is not a solitary instance. Even in the valley of the Pic River, a branch of which comes near Heron Bay, there is a considerable tract of very good land. Once you pass Michipicoten and continue eastward to Sault St. Marie and along the north shore of Lake Huron, the country will compare very favourably with many counties now cultivated in other parts of Canada. The hon. member for Biome (Mr. Fisher)—I do not suppose he wished to disparage our country—spoke of the Lake Superior region and the Rocky Mountains in the same breath, as if one was not more valuable than the

other. But let me tell that hon. gentleman that there are vast areas of land north of Lakes Huron and Superior which will compare very favourably with the Eastern Townships where he himself resides. To retard or stop the work on the railway would be to return to the old state of things. Surveys were carried on during eight or ten years, and little progress was made. Year after year we had surveyors in the field, and yet the then Chief Engineer sent in a report at the last to the effect that nothing reliable was known. That officer seemed to have borrowed the expression from the Greek sage who, after a life of research in every branch of human knowledge, came to the sad conclusion that "all that we know is, nothing can be known." While "nothing reliable known" was the expression of our sage Engineer. Sir, are we to go back to that state of things, now that this work is going on so rapidly, when we have an army pressing forward, under the best generalship and with the best of men, thoroughly experienced in the work? And now a word about the employment of Americans. I have only to say that it is not the case that Americans are employed to the exclusion of Canadians, on the north shore of Lake Superior, at any rate. There are a great many contractors on the north shore, and as I know them all I am able say that with a single exception they are Canadians. They came from the United States with the Chief Engineer of that part of the road, the gentleman to whom I have alluded, who had been all over the continent making railways. These men were with him in the United States, and having followed his fortunes there, they followed him back to this particular work, upon which he knew exactly where to place them, so as to have the advantage of their experience. These men were Scotchmen, like himself, and not Americans. So much upon that point. There are some other matters in connection with this question with which I might deal, but as many hon. members have spoken upon them, I shall not detain the House. There was one matter, for instance, which was alluded to—and very properly alluded to—the other day by the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), and that is that the settlement of this question will settle the Indian question. We heard some few years ago of the terrible results which might follow an Indian insurrection, but the construction of the Pacific Railway to British Columbia has settled that question forever. There is another aspect of the question which I might mention, as I have not heard it referred to by any other member. Long as we have been at peace, and long as I hope we may remain at peace, with the United States, still it is but right and reasonable that we should look at this road in a military point of view. It connects the Atlantic and the Pacific Ocean, and renders every part of our territory available, without passing through a foreign country. It may be still within the recollection of some hon. members that there was an insurrection in the North-West and that when we sent forward troops to suppress it, the Sault Ste Marie Canal was shut against us. I believe that it was not intended by the Federal Government that the canal should be shut; but looking at the matter in a national view, I think we may rejoice that the road has been made. Before and above everything else, it will connect all these scattered Provinces together, from the Atlantic to the Pacific; it will render access easy between them, and if anything can bind us together it will be a most powerful influence to weld all the provinces into an undivided nation. A great deal has been said about patriotism in this House, but I have nothing to say on that subject. I believe that true patriotism is consistent with any political opinions whatever. I believe that true patriotism exists on both sides of this House, and I believe that it is maintained by every hon. member present, no matter what political opinions he may express.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Bearing in mind the statements that the First Minister made last night to the House, that he should ask his supporters to remain with him to-night, until the vote was taken upon this subject, I feel it would be improper for me to speak at any length, as other hon. gentlemen wish to speak before the debate is closed; and therefore, in order to afford them an opportunity of doing so, before they are entirely worn out by a night session, I shall endeavour to speak as briefly as I may upon the important question which for some days past has been engaging our attention. It will be remembered, Sir, that the Minister of Railways in introducing these Resolutions, and that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), after their introduction, took the line of reciting to the House the different projects which had been entered into, and the different plans adopted for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Both those gentlemen ventured the statement that it had been the deliberate policy and plan of each Government to build this road only by a company; and they instituted comparisons between the terms which were offered to a company, under the Mackenzie Administration, and the terms offered to a company under the previous Administration of Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1872, as well as the terms offered, given, and ratified by contract, with the Syndicate to whom was finally allotted the building of a portion of this work. Now, Sir, the statement is hardly correct that it had always been the plan of all the Governments of Canada to construct this work through the agency of a company. It is not correct, as I read the history of the country, and as I understood the utterances of the Minister of Railways, and the First Minister, not many years ago. I desire for a short time to recall to the memory of hon. members, another plan which was devised, another scheme which was propounded, a scheme which was being acted upon, not by the Mackenzie Administration, but by the Administration which now occupies the Treasury benches, the Administration which effected the contract with the Syndicate to build a portion of that road. And what was the scheme? Why, Sir, in 1880, in the very year the contract was signed with the Syndicate, the Minister of Railways rose in his place in the House, and laid down the policy of the Government with reference to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway—not that their policy was to be to secure the services of a company to construct it, but that they would, as a Government, acting directly as a Government under Government supervision, and paying directly out of Government funds—build this road. The Minister of Railways not only told us so, but the First Minister told us. The First Minister went further, and he told us the reason the Government determined to build the road as Government work. He said when they came into power after the fall of the Mackenzie Administration, he found that that Government had undertaken the work of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government work. He found that the Pembina Branch was built. He found that the contracts were let out for the ends of the Thunder Bay Branch; he found the work rapidly progressing upon that difficult part of the undertaking, that part of it which is now completed, that key to the whole North-West country; and the language of the hon. First Minister on that occasion was, that when they came into power, finding that the Mackenzie Government had built the more difficult portion of the work as a Government work, it would be folly, it would be an act that could not be justified on the part of the Administration, then to hand over the construction of the comparatively easy prairie section to a company, but that the Government should retain it in their hands, and build it and make money out of it. Sir, they did more than that. The hon. Minister of Railways

gave us a close and elaborate calculation upon that point. He gave us the exact items of the cost of the different sections of that road, and I have them in my mind now, so clearly did the hon. gentleman lay them down. What are they? After giving the cost of the portions of the road that the Government were to build, have built, and are building, he detailed to us the distances, and the cost of constructing the different portions which have been handed over to the Syndicate; and what were they? From Jasper to Kamloops—for that was the line decided upon at that time—335 miles, the cost was to be \$15,500,000. The 1,000 miles from Selkirk to Jasper, over the prairie country, were to cost \$10,000 a mile. He put the cost at \$13,000 a mile, which he said included a light equipment, which would be all the equipment required for years. That made the cost of that section \$13,000,000. The 600 miles of the Lake Superior division he gave as costing, in round numbers, \$20,000,000. This was the statement of the hon. gentleman that \$48,500,000 would complete the building and equipment of the portions of the road which, under this contract, we gave to the Syndicate to complete. He then detailed to us the cost of the other portions of the road which, under the contract, the Government had to build, have built, and are building. The hon. First Minister gave us a calculation at that time as to how the cost of the railway was to be met. He told us he had a plan by which he could sell his land at a certain price per acre, and the result of it would be that at the end of ten years, when the road would be completed, he would have \$32,000,000 of cash in hand and \$38,000,000 as good as cash in the security of the land. Thus the road was to be built. We were in ten years to sell lands that would net us \$70,000,000 and to pay for those portions of the road which the Syndicate are to build for \$48,500,000. And yet, with that plan before us, detailed in the House by the hon. Minister of Railways and the First Minister, and Parliament having accepted and ratified that plan, and having warranted the Government in going on with the Railway as a Government work, these hon. gentlemen, without the authority of Parliament, without any advantage for the country that we can conceive of, in a short eight months afterwards, deliberately entered into this contract with the Syndicate, in which, for building what they had declared would cost only \$48,500,000, they gave \$25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land, agreed to build the road from Thunder Bay to Selkirk and hand it over to them, agreed to throw in the Pembina Branch, which was finished, equipped, and running, and paying a large dividend; contracted to build the road through the Rocky Mountains at a cost of some \$9,000,000, and to construct the section from Yale to Kamloops and hand it over to them—and all this was given to them for doing a work that would cost only \$48,500,000. I may be laughed at for these figures, but let hon. gentlemen opposite beware of laughing at them, because if they do, they laugh at figures solemnly given in Parliament by the hon. Minister of Railways, and not at my figures. If they wish, I can give them the page of *Hansard* in which they can read these figures for themselves. In addition to these vast amounts of money and property, however, they gave to that Syndicate powers and privileges and rights which I hesitate not to say ought not to have been given to any corporation by any Government in a free country. From this very fact—and I may be pardoned for it—I view with no little suspicion and distrust any move that is made on behalf of this Company—that every transaction we have had with this Company has been pressed on with such hot haste through this House. When the contract was first entered into by the Government with the Syndicate, all other business was suspended, and precedence was given to the consideration of that question over every other question, and day by day, night by night, it had to be discussed and forced along, in order that that bargain might be ratified. We have had a

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

repetition this Session of that circumstance in the new demand which is made by the Government on behalf of this Company. All other business has to stand aside, and precedence has been given to the question of lending our credit to a firm that contracted with us to perform this work, and got such an immense bargain when they made that contract. To-night, we are told, must close this debate, the body must be worn out if necessary in order to force this question to a decision. There is another thing connected with the measures introduced in regard to this matter that makes me a little suspicious, that is the lack and the refusal of information which is necessary in order to enable the members of this House to form an intelligent judgment on this subject. When the contract was first entered into, papers were moved for by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and his motion for those papers, which were necessary for the proper consideration of the bargain, was voted down by the representatives who then occupied seats in Parliament. While I will not say that during this Session papers have been refused, I will say—and I believe I am within the strict line of truth—that papers moved for and not objected to, have not come down, and we have not the information that we ought to be in possession of before we enter into the negotiations now pressed upon us. Sir, why are we asked at this stage to aid this Company? It is not wonderful that we should be suspicious when we recollect that one of the strong reasons given at the time the bargain was made why it should be ratified by the members of this House, was that the Syndicate were a wealthy body of men; that they were possessed of unbounded resources, and were able to complete their work; and that we should give them a good bargain, because we should never hear from them again. The hon. First Minister on a public platform is reported to have said—and he admitted the substantial accuracy of the report—that the Company were able to build a dozen railways. The hon. Minister of Railways said the same thing, and he pointed out in this House that we were securing finality in this matter—that we should not be called on again. And the First Minister, heaving a long sigh of relief as he uttered his words—feeling, in common with the rest of the people of this country who had been borne down by this great enterprise, but more than others, because he bore at the same time the burdens of State—said that we should breathe easier, because we should be relieved from the responsibility of this enterprise. We breathe easier because we are relieved of the responsibility of this, said the hon. Minister of Railways, in the discussion across the floor; and when the hon. member for West Middlesex, discussing the proposition made by the second Syndicate, said they were men of wealth and standing in the community, men of ample means whose claims ought to be considered, as they were offering better terms than those offered by the first Syndicate, the hon. Minister of Railways replied that there were Canadians in the first Syndicate, one of whom could buy out the whole batch that formed the second syndicate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear;" but if he had been with me in the thriving town of Strathroy, not many weeks ago, he would have heard his colleague, the hon. Finance Minister dilate, as he only can, upon the wealth, energy and enterprise of one of the men who were members of that second syndicate—a man of unbounded resource the hon. Minister of Finance described him, and yet we are told—although he was only one of the many men in this second syndicate—that there were men in the first Syndicate, one of whom was able to buy out the whole of them. Why then are those men here knocking at our doors for a loan if they are men of such unbounded

resources? Why do they not do that which the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. First Minister and all the members of the Government led the House to understand they would do—that if there was not money enough given them out of the public Treasury to carry out this bargain, they would put their hands in their pockets and build the road out of their own resources. Three short years have elapsed, and here we are in Parliament, day after day, night after night, discussing, as a matter of urgency in the interest of the Company, whether we will advance them another \$30,000,000. Why has it come to pass that such is the case? Is it because we were wrong in estimating the cost of the work they undertook to do? Is it because we have failed to carry out our part of the bargain with reference to it? Nothing of the kind. I stand here to-night and repeat what I said when that contract was under consideration of this House, that to my knowledge, never was such a bargain given to any men under the sun, as was given to the Syndicate in that contract; and I think it is capable of demonstration that their running out of funds at present is not due to the fact that they have undertaken the work at too low a price, but to the fact that they have taken the funds which were devoted for the purpose of building this great national work and have diverted them to other uses. They now come to Parliament and whine, through the members who support the proposal, because in doing so they have awakened hostility to themselves. It is rather amusing to hear hon. gentlemen opposite, with scolding tongues, berate members of the Opposition because we desire a little information with reference to the doings of this Company and the use they have made of the money that has been given them, and the stock they have issued, and all their operations in regard to the matter. It is rather amusing to see this Company come here, and through the mouth of the Government tell us: We are in this pitiable position because the naughty American roads that are our rivals have actually gone and opposed us in the London and the New York money markets and have damaged our credit. Did these men of unbounded resources, these men of great enterprise, these railway kings who entered into the construction of a great trans-continental road, imagine that they could do so and not awaken animosity on the part of rival roads? Why, they must have known such would be the case. Energetic men like them must surely have known that they could not build a competing line with another road and not find that other road doing what it could to protect its own interests, even to the decrying of the prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. Minister of Railways was, as the hon. member for West Huron said, mild, for him, when he introduced the Resolutions. He alluded to the opposition the Company had met with from the Northern Pacific Road and other roads in the United States, and he stated besides that there had been opposition from sources nearer home. But he did not declare what those sources were. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe succeeded the hon. Minister of Railways in the debate, and received his inspiration from him, and in saying that, I mean no discredit to the hon. gentleman, because he presented his case well, and the hon. Minister of Railways did well in selecting him—but I say he received his inspiration from the hon. Minister of Railways. I do not blame him, because it was not in the power of the hon. gentleman, any more than it was in the power of the leader of the Opposition and those who spoke in the early part of the debate, to know fully what to say on this subject, for the hon. Minister of Railways came down with his proposition to this House and desired to press it through, before he had submitted to the members of this House any information, before he placed them in a position necessary to deal with it. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe—I do not know whether

the hon. Minister of Railways suggested to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe that, as he could not well make an open attack on the Grand Trunk Railway, or the Liberal party, or the Liberal press, since he was making a statesman-like speech, and it was not in his interest to awaken hostility—the hon. member could now, when the debate had reached the right point, supplement that lack; that he need not have the delicacy the hon. Minister had, but might allude to the hostility of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the unpatriotic conduct of those members of the Opposition who asked for information before they would vote, who absolutely refused to shut their eyes and swallow down a proposition to give \$30,000,000 to the Company before knowing something about it; but the hon. gentleman proceeded, at any rate, to take this course. He pointed out that the Grand Trunk Railway had damaged the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway because they had used their influence in London and the other money markets against them. What did these energetic, shrewd men of the Canadian Pacific Railway expect the Grand Trunk Railway to do? Did they expect that they could take the moneys which had been voted so lavishly by the people of Canada to build a great international road across the continent on British soil and use it instead in acquiring branches, in leasing all the existing lines of railway in Ontario on which they could lay their hands, and which would give them fully half the control of the trade that was being done by the Grand Trunk Railway. I am not pronouncing judgment upon the wisdom or the contrary of this, but I say these men in doing this, these men in undertaking by this means to damage the stock of English capitalists who have tens of millions invested in the Grand Trunk Railway, must have known that they were sure to arouse a feeling of hostility on the part of that company. Now, Sir, it is not their place to come to Parliament, and, with whining mouths, through the representatives who argue their case here, say: We could have gone on all right, but we had Grand Trunk rivalry. They should have counted the cost before they went into it, and, if—and I will deal with that later on—there has been anything said against the operations in which they have been engaged, which has tended to damage their credit, by members of the Opposition and by the Liberal press, then, before, they entered into the questionable transactions which have been pointed out by the Liberal press and by the Liberal party, they should have counted the cost, and should have known the effect it would have upon them. Surely, the Liberal party are not to be blamed if, in pointing out what has been done by this company, it redounds to their injury, for it can only redound to their injury if they have been guilty of acts which, in themselves, would not bear scrutiny and investigation. Now, I come to consider what are the reasons urged why we should aid this Company, and in the first place I will consider the reason that is urged with reference to time. The whole question turns upon that. The hon. Minister of Railways says they are able to go on and finish their contract, but unless you give them this \$22,500,000 as a loan, and defer the payment of the \$7,300,000, a portion of which they should have paid in on the first of this month, and in which they are defaulters at this present moment, you cannot get your railway completed before the end of the term of the contract; but if you do, you will have the road completed within two years from date. The sole reason that is urged in reference to this matter, or the one on which they rely, is the early completion of the work four or five years before the date mentioned in the contract. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you did not fail to observe, with your shrewd observation, that in the Resolutions we are asked to approve in the House, the Company are not bound to complete the road at the end of two years. They are not bound to, and the whole case rested on the fact that this \$30,000,000 was to be given to

this Syndicate in order to accomplish that end; and yet, in the Resolutions we are asked to adopt, it is not provided that they are to complete it then. True, we had a little bye-play between the hon. the Minister of Railways and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), but the debate had gone a long way before that. The Minister had spoken, but he did not, in the whole length of his speech, intimate such a thing as that the Government would bind the Company to do it. It was pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, that gentleman who is attacked so much in the House, and certainly we ought to give him credit for that, if for nothing else, that he saved those gentlemen who proposed to vote for these Resolutions from the ridiculous position they would have been in of voting of thirty millions of money to have the road built at the end of two years, without having the Company bound in the slightest degree to do it. And that it was an after-thought is very evident, not only from the fact that it was not mentioned in the speech of the Minister of Railways, but even after the hon. the leader of the Opposition had pointed it out, it was not mentioned by the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) who followed. The Minister of Railways, I fancy, had not at that time had an understanding with the railway Company that there was a necessity that that clause should be put in, or I think the member for Richmond and Wolfe would have been careful to give the information to the House at the first opportunity. But when the hon. member for Cardwell came on, whether it was arranged or not I do not know—I must infer that it was not known between them, because the hon. gentleman said he did not know—he was expressing his desire that something of that kind should be put in, when, very opportunely, just waking up to a realization of the announcement, the Minister of Railways rose, begged his hon. friend's pardon, his hon. friend at once granted it, and took his seat, and the Minister of Railways went on to say that it was impossible in Resolutions of this kind to embody every point, but they meant to do it in the Bill. But surely, Mr. Speaker, Resolutions of this kind, in which we are being firmly bound to give \$30,000,000, room ought to have been found for a few words to compel the Company to fulfil their part of the contract. The hon. member for Cardwell sat back in his seat satisfied. But I tell the hon. gentleman from Cardwell that he must watch the Minister of Railways—and I am speaking in a parliamentary sense now. I warn him to be on his guard, I warn him by his own past experience, with reference to the expressions of hon. gentlemen who lead his party, to remember what scrapes they have got him into. He must watch the Bill when it comes down, and see that nothing is forgotten or omitted. He has a reputation made in the country and in this House, and by trusting implicitly the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, and deeming that they were speaking without any reservation when they made important statements, he committed himself to a statement, to a line of policy and action, in this House, which stands recorded against him upon the public journals, and which has cast a blot upon the fair fame he had achieved for himself. Surely he heard the First Minister say, when this contract was under discussion, with reference to the clause affecting the North-West Territories—he heard the First Minister say: We cannot check Ontario. He heard him say: We cannot check Manitoba; and his mind grasped it at once. He thought he could obviate a great objection in the mind of members opposite by elaborating that point, and showing that this monopoly clause only gave power to this Company over the North-West Territories, but did not give power to them in the Province of Manitoba. And he enlarged upon it: he explained to the House and the country, that it was beyond the power of the Government, that it was unconstitutional on their part, that they could not, if they desired, check Manitoba in any way; that Mani-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

toba was free to grant a charter at any time, from Winnipeg, to connect with any system of American railways that might choose to tap it. And under that persuasion, I dare say, strong scruples on that point in the minds of many members were removed. And yet, that hon. gentleman knows that having uttered those words, he to-day follows an Administration that has disallowed charters that have been granted by that Province, and which does not give to it the rights that he promised on behalf of the Government. I say to him, with his past experience, to beware when the Bill comes down to see to it that that becomes a part of the Statute Law of this land; that it be not repeated upon him again, that he may not be deceived once more by statements the Minister may have made. Now, Sir, there is another reason assigned why we should complete this road in two years. I have heard arguments advanced on the part of the supporters of the Resolutions before the House—I do not say on behalf of the supporters of the Government, because I am in no position to judge that the supporters are, all of them, in this case to support the Government; it is a question which is to be left to the free judgment of the people's representatives here—but I have not heard from those who have justified the Resolutions any strong reasons why it is in the interests of the country that this road should be built in two years, and that we should not allow the eastern and western ends to be built within the time mentioned in the contract. True it is that we heard the hon. member from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) tell us that it would promote emigration; true it is that we have Mr. Schreiber, one of the gentlemen to whom this question was referred, giving us his view in reference to it; and I propose to call the attention of the House to the manner in which the Minister of Railways fortified himself in bringing these Resolutions down to Parliament by the reports of his subordinates. I think it was the 28th of January that he referred to his Chief Engineer the consideration of the last proposals of Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I think it was on the 2nd of February that he received a reply from that officer, which he submits to this House as a reason why these proposals should be accepted. The report is a remarkable document, but I submit, with all deference to that gentleman, that he was not in a position in which it was desirable he should be placed, in order to enlighten the Government with reference to the expediency of these propositions. I find he said this:

"With regard to the proposal as a whole, I beg to state that in my opinion too great importance cannot be attached to the early completion of the railway which is to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by way of British territory. It is an absolute necessity for the development of the country in every respect. It is the only means whereby the North-West can be peopled with any degree of rapidity. By its means the Rocky Mountains would be filled by a mining and lumbering population. The fisheries of the Pacific Ocean would be developed and the trade of China and Japan, which now finds its way into and through the United States, would no doubt follow our line as the shortest and most favourable route to the East."

The engineer of the Government viewing these propositions as a whole, bases his recommendation of their acceptance on these sentiments that he says he entertains, and has here expressed. With all respect to that gentleman for his engineering skill and for his energy, to which I would differentially submit, as would every other member of this House, I still venture to remark, that when he comes to speak of the utility of this road, and its effect on settlement, and the development of trade, he knows no more on these questions than do the commercial men who occupy seats in this House. Does any sensible business man believe that it is essential for the early and rapid settlement of the North-West country that the end of a road toward British Columbia should be built? Has the Minister of Agriculture had another wonderful stroke of genius like the one he had in England, that the Minister of Railways told us about, and has he devised an arrange-

ment whereby immigrants from Great Britain and Europe are to be sent round and brought into the North-West by way of the Pacific Ocean? Are they to bring in our immigrants in that way? If not, how is it that the completion of that end of the road is to facilitate the introduction of immigrants into that country? True it is, he may have immigrants coming in that way, but they will not be immigrants from Europe. If they do come into that country, and settle in the North-West they will not be Europeans but Asiatics. Therefore, I suppose we must assume that in order to bring in a large immigration of Asiatics, this Parliament must vote \$30,000,000 of the people's money, contributed by the working men of this country, in order to bring in Asiatic foreigners to compete with them. The Government certainly will not bring European immigrants in that way. Then, with reference to the Lake Superior division, will the Government tell us that, in order to people that country with immigrants, it is absolutely necessary that they shall go in over the section that is being built north of Lake Superior? Why the Minister of Railways has told us himself that arrangements are effected now by which immigrants go from Quebec to Winnipeg through our own territory, by the mixed rail and water route, for the sum of \$12 per head, and I venture to say that, when the road is completed north of Lake Superior, he will not be able to make better or cheaper arrangements for depositing those immigrants in that country than he has at the present time. Therefore, talking about its being a means of settling the North-West, is to me talking clap-trap. We have now the means of access and of ingress to that country reduced to the minimum of costs, and quite as cheap as it will be when the ends of the line are completed; and, in urging that as a reason for making haste, and in making haste, for giving \$30,000,000 more of the people's money, we have an argument which, properly considered, will not carry any value at all. Oh, but it will develop the Pacific fisheries, we are told. Well, I do not know that the fishermen of the Atlantic coast, the fishermen of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, find the price of fish too high now that they need give \$30,000,000 of their money to bring fish from the Pacific down to compete with them. Then, as to the Rocky Mountains being filled with miners and lumbermen, they can go to the Rocky Mountains now over the portion that is constructed. What we desire, and what we have ever advocated, and what we are in favour of to-day, is the speedy opening up and settlement of the fertile plains of the North-West, that they may be opened up, that happy homes may be given to the sons of all Canadians, from all the Provinces, that may go there to settle on land bought with their own money, and that is their inalienable right; and that, when they settle on those lands and endeavour to hew out a name, a fame and a fortune for themselves, Government restrictions and the shackles of this railway monopoly shall be knocked off them, and they shall be given all the freedom of communication that is requisite to build up a great and powerful people there. And, when these gentlemen opposite charge, when they dare to charge upon the leader of the Opposition or upon any members of this side of the House, that they have not favoured the speedy opening up, the speedy peopling of the fertile plains of the North-West, I say, and I say it here boldly, that I challenge them to the proof. In vain they will search the records of this country for it. If I might talk in a party sense in this House, though the party spirit should be dropped when we are considering a great subject of this kind, if I desired a party victory on this point, I might remind them of facts they could not deny—I might remind them that, while many of them were opposed to the acquisition of that territory, the late lamented George Brown, at one time the grand leader of the Liberal party, with his powerful organ, the *Globe* newspaper, which at times says things that do not suit the hon. gentlemen opposite, and at times says things

that I myself would not have said, this grand old organ, that has stood firm for the cause of liberty, justice, and right, advocated it time and time again, and he was followed and endorsed by the people on this side of this House. And I say boldly that there has been no greater friend and advocate of the opening up and settlement of the North-West country than that gentleman who sits before me now, the hon. member for East York. Sorry I am that the powerful voice that once filled this chamber is not his for the time being. That it may soon be restored to him, that he may rise to his own feet, and, with his own voice, defend himself again, as he has done time and again, against the men who from the other side have dared to say he was lacking in the spirit of patriotism and did not carry on the affairs of the country as he should, is my earnest wish. Now, what was the view of my friend from Richmond and Wolfe, in reference to this subject of the speedy completion of the road, a few years ago? When the contract was under discussion, my friend, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) made a very good speech, and one of the best things he said was a joke which told against the members of that party to which I belong. It was very well done. Referring to the First Minister, who had said that from serene heights he hoped to gaze down and see railways running through our North-West country, he told us that, unless we changed our ways, all we should know in the other world would be to hear the rumbling of the cars overhead. We are not there, and I trust we are not to be consigned to that place. In that speech the hon. gentleman deliberately laid it down as his view that the 90 miles from Yale to Port Moody should not be built for some years—at all events, until we had finished the portion from Yale to Kamloops. If you do not do that, said he, with the immense impetus which will be given by the National Policy, and the good times which will be brought about by the expenditure of large sums by the Canadian Pacific Railway, we shall have such an overflowing Treasury that we shall not have to borrow a single additional dollar. He was cautious in those days; he was desirous of exercising a prudent economy; he was desirous of exercising that common prudence that should weigh with every member of Parliament. Proceed in that way, he said; do not go too fast; do not touch the portion between Yale and Port Moody until you have finished the portion from Kamloops to Yale, and all you will pay is \$6,700,000 this year, and next year, and the next year, and the next year, and \$3,900,000 per annum for the remaining years of the ten years. And doing this, you will, out of the surplus, through the great impetus given to the trade, build and complete the road without borrowing a dollar. Now, we have the Minister of Finance telling us that he will have to go to England—he has not told us, but we know he will have to go—to borrow the money required for this loan, and we shall have to pay interest on it. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe is now one of the most earnest advocates of this scheme, which involves an entire change of base on his part. The Minister of Railways, in 1880, did not propose that we should proceed with the railway north of Lake Superior at once, but he thought before a great many years had passed the demands of trade would require it to be built. Now, Sir, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), has offered an amendment to the House. He has recited that it is desirable we should have a Select Committee to inquire into the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company before we are asked to ratify the Resolutions before the House. He asks for a Select Committee, because he thinks a full and searching enquiry into the affairs of the Company is necessary. He thinks more information with respect to the stock dealings of the Company, and with respect to the contract made with the construction company, and with respect to the amount of money expend-

ed, is absolutely necessary. I appeal to hon. members, not on one side of the House, or on the other, but I ask all hon. members to put this question to themselves and answer it honestly and faithfully: Do you know the whole ins and outs of the stock transactions of the Company? Have you seen the returns, partial though they be, submitted to the House—and they have not been printed? Are hon. members prepared to vote when only partial returns have been submitted, the most important part being withheld? If they answer the question honestly, that they are not in possession of the information required to enable them to know all about the stock operations of the Company, I submit they are not in a position to say they are justified in voting for the Resolutions now before the House. What have we learned by a cursory glance at these partial returns? We find that the original stockholders took \$5,000,000 stock at par; that at a subsequent period—I do not know the date, the month is given, but not the year—appropriated to themselves other \$20,000,000 stock at 25 cents on the dollar. Well, what did they do? They came to the Government. And what did the Government do? The Minister of Railways told us the Government agreed to guarantee 3 per cent. interest on the stock, amounting to \$65,000,000, the Company depositing a certain sum of money, and agreeing to deposit a further sum; but they have not done it. and they ask us in the Resolutions before the House to postpone the date of payment. What did this operation mean? Was it a proper operation? I think the Minister of Railways admitted that the Government had transcended their legal powers in guaranteeing the stock. But what an operation it was for the Government, to mix itself up in such a transaction! It may have been all right, but it excited alarm among men accustomed to dealing in stocks in the money markets of the world, and the effect was, instead of the results desired being obtained, the stock fell into a worse position than before, and necessitated the Company coming to Parliament, unexpectedly, I believe, by the Minister of Railways himself, to submit the proposition now before the House. Mark what the effect would have been—I do not say that it was—but it is open to this construction. Taking the average of the \$5,000,000 stock which the Company took at par, and the \$20,000,000 they took at 25 cents on the dollar, the original shareholders allotted themselves \$25,000,000 stock for which they gave \$10,000,000. Then they come to the Government and obtain a guarantee of 3 per cent. As the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe told us, they had a right to expect that under the guarantee the stock would go up to 75 cents on the dollar. There was the transaction. This would have enabled the original shareholders to have sold out that \$25,000,000 stock at 75 and realized an enormous profit. I understood the Minister of Railways to admit that the statement of the leader of the Opposition was correct, namely, that the Government had transcended their legal power in giving the guarantee, the effect of which was expected to raise the value of the stock to 75 cents on the dollar, and we know the original shareholders obtained the \$25,000,000 stock at an average of 40 cents. Is this information which commends this Company unreservedly to our confidence? We want more light and explanations in regard to this matter, and I support the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron on the position he has taken. Then it is desired that we should have more information regarding the transactions with the construction company. I confess I am at a loss to understand from the partial returns submitted to us the dealings with the company, and I propose to submit to the House certain figures given in that return, which only work out in a certain way, but the result of which proves that there must be something wrong in the figures, something not straightforward, which requires explanation, and

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

if the Minister of Railways thinks it worth while to give his attention he will see the difficulty, and perhaps he may be able to help me out of it with the knowledge he possesses, which may not be in the possession of myself and other hon. members. Now, Sir, we find in the returns which came down the other day, a statement of account with the construction company. Mr. Van Horne, General Manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, admitted, in a conversation he had with a correspondent of the *Mail* newspaper, in this city, and which conversation the correspondent has published in his widely spread journal, for the information of the people of this country—he admitted that there had been in connection with construction companies, in some cases, that which was far from being straightforward and right, and that it would not be unreasonable—I think that is the tenor of his argument—that there might be a little suspicion attached to the construction company peculiarly formed, at any time, or wherever it might be found, but that so far as this Company was concerned, it was all right and straightforward. So it may have been; I will not say it was not, but it is a remarkable thing that a railway company having a large contract, should form a construction company to carry on the work, and that out of the 25,000 shares of that construction company, the Railway Company should hold about 21,000 shares. This, on the face of it, is a transaction which requires more explanation than we have at the present time. Here, however, is a statement of account with the construction company, as furnished by the return I have referred to: Sundry small vouchers for supplies and labour, \$127,340; Langdon, Sheppard & Co., \$1,118,528; Thomas Ross, Manager, \$1,260,831; total, \$2,506,700; that is on the Western division. On the Nipissing Division, we have labour, fuel and small supplies, \$1,389,127; on the Lake Superior division, labour and small supplies, \$2,064,608; or, taking the three amounts together, we have a total of \$5,910,436. Then we have other items, as follows: Material and supplies furnished, \$4,184,511—less material and supplies returned, \$2,373,620, leaving a net amount of \$1,790,891. Labour furnished before date of construction contract, \$78,432; transportation charges, amount paid out for back charges on freight, \$103,315; Canadian Pacific Railway Company's charges, \$1,274,970, and putting those two together, we have \$1,378,286, and this and the other items together, with cash advance to construction company \$600,000, makes a total of \$9,753,096 paid to this construction company; or leaving out of consideration the \$600,000 advance, for purposes as to which we are entirely in the dark, as to which we know nothing, we have an expenditure \$9,158,096 made to the construction company. I have to ask the Minister of Railways that he will be kind enough to give his attention for a moment to a point which strikes me as a difficult one, with reference to these figures. I desire to place nothing before the House which is not correct, but hon. gentlemen who have spoken will agree with me, that it is a difficult matter to speak with positive accuracy, because of the partial information we have with reference to this question. But the cash advances on the western division are \$2,506,700; I add to this the sum of \$1,493,300 for the western division, out of the total sum of \$1,790,891, material and supplies. I do this because the statement does not say how this item of material and supplies is divided between the Eastern and the Western Divisions. Then I add for fuel and labour furnished before the date of the construction contract, \$78,432. Of the item for transportation charges, amounting to \$1,378,286, I add \$921,518. Adding these items together, I find we have a total paid to the construction company of \$5,000,000 for work done by them on the western part, according to the figures which have been furnished. You will observe that the construction company, on this

western part, built 345 miles of road, from the point of commencement, 45 miles east of Medicine Hat, to the summit. This would give us for the \$5,000,000 expended on that portion, the rate of \$14,500 per mile. That includes the bridge over the Saskatchewan, it includes mountain work between Calgary and the summit. Then the Minister of Railways has given us the total cost of the western division, and the amount is \$17,529,175. If we deduct the \$5,000,000 paid the construction company for the 345 miles of their contract, we find that the expenditure by the Canadian Pacific Railway themselves is \$12,529,175, for a distance of 615 miles, or at the rate of \$20,372 per mile, and this is over the easy prairie section, which the Minister of Railways estimated would be built at \$10,000 per mile. Let us look at it in another light. What were the construction company to get for building this 345 miles, and the 290 miles—or, as the Minister of Railways put it, the 300 miles from the summit to Kamloops? They were to get in cash \$17,880,000 and \$25,000,000 of stock, which we will estimate at 60 cents on the dollar. That will not be out of the way, when my hon. friend said it should bring 75 cents. That will give us \$15,000,000 for the stock, or a total of cash and stock amounting to \$32,880,000. That was the bargain made with the construction company. Now, we find that the amount paid to the construction company for the 345 miles was \$5,000,000. Mr. Van Horne says to the *Mail* correspondent, and the *Mail* correspondent has given it to the world, and I am glad he has done so, for it will be useful in this discussion—Mr. Van Horne says they will finish for \$10,100,000 the intervening space between the summit and Kamloops. In other words, they would have a profit of \$2,780,000 out of the cash subsidy alone, and a clear present of \$25,000,000 of stock. Will the hon. Minister of Railways say that this House is prepared to vote on these Resolutions while it has figures before it which gives a result like that? In case it should be said that I have not added a fair proportion to that western division for supplies and transportation, I have made a second calculation in which I have added the whole cost of transportation of material, supplies and labour to that western section, so that I could make no mistake at all; and let us see how it works out: Cash advances, \$2,506,700; add all material and supplies, \$1,790,891; add all labour furnished before the date of the construction company's contract, \$78,432; add all transportation charges, \$1,378,286; and you have a total advance paid to the construction company of \$5,754,359. Now, Sir, I have added everything in this statement, except the two items which the record says are specifically for the Lake Superior and Nipissing division. How do these figures work out? The contract with the construction company for the western part provided that they were to get in cash \$17,880,000 to finish that contract. The construction company were paid \$5,754,359, and Mr. Van Horne says that they can complete the balance for \$10,100,000; so that the construction company were to receive \$17,880,000 for work that could be done for \$15,854,359. That would give a balance of \$2,025,641 in cash, and \$25,000,000 in stock besides. And yet the hon. Minister of Railways asks us to proceed with these Resolutions, and the First Minister says we must vote on them to-night. I venture to say that these figures have not been seen by a large majority of this House. I throw on them the responsibility of voting for these Resolutions, in the face of these facts, and I tell them that there are strange things in the figures submitted to this House, and they ought to make themselves acquainted with them before they cast their vote. Let us look at these figures again. The total cost of the western division, as given by the hon. Minister of Railways, was \$17,529,175. Deduct the cash paid to the construction company, according to my second calculation, \$5,754,359, and you will have 615 miles of prairie road built by the Company themselves,

costing \$11,774,816, or \$19,143 per mile; while the 345 miles built by the construction company, including the bridge over the Saskatchewan and the work in the mountain region, cost only \$5,754,359, or only \$16,680 per mile. Sir, these figures require explanation. If they are correct figures, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have, by some kind of manipulation, expended thousands of dollars per mile more in constructing the easy prairie section than the construction company were paid for building a large portion of the line running through a mountainous and expensive district. That is one of the alternatives I present to the Government, and the other is that this House has been given figures that are not correct; or, if correct, require to be explained and added to in some way or other. Now, I come to another consideration in this matter. I wish to point out to the hon. Minister of Railways and to the hon. members of this House, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have had from the Dominion Parliament more than enough to build all the line that they have built under the contract without one single dollar of their own, and to have millions of dollars besides. I notice one remarkable thing in this debate. I notice that hon. members opposite, in criticising the speeches of hon. members on this side of the House, have fought shy of the figures given by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fairbank). One hon. gentleman so far forgot himself—and I will do him the credit to say I think he did forget himself—as to attempt to break the force of that hon. gentleman's argument by reading a portion of an item from a newspaper without its connection with this matter, but was designed to leave the impression on the minds of hon. members that the hon. member for East Lambton had not been able to effect anything by his argument. It was an easy way, if not an honourable way, for that hon. gentleman to get around the arguments of the hon. member for East Lambton, but to this present moment his statements and his arguments have not been met. That they were worthy of consideration was shown by the attention that the hon. Minister of Railways paid to them. I propose to follow out the same line. If our figures vary at all, they vary because there has been a little discrepancy between the figures published in the newspapers, which he was forced to use, and mine, which are taken from the return. Substantially they are the same, and what do they show? The official return brought down, reinforced by the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways himself, gives the amount expended by the Company on their main line—and mark you, in the discussion of this question we have to confine ourselves to the main line, and the contract we made with the Company. We did not contract with them to acquire roads to the east, to the west, or to the seaboard. We did not contract with them to build branches here, there and everywhere, but a main line reaching from Callander to the Pacific Ocean, and we must confine ourselves to the operations of the Company under that contract. Now, the total cost, as given by the Minister of Railways, and by the return of that main line is \$23,078,951. Now, what have they received from the Government alone, leaving out the bonuses from Winnipeg and the other towns, leaving out all receipts from the sale of stock and from other sources? They have received cash \$12,289,212; they have realized from sales of lands, 3,753,400 acres at \$2.36, or \$8,858,924. Then there is the proceeds of the land sold in transactions not embraced in operations connected with land grant bonds—such is the language of the returns—I suppose it means town sites, \$147,775—making a total received from the Dominion Government, without putting in one cent of their own and without including the bonuses of any municipalities, or the proceeds of the sale of stocks, or anything of that kind, of \$21,625,011 in cash lands. This leaves them but \$1,453,940, to provide to pay the entire cost,

and every single dollar they have laid out on the construction of the line they have contracted to build. Yet these gentlemen come to us and demand that we should give them aid. In that calculation I have only figured up the land they have sold, and have not attempted to make any calculation as to the land they might have sold had they asked a reasonable price and placed less galling restrictions on the people of the North-West. Let us look to the expenditure they have made and the total receipts they have got from the Government. Their total expenditure was \$23,708,951. They received from the Government, \$12,289,212; they received from the sale of 3,753,400 acres, at \$2.36, \$8,858,034, and from the sale of town sites, &c., \$477,775; and they have retained yet 10,002,305 acres of land they have earned, and which I estimate in this calculation, not at \$2.36 but at \$2, leaving out the 36 cents to defray costs and charges. This land will give them \$20,004,610. In other words, the Company's receipts from the Government alone amounted to \$41,629,621, deducting from which expenditure as given by the hon. Minister of Railways, \$23,078,951, and they have a profit on the amount given by the Dominion Government for the work done, without embracing the proceeds from the sale of stock or from any other source whatever of \$18,550,670. But the hon. Minister may say you have not included the rolling stock; they have to furnish the rolling stock. Sir, when you contract for the construction of a road the cost of the road does not include the rolling stock. But I propose to give the hon. Minister of Railways the utmost he can ask for—although I maintain he has no right to ask for this—and I will add to the entire expenditure made on the main line the total cost of their rolling stock, \$6,130,792. What do we find? We find that we have paid every dollar they have laid out on the main line, including their rolling stock, and they still have a profit of \$12,419,878. I challenge the hon. Minister to take these figures, to confine himself to the contract, and work out if he can any different result to the one I have given. All this lugging in of money deposited with the Government, and money expended in the acquisition of other roads, is beside the question. What we have to consider is the contract and only the contract. What we have to consider is the money expended on the road they contracted with us to build, and in considering that we find that the Dominion Government has paid all so expended and the Company have a profit of over \$12,000,000 besides. I do not desire to weary the House further with figures or to take up much more of its time.

Mr. RYKERT. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. I have really succeeded in tiring the hon. member for Lincoln. But if I have succeeded in tiring him to anything like the degree he tired me last night, I pity him from the bottom of my heart. I do not claim that I have made a speech as eloquent as the hon. gentleman—his speeches are always eloquent because they contain very few words of his own. He does not give the House the benefit of his own ideas, but he has a happy way of giving the views of more intelligent and able men—of course I exclude myself—who have spoken on this side of the House, and hon. members on this side would have no objection to his quotations if he would only show a little more fairness, and in reading the eloquent comments made from time to time by the leader of the Opposition and other hon. gentlemen, give them in their proper connection, and not give us statements taken out of their connection, and thus at times be made to bear a different construction. I am glad he is the only hon. gentleman opposite who is tired, or that no other hon. gentleman opposite has expressed his fatigue, because, they have more respect for my feelings than has the hon. member for Lincoln, and I venture to say that, tired as the hon. member for Lincoln may be and other

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

members may be, they will not deny me the right of saying a word or two in defence of the party with which I am associated, and which hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to vilify. Hon. gentlemen opposite who, in default of argument, have been using the tongue of a scold and berating hon. members on this side, for what they are pleased to term lack of patriotism, ought to know when making a charge of this kind—if they are speaking of that patriotism which is alone worthy of the name, and that I believe dwells in the breasts of hon. gentlemen of this side—they are endeavouring, as far as within them lies, to insult hon. gentlemen on this side. You have, Mr. Speaker, deemed it your duty to call members of this House to order for expressions used in the heat of debate with reference to members sitting in the House, but I think you will agree with me that no more insulting language can be used by one member of this House to another—if he really understands what patriotism is—than to charge a lack of it to any hon. member here; but when hon. gentlemen opposite charge us with lack of patriotism, do they mean that patriotism which the hon. member for Queen's describes as the last resort of a scoundrel? Similarly described, I am told, though I had not the pleasure of hearing him, by a gentleman almost as cultivated and intelligent as the hon. member for Queen's, who spoke in the Opera House the other night—I mean Matthew Arnold—who gave the same definition. If it is that kind of patriotism they charge us with lacking on this side of the House, we plead guilty to the charge, and we glory in it. We do not admire that kind of patriotism that was manifested, as we read in one of the city newspapers the other night, that kind of patriotism that dwelt in the breast of a certain major who dwelt in a city in the State of Mississippi. That gentleman was very fond, as hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond, of at all times parading his patriotism. His unalterable love of the constitution, his unalterable love of the United States, and whenever he was caught in a more shady transaction than usual he paraded his patriotism a little louder. He died. One of his friends pronounced the funeral oration. He said: "I remember a touching incident in the history of our deceased friend. Our departed friend at one time was the president and cashier of the Wolfsburg Savings Bank, and the Savings Bank broke, and a committee of depositors waited upon him, and asked what had become of the funds they had placed in that institution. Our departed friend drew himself up to his full height, and his breast swelling with patriotism, he said: 'Gentlemen, I forget what I have done with the funds, but I cannot allow this auspicious occasion to pass without assuring you of my unalterable devotion to the constitution and laws of the United States and to the flag that floats over us.'" That may be the kind of patriotism that dwells in the breasts of hon. gentlemen opposite. That, at all events, is the style of their argument. They rise to debate a question, a serious question, a financial question, a question of great import, whether we shall add to our public debt nearly one-fifth more than it is now; they rise to discuss that, never having, judging from their utterances, taken the trouble to read what partial returns are before us, and they think they are making argument and replying to us enough if, when we ask them: "Have you read the returns in reference to this matter; do you know anything in reference to this stock operation?" they say: "Oh, no; we do not want to know, all we care to know is that our devotion to the flag is unalterable; we are patriots." If we ask them: "Are you prepared to shut your eyes and vote this money blindly?" they say: "We do not care about the money, but we assure you there is a feeling in our breasts of undying patriotism." If that is the patriotism that these gentlemen are talking about, this patriotism for revenue and for revenue only, then we deny having it on this side, and we desire

not to have it; long may we be without it; for, if there is anything more disgusting or revolting, if there is anything which is more of a stench to the nostrils than another, it is a man who, when unable to maintain his own in argument, will, in the guise of either religion or patriotism, seek to cover up crimes or misdeeds that he may have been guilty of. But, if they mean that patriotism which is true patriotism, if they mean that love of country that should be deep in the heart of every citizen of a free country, if they mean to charge upon the members of this side of the House that we are lacking in that, I hurl back the charge in their teeth, I defy them to the proof, either by word or by deed. I charge not upon them anything of that kind. I merely remind them of this fact, that they made two statements, one of which must, I think, not be true. They charge that the Liberal party and the Liberal press—and they admit its powerful influence for evil if not for good—are damaging and destroying this country, that we, in part, have helped to wreck the credit of this Company, that we are decrying our country and preventing immigration from coming in, and doing vast harm to this country; they charge that upon us because they say we point out certain things which we consider are not right in this country, because we say there is a railway monopoly that holds within its grasp men who ought to be free in the North-West country, and they say we are doing harm to our country by pointing out evils which exist in it. What effect then must the utterances of these hon. gentlemen have upon the well-being of this country, if they believe what they say or think anyone else will believe it, when they proclaim broadcast to the people of the world that one-half, or nearly one-half of the people of Canada, and the most influential portion of the press in Canada, are without a spirit of patriotism and are working for the destruction of their country. That is what the hon. gentlemen opposite are doing. They must think that no one would believe what they say, or they would forever hold their peace from saying that the Liberal party and the Liberal press are crying down their country; for they would, if men believed them, do more to injure their country in that way than by anything else. People would rather come to a country where there was a monopoly clause and a charter than to a country where the people were divided, one-half of them seeking the destruction of the country in which they dwell. They know that, in making this charge, they are but seeking to cover up a case they are not able to argue upon its merits, and I would propound to the hon. gentlemen this question: if they want to evince that spirit of patriotism which they say dwells in their breasts to such an extent, as they charge us with unpatriotism and say we only voice it when we are in opposition on this side of the House, and are doing such injury to the country, why cannot they, out of the depths of the patriotism of their patriotic souls, say, "True, we are on the Treasury benches; true, it is nice to be here; but there is such a spirit of patriotism in us that, as we can stop your unpatriotic cries if we let you into our places, we will step out and invite you into them?" They are not capable of a spirit of patriotism of that kind, but they will remain over there, and cling to their benches, and, introducing measures that are questionable, and in my judgment, more than questionable in the best interests of the country, will seek to make up for lack of argument by endeavouring—I use the word advisedly—to abuse the men who sit opposite to them, and stand their peers in Parliament, and have a right to express their views, and do it, they believe, conscientiously and in the best interests of the country. We have been taunted as being a small band on this side of the House, as a party it is not worth arguing with, for we are but a small handful, and time and again hon. gentlemen opposite have not thought it beneath their dignity to rise and point to the smallness of

our number and taunt us with it. The member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) hesitated not to do it last night. In his most offensive way, he referred to the member for South Huron as a gentleman who had lost his election and could not find a seat in the House. He was unable to carry his county, and why? Because of an Act that ought to bring the blush of shame to that gentleman's cheek. Does he not know that he was one of the party sitting in the last Parliament that used their powers as a majority to perpetrate and put upon the Statute Book, to enact and put on the Statute Book of Canada, a law that I say, Mr. Speaker, ought to bring the blush of shame to the face of every man who voted for it, whenever he hears it mentioned. It was conceived in the spirit of—I do not know whether I am allowed to use the word cowardice in Parliament or not, but it was a law that was conceived in that spirit which lacks that element of fair play that is so dear to every Briton. When, by their overwhelming numbers these hon. gentlemen introduced a measure that had been meditated upon day and night, presided over, I was told, by the hon. Minister of Customs in a secret committee, introduced in the dying days of the Session, and voted for by the majority of this House, and by which almost every hon. member of the Opposition in the Province of Ontario was struck at that it was possible for them to strike at, because they dared not face the Liberal party before the electors of this country—I say, Mr. Speaker, cannot the word cowardice be applied to that Act? And we have the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) talking about the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) being out of this House for one Session! And why not? He, unlike myself, and many others in this House, had not his constituency remodelled, but he had it wiped out altogether; and so effectually was it wiped out that the hon. gentleman himself, while speaking last night, did not appear to know who represented South Huron and who represented West Huron; and some hon. gentleman sit there, not by virtue of the will of the people of this country, but because they passed a law by which the mind of the people could only be unfairly expressed, and they consequently sent a small minority to this House to represent almost a majority of the people. Yes, the hon. member for Lincoln was one of those gentlemen. Sir, I say to you that it would not have been so bad for members on that side of the House, including the hon. member for Lincoln, had they simply done this in the spirit of craven fear that beset them; but they went to the electors in the last election, having taken care, as they generally did, to have Conservative territory added to their own in order to keep their seats. I believe, Sir—I speak subject to correction, I may be mistaken, but I believe I am correct—I believe that that hon. gentleman sits here to-night as a representative of the people by virtue and by grace of the Gorrymander Act, that gave him strength he would not have otherwise.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I would have had a majority of seventy-five in the old territory.

Mr. PATERSON. I have spoken subject to correction; I hesitated to make the charge because I was not positive. I am not therefore in the position of one who has anything to retract. But what I have said, speaking under correction, has been heard by the members of this House, and what he has said has been heard by the members of this House. The returns of the General Election of 1878 can easily be had, and will show the townships that his county now comprises, and we can find out whether, by the alterations that were made by that Act, that hon. member strengthened himself thereby. And having strengthened himself in that way, he has the manliness to rise here and taunt men on this side of the House that were legislated out of their seats, with misrepresenting the people. If he

had a particle of feeling in him he would be the last man that would ever attempt to cast such a taunt across the floor of the House. There are hon. gentlemen beside him who sit there by virtue and by grace of the Gerrymander. They did not dare to go before the electors until they had strengthened themselves by this sort of legislation. But, Sir, they went further than that. Not content with taking care of themselves, they determined that the men of this side who had to go before their constituents, should go there bound by the legislative fetters they have placed upon them, and in an unequal combat. Sir, in spite of all that, there are still a band of Liberals in this Parliament, undaunted and undismayed by the overpowering numbers that are against them, who will every time stand up in their place, and when they see a measure introduced by this Government that they conceive is opposed to the interests of the country, they will rise and, in parliamentary style, but with all the force and vigour they possess, they will oppose that measure; and if they fail in opposing it successfully, they will not, at any rate, in the future have to regret that they did not put forth their efforts and do their duty in that direction. I do trust, Sir, that before this debate closes it will be found that not alone the members of the Liberal party, who have criticised these Resolutions, but that on the other side of the House there are also many who, weighing well the responsibility upon them, knowing in their inner consciousness that they know scarcely anything at all of the operations of this Company, will vote for the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron, who does not say we will not give them the money, but who does say: Before we do this it is necessary to have a Committee to enquire fully into the transactions of this Company, and report its position to this House. For that amendment I shall have much pleasure in recording my vote.

Mr. ROSS. In rising to address the House on these Resolutions, I do so with much diffidence, inasmuch as I am a young member, and as so many able speakers have preceded me. But when we consider the importance of this question to the North-West, and that the interests of the North-West are so nearly identical with those of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I think it but right that some member from the North-West should be heard on these Resolutions. Now, Sir, a good deal has been said with reference to the North-West by some hon. gentlemen who are not fully posted as to the facts. I propose to point out some mistakes that have been made. When this charter was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Government had completed a line of railway from Emerson to Selkirk, and east from that to Cross Lake, and from Winnipeg west to Portage la Prairie. The moment the Company got that charter they commenced the construction of a road from Portage la Prairie westward, with a rapidity that has been a source of pride to the people of the North-West. I think the hon. member for South Huron said it was a great disadvantage to the people of the North-West that this railway was built so rapidly. To a certain extent he is correct. To those people who were in the North-West previous to the granting of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, it has been a source of dissatisfaction and grumbling; and for this reason, that previous to the granting of the charter, there were two streams of emigration flowing into that country, taking Winnipeg as a starting point, one to the south-west, towards the Pembina Mountains and the Turtle Mountains, and the other by Portage la Prairie on to Shell River. The people who went in there expected a line of railway to pass their doors. The people in the south-west expected the road then controlled by Mr., now Senator, Schultz, to pass their doors; and the people in the north-west expected the Canadian Pacific Railway to pass their doors, because the Government in their maps laid down the line of Rail-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

way they were about to construct as running in that direction, and the people therefore settled there. When the work of construction began, people, instead of striking out in a north-westerly direction, settled along the line of railway. What was the result? The people already settled, instead of finding markets, found no markets; there was a lack not only of a railway market, but they were not able to sell their produce, as previously, to incoming settlers. But I take it that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have their duties and other interests to look after than merely the interests of the original settlers in that country. The interest they had to serve was the interest of the whole Dominion. They had to build a railway from ocean to ocean as rapidly as it could be built; and in that rapid construction they have developed a country which otherwise would not have been developed as it has been. This is a very important consideration, looking at the matter from a Dominion standpoint. Some hon. gentlemen have said that this has been a disadvantage. I agree that it has been a disadvantage to the original settlers, but not to the new settlers and not to the Dominion as a whole. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) made a statement which I was sorry he uttered, because the paper which he edits and controls has shown a fair amount of justice to the North-West during the past years, so far as I have traced the course of that journal. The other night the hon. member made use of an expression which, as I have said, I was sorry to hear, for when the hon. member used it it was not spoken out of his inmost soul, but in doing so he was pandering to the prejudices of certain people in eastern Canada. When he compared the people of the North-West with the early settlers of Ontario, he forgot that they were placed in entirely different positions. We are now at the end of the nineteenth century. Who were the original settlers of Canada? People who had to leave England, Scotland and Ireland, in order to make room for sheep farms. The hon. gentleman said he had heard the tales of early settlers in Ontario. I have not only heard them, but I have seen the difficulties for myself, and I know what the early settlers had to put up with. The settlers who went from the north of Scotland had to make room for sheep farms, and on leaving they saw the smoking ruins of the cottages in which their forefathers were born. They crossed the ocean after a three months' voyage. When they reached this side, the bridge was broken, and there was before them either destitution or success. These people settled up Ontario and made it what it is to-day. But at that time the United States had no field for immigrants to compare with Ontario. At that time their great West was a sealed book, and was unknown; but, to-day, when inviting people to go to the North-West, we have competitors in the great western States, and in the north-western States, which have equal and similar advantages with our country, a better climate, and more favourable conditions, but not so fertile a soil, and we must make ready use of our advantages. When the early settler came into Ontario, he carved out a home for himself, although many men were digging their grave by so doing. What capital did they require? Their only capital was an axe, a harrow and a few other things of trifling cost, and even on these there was no National Policy. They went to work, built a cabin, made fences, and put in crop, and in the winter they were able to go and earn money in the shanties, and they did not require much. What does the settler in the North-West require? He requires lumber, at from \$25 to \$30 per M. for his house, wire for fences, posts, and all sorts of agricultural implements; and these are difficulties with which the people in the North-West have to contend, and which they never experienced in Ontario. I would ask the hon. member if he would be satisfied to go back to the old days and travel in a stage coach, because his father did? If the Grand Trunk had a strike on hand

and an election were pending in Cardwell, and the electors were as anxious as the hon. gentleman for him to visit the constituency, would he be satisfied to take a stage coach, because his father in Ontario did? I think not. We must offer similar advantages in the North-West to what the Americans offer, and that we are endeavouring to do, by opening up the country and making land laws and regulations to suit settlers. A great deal has been said with respect to the misrepresentations of the press. As a Reformer in the North-West, I feel very strongly on this subject. I say that the Reform press throughout Ontario has misrepresented the North-West. I have pointed it out to leading members of the press, that they are misrepresenting and doing a great injustice, not only to the country but to the farmer, and that if they adopted a different course, nine-tenths of the people in the North-West would be in thorough accord with the Reform party. But they have adopted an entirely different course. The *Globe*, the leading Reform newspaper, was one of the very first to advocate the interests of the North West, and it pointed out that it had a great future before it. But a change came over that journal. After the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was passed, some of the papers, I will not say all, misrepresented that country. Last winter the *London Advertiser*, one of the most influential Reform papers, started into circulation a report that a whole family in my constituency had been frozen to death. It went into the facts that a blizzard came on, that the family were frozen to death, not possessing any firewood. It mentioned the man's name, and where he came from—in Ontario. A long time elapsed before the truth was found out. The leading Reform paper of Manitoba, the *Winnipeg Free Press*, set itself to work with vigour and energy to find out what amount of truth was in the statement. It found out that there was no such man in the part of the constituency to which reference was made. The man lived in Winnipeg; he and his family were comfortable; they had never seen a blizzard in their lives; they had never suffered from want of wood, and whenever they required it, they went to the market and bought it. I found that this lie travelled not only through Ontario, but when I was in England, last summer, it was being circulated all over the United Kingdom and was being copied by the press. The same paper last fall, when the report was in circulation that there was very serious damage done by frost in the North-West, took credit to itself for being one of the first to let it be well known that serious damage was done in the North-West. This was done for selfish purposes, to make a few hundred thousand dollars from buying grain in the North-West. It is a falsehood, as far as the amount of damage really done by frost is concerned. The report was circulated first by the largest grain buyer in the country. It was conceived in greed and brought forth in iniquity, properly clothed, and nourished, and started forth in the world by a petty party press. It was first circulated here, and is now being circulated all over England and being republished through Europe. That journal said:

"One of the reasons for a large wheat crop in the North-West is the slowness with which it matures, but this is wholly due to the fact that the ground freezes to a great depth; that it takes the whole summer to thaw out. The temperature of the soil is therefore kept at a very low point throughout the season, and the risk from frosts is proportionately greater. If your correspondent could prove that there are no greater risks than here, he would at the same time prove that the productiveness of the country, as a wheat region, has been grossly exaggerated."

I would simply state that the writer's argument is all false. To begin with, he says that the frost goes down a great depth in the ground. But it is for that very reason we have an abundant harvest. The experience in Russia, which, is the great wheat-growing country in Europe, is that when they have very little snow but heavy frost during winter, in the following summer there is a heavy

wheat crop. The same experience prevails in Minnesota. In the North-West, no doubt, the frost goes down deep, and when the hot season approaches the frost is coming out of the ground and stimulates the growth of the grain, and it is on this account that the growth in the North-West is more rapid than in any part of Canada. Sir, the whole argument is a fallacy. He goes on to say in another part:

"When our correspondent says that the wheat crop of Manitoba and the North-West will average twenty bushels to the acre, we believe he is altogether mistaken. We are certain that the winter wheat crop of this western peninsula will not average anything like ten bushels to the acre, and our information convinces us that the estimate of our correspondent is altogether erroneous. One farmer from the vicinity of Turtle Mountain informs us that his average this year will be about twelve bushels, and the average beyond the boundaries of Manitoba in some places are reported as high as twenty, but in others much less. But whether believed to be more or less, is a matter of no consequence. It cannot change the result."

What has the average of crop of one single farmer to do with the average of the whole country, or the average of the crop in the western Peninsula to do with that of Manitoba? I wish to speak about this damage by frost. The leader of the Opposition made use of an expression which I wish to have explained. He said there was a liability to frost in a certain portion of that country. Now, I would like to ask him what portion of the country does he refer to, because our territory extends to the Arctic Ocean, and he may mean the Mackenzie River. Or does he mean that what happens once may happen again? If that is what he means, I accept the statement, because that frost not only visited us, but extended far south, as far as Iowa and other States where frost had never been known before. If he means that, then the liability to frost extends not only to the North-West, but over a large portion of this continent, and we are not more liable to frost there than in any other part of Canada. I have seen nine harvests reaped in the North-West, and I never saw the effects of frost before. I have seen delicate varieties of flowers growing in my own garden at the end of September, and even as late as the 5th of October. Last year, however, it was different; but, as I have stated, this was an exceptional year not merely in Manitoba but for a long distance south of it. I would also give the evidence of Senator Sutherland, who is a native of that country, who has lived in it a lifetime, and who informed me that he has never seen damage by frost for the last thirty years; and if that is the case, I think we can safely say that so far as any liability to frost is concerned, we share that liability with the rest of Canada and a large portion of the United States. Now, Sir, there was a statement made in a letter to the *Globe* the other day, to which I wish to refer. The writer said:

"The people and Parliament of Canada would do well to consider the fact that the building of the Pacific Railway is a national speculation at best. The North-West has certainly not yet been proved a country in which agriculture will flourish, or be more than a most precarious occupation. If 1882 and 1883, were years of normal climate in Manitoba, grain-growing there is a lottery with a very large proportion of blanks. Before pledging the credit of the country for \$35,000,000 more, it would surely be well to wait for evidence that the frosts of 1883 and the floods of 1882 did not make them abnormal years. Mr. Stephen says that his Company can fulfil their engagements, but if not granted aid now must call a halt for five years. A halt is just the thing that will suit the general interest. It cannot harm any public interest or any interest that Parliament can legitimately befriend, while it will give time to learn the truth as to the capabilities of the North-West before making the expenditure of many millions that should not be expended, unless the North-West will certainly return the money, principal and interest."

Now, Sir, that statement is most damaging. With regard to the floods in the North-West, that is another matter as to which the newspapers have exaggerated to such an extent, that it is wonderful to find that their statements are believed by anybody. I believe they had floods in Montreal the other day, and to talk about the injury by floods in the North-West is about the same thing as to say that the floods in Montreal injured the whole of Canada, the whole of the eastern States, and nearly all the midland States, as far as

the Mississippi. The floods extended over a few thousand acres along the line of the Red River, and were very limited in extent. I was astonished at meeting some of my friends from Ontario, who came up to that country who owned land 40 or 50 miles away from the Red River—I say I was astonished at their asking me the following summer how many feet of water was on their land at the time of the Red River floods. Their idea seemed to be that the whole country was covered; and when you take into account the fact that the portion which was flooded at that time was but the merest fraction of the whole country, and that even at places a short distance away from Winnipeg, such as Portage la Prairie, Brandon, &c., the floods were unknown, you will have some idea of the effect of these floods, and of the amount of damage that is likely to be done by similar floods in future. The *Globe* says again in an editorial article:

“What benefit has Ontario derived thus far from the opening up of the North-West, or what benefit is it likely to receive that would justify the imposition of burdens so heavy upon our people? We have seen the very flower of the youth of this Province allured to the West by what was said of the fertility of that region and of its vast resources, and we saw thousands of those young men, after much of their means had been wasted, forced to return, or driven wholly out of Canada, by the monstrous regulations framed in the interest of speculator and monopolist. We have seen the value of real estate in this Province greatly reduced because of the outflow of the population.”

Now, Sir, I maintain that a paper of the standing which the *Globe* has in Canada, advocating the rejection of these Resolutions, and giving as a reason for so doing, that the young men of Ontario had gone to the North-West, and that, therefore, this Province should not be called upon to do any more for that Company, is something like the position the New York *Herald* would occupy if it argued that Congress should not pass any Bills in assistance of a line of railway passing through that country across the Rocky Mountains, simply because the young men of New York State, and other States, in the east, had gone to better their condition in Colorado and Wyoming, and that, therefore, it was a damage to the country. Another question has been referred to, and that is the colonization companies and the monopoly provisions, as they are called. Here is what the *Globe* of October 19th, says:

“A correspondent of the *Globe* is quoted to prove that larger quantities of free lands ready to be homesteaded have been discovered in Liegar, and that there has been a rush for them. That this discovery is made only now, shows how bad the management has been. That there was such a rush for those lands only proves that settlement would have proceeded more rapidly had it not been obstructed by monopoly.”

Now, Sir, with regard to these very lands, I have only to say that they have nothing whatever to do with the monopoly; that they are outside of the railway belt, and that they are not covered by the colonization companies' grants. I tried my best to settle those lands years ago, but could not. The people coming in then were determined to rush westward, and nothing could stop them; they were bound to get ahead of the construction party on the railway in order to get first choice, and when they reached the Rocky Mountains, then, and then only, did they come to the conclusion that they had better get lands in the eastern part of the North-West. Then it was that these settlers wisely decided to settle on these lands within 40 miles of Winnipeg. With regard to what was said by the hon. member for Grey, the other evening, that some young men from his part of the country had gone there, and could not get land, I have only to tell him that to-day I can take his friends and place them on as fine land as the sun shines upon within 50 miles of Winnipeg, and that I can place settlers on these lands to the number of hundreds or thousands. The truth is, that I have seen people going up there like the wandering Jew, going over as fine lands as could be found anywhere, not once or twice, but five or six times, and they still remained unsatisfied, and would not be satisfied even if improved farms were given them. These are the kind of men

Mr. Ross.

who try to find an El Dorado, who try to get perfect farms. I saw a party of them in the neighbourhood of the Souris settlement, in as fine a country as the sun shines upon, searching amongst thousands of acres of magnificent country, and still they could get nothing to suit them. These same gentlemen have come up there, and they have come back; and if they ever get to heaven, they will not be satisfied to stay there, because some of the choicest seats, in their opinion, will be taken up. Another question has arisen with regard to the North-West. Various newspapers have published articles to show that our land laws are not so favourable to settlement as those of the United States. Although some mistakes have been made, I say that the regulations in settlements where there are no reservations, are more favourable than those of the United States. The *Globe* of the 17th of October last, says:

“The right of preemption was one of the most effectual means of promoting settlement in the western States. This was abolished by statute last year. The effect of such abolition must be to discourage settlement.”

Now, Sir, I hold that preemption as it is known in Canada, does not exist in the United States. What is called preemption there is an entirely different thing, although we have in Canada also what passes for preemption in the United States. I wish to settle this matter once for all, because a great deal of discussion has taken place upon it which need not have taken place. I will read the laws of the United States on this subject:

“Heads of families, widows or single persons (male or female) over the age of twenty-one years, citizens of the United States, or who have declared their intention to become such under the naturalization laws, may enter upon any offered or unoffered lands, or any unsurveyed lands to which the Indian title has been extinguished, and purchase, not exceeding 160 acres, under preemption laws.”

Now, Sir, there is no such thing as the privilege of getting a preemption alongside of a homestead. Any man who gets a preemption in the United States cannot get a homestead. The United States law further says:

“A preemptor may submit proofs of residence at any time after six months and obtain title to his land. At any time before expiration of time allowed for proof and payment, the settler may convert his preemption claim into a homestead. No person who abandons his residence upon land of his own to reside upon public lands in the same State or Territory, or who owns 320 acres of land in the same State or Territory, is entitled to the benefits of the preemption laws. The latter provision does not apply to a house and lot in town.”

Now, what is the meaning of this law? That if any man wishes to take up land in the United States he can do so, and he can get that land in one year as a preemption by paying for it; but he must not own even 320 acres in his own right, and, moreover, he cannot leave his homestead and take up a preemption, for a homesteader must live on his homestead, and a preemptor must live on his preemption. Therefore, no man can have a homestead and a preemption in the United States. That is the pre-emption law of that country. Another advantage we possess over the United States is that we have second a homestead entry, while they have not. We provided for this last Session, so that any man can now take up a second homestead in the North-West, after he has got his patent for his first one. Therefore, I claim that our land laws are, on the whole, much more liberal than those of the United States. Now, Sir, the course taken by certain portions of the press, and by those who are opposed to the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been identical. Both are opposed to the North-West, and the effects of their opposition have been most disastrous in England, not only to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but to the North-West, for the interests of both are identical. I believe a great deal of the abuse which has been published against the North-West, with regard to frosts, &c., has been published in order to injure the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The effect is to injure both, to impair the value of the Canadian Pacific Railway stock in the English money markets, to check immigration and

the investment of capital in the North-West, and to cause general stagnation of business over the whole of that country. There have been other causes for that stagnation, but these things have helped to increase it. Is there any foundation for these attacks which have been made on the Canadian Pacific Railway? Is there anything in the nature of the North-West to show that it would not support a railway? I hold that in Manitoba alone there is going to be business enough to support the Canadian Pacific Railway. Take the statistics of last year, which have been collected by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture for the Province, who has been very active and painstaking in collecting them. They show that last year there were 457,216 acres under cultivation, of which 208,674 were under wheat, yielding an average of 23.69 bushels to the acre, making a total yield of 4,799,571 bushels. It was thought at the time these reports appeared that the average yield claimed was too great—that the result would not bear it out. The Deputy Minister, with his accustomed energy, went to work and got returns from the threshers in the different parts of the Province, and they bore out his report within a fraction. Our export this year is about 2,500,000 bushels. Now, Sir, we have an estimate that next year there will be 377,624 acres in wheat which, at twenty bushels to the acre, will give a total product of 7,552,480 bushels. In addition to these, I have got statistics from the assistant land commissioner of the Canadian Pacific Railway, showing the amount of breaking and back-setting in the North-West Territories. The statement he furnishes shows that 87,000 acres of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands alone are broken and back-set, ready for seeding next spring. If they yielded twenty bushels of wheat to the acre, that would add 1,740,000 bushels. I have not been able to learn the exact number of sections of Government land which have been settled in the North-West, outside of Manitoba, but a large addition can be made on that account. These figures show that the total yield of wheat in the Province and the territories next year under ordinary circumstances will be 9,293,480 bushels, so that we shall have at least 6,000,000 for export. That may not seem a very large amount; but when we consider that during the past year the total exportation on the St. Paul and Manitoba road, which has the largest percentage of the wheat carrying trade of all the railways in America, and has two lines of railways besides running parallel through the Red River Valley, amounted to 13,000,000 bushels, and that that road will carry this year no more than 16,000,000 bushels, we may conclude that the North-West will do pretty well if, in the second year of its exportation, it will have a surplus of 6,000,000. In the following years the product will increase much more largely. At this rate of progress, I estimate that the wheat yield in five years from to-day will be over 20,000,000 bushels in the Province of Manitoba, of which we will have at least 16,000,000 for exportation, or as much as the St. Paul and Manitoba road have carried over their line this year. This is more than the Canadian Pacific Railway could really carry out of the country. Taking the 30,000 farmers now in Manitoba, and supposing that each cultivated only thirty-five acres of wheat, and that each acre gave twenty bushels, we will in five years have a yield of 21,000,000 bushels, that is if immigration should entirely cease, and these farmers should only cultivate thirty-five acres each; but with the large number of immigrants coming in every year it is impossible to give even an approximate amount of the production in the time. Yet we are told that there will not be sufficient traffic to make the Canadian Pacific Railway pay expenses. I hold, on the contrary, that the traffic on that road is going to be so great that the Canadian Pacific Railway will not be able to carry it all. The hon. Minister of Railways, I think, went over the mark when he said that 320 acres would be cultivated by a single man; but supposing in seven years from to-day there would be 100,000

farmers in the North-West—and this would only give us 50,000 a year of increased population—and supposing that each one cultivated 80 acres, yielding twenty bushels an acre, that would give 160,000,000 bushels. If we cannot do this in seven years we can do it in twelve, for it is certain there will be more than 100,000 farmers there then. Take the wheat grown in India. It is not ten years ago since wheat was begun to be exported from that country. In 1875 1,500,000 bushels were exported from India to England; last year 35,000,000 bushels were exported. From the American continent the exportation last year was about 75,000,000, making a total of 110,000,000 from India and the whole American continent. I am satisfied that under favourable circumstances and with the progress our North-West is making, we will be able in twenty years at furthest to send as much wheat to Europe as was sent from the whole American continent and India in the past season. This means that the Canadian Pacific Railway will not be able to do the work in a few years, and before long they will be building a double track from Winnipeg to Port Arthur; in five years they will have more trade than they can carry, and it is important that other outlets for the carrying trade should be provided, for the growing trade of the North-West is not confined to wheat alone. We have a large cattle trade in the ranches of the West to develop, and a lumber trade, and the minerals and mines to be developed, which will furnish a large amount of traffic. Next season, I am satisfied, we shall have 10,000 men prospecting in the Rocky Mountains and opening up new avenues of trade. Look also at our large coal fields. In one section of land alone there are 11,000,000 tons. And when I say that we have thousands of those sections, you will be able to form some idea of the vast amount of coal in that region. The lumber and coal trade will furnish a large traffic for the railway, and these products will be all sent to the eastern part of the territory, while the cattle will be sent to eastern Canada. In view of the rapid development that is going to take place in the North-West, it is more necessary to the people of eastern Canada that the road should run to the north of Lake Superior than it is to the people of the North-West, who, to-day, have their outlet by Port Arthur, which gives them all the outlet they require, and a winter outlet by St. Paul. But if the people of eastern Canada want to control the trade of the North-West, it is absolutely necessary the line should be built north of Lake Superior. How is the general trade and merchandise of the country to be carried if not carried over that road, otherwise a large portion of it will go by St. Paul and Chicago. It is said that the construction of the Hudson Bay road would be disastrous to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I hold the contrary opinion. I believe that if the construction of that road were started to-morrow it would give such an impetus to enterprise, it would so develop the energy of the people, and trade would so rapidly increase, that the Canadian Pacific Railway would, in the meantime, receive great benefits; and if the road were built to Hudson Bay the traffic would be so great that both roads would have all they could carry. It would be very important to the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the Government, and the whole country, that the Hudson Bay road should be started as speedily as possible, and the more we consider the North-West the stronger must be our conviction that not only two but a dozen lines of railway will be necessary there in the near future. A great deal has been said about the land along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, west of Moose Jaw, and I was prejudiced myself against the land owing to the reports made of it. But I have since travelled over it and I have travelled over the land along the lines of the Union Pacific, Kansas Pacific and the Northern Pacific, and I can state from my experience and from the knowledge I have of the soil—and I profess to have some knowledge of soils—that the land along the line of

the Canadian Pacific Railway is better than that along the lines of the three American roads. There is no line of railway in America of the same length as this 900 miles, which passes through such good average land as that through which this passes. For 300 miles west of Moose Jaw, there is better soil to be found than along any 300 miles of railway in Canada. The soil, Sir, is excellent. But here comes the question about the dryness of the climate. I have my own opinion about that. I saw farms cultivated on the Union Pacific and on the Northern Pacific, with drier climates, producing good and fair crops, and if they can produce fair crops in that climate, I do not see why we cannot produce as good crops in the North-West, where the climate is not so dry, where there is more moisture, and where the soil is infinitely better. I examined the grass in the North-West country, and I came to the conclusion that, where such grass as that can be grown, though it does not compare with the grass in the western part of that vast plain, there is moisture enough in the soil to produce any quantities of crops we wish. The great thing for the settlers in the North-West to do is to sow their grains either late in the fall or in the early spring, or on the snow, and I am satisfied that, with the moisture of the snow and with the early rains, the crops will be prepared to stand any drought in the summer. People in travelling across that country come to the conclusion that, because the grass is short, the country must be poor. If you took a gentleman from Kansas, who never saw a wooded country in his life, and brought him through Canada and showed him a hemlock and pine forest, and the magnificent trees in it, and then showed him a forest of beech and elm, with its underbrush, he might, in the same way, come to the conclusion that, in the hemlock forest, where the trees were so large, the soil is very fine, and that, in the smaller forest, the soil is inferior. It does not follow, but the reverse is the case. The grass which grows in the North-West plains is peculiar to the country along the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, and it does not follow that, because the grass is short and apparently withered, the soil is poor. That grass is peculiar grass, and when people travelling over that country in August or September, or even in July, see the grass brown and coloured, they come to the conclusion that the country is withered up and good for nothing, whereas the grass is hay with its roots attached to the soil, which is undergoing or has undergone a curing process. That is why it is fit for ranche purposes. If it did not undergo that curing process in the summer months, it would be good for nothing in the winter for stock; and that is not confined to the North-West, but is the case throughout that plain, and extends down to Texas, and that is why the people do not understand the nature of the soil in that country. I hold, further, that in no part of the American continent—and I think I have travelled on most of the line through the best parts of the United States—do you find so much good land in one solid bulk as in the North-West, and this is the country that is to support the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why, Mr. Speaker, in that vast country we have a heritage that the people of the North-West themselves have not yet commenced to realize, and the people in eastern Canada have not commenced to dream about. The people in eastern Canada seem to think they know all about the North-West because they have read about it. They know no more about it, they have no more clear and defined idea of it, than they have of heaven from reading about it. They have a vague and indefinite idea, but they must go there and see for themselves before they can realize what it is. The extent of that country is so vast, its resources are so varied, that we who have been there for years have not yet commenced to take in the situation and realize the future which is in store for us. In that country there is an infant, in swaddling clothes, if you will, spoon-fed, perhaps, but he feels within

Mr. Ross.

him the power of a mighty giant, which, in the future, will be felt in eastern Canada, as well as throughout the world; and we hope that, when that day arrives, when that power is felt by eastern Canada and the rest of the world, the people in eastern Canada will take pride in it, and recognize the fact that it is part of one common heritage. We are only now beginning to feel the dawn of inspiration of our future greatness coming over us, and before it rises into meridian splendour, we hope the people of eastern Canada will begin to see some faint streaks of that future splendour. I hope and trust they will. One question that comes home to us is, what is going to be the cost of transportation of grain in that country? Is it to be so cheap that the farmers in the North-West can make a living? If not, then the country is a failure, and the Canadian Pacific Railway is a failure also. I find that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be able to take grain from Winnipeg to Montreal, *via* Port Arthur, for 25 cents a bushel at most. Take grain in Chicago. It takes about 8 cents to 9 cents a bushel, take it year after year, to bring grain from Chicago to Montreal. Now, the grain in the North-West, our hard wheat in the North-West, is worth about 10 cents a bushel more than the grain of Chicago, showing that they have only a few cents the advantage over us in the wheat-growing trade of our country in the future. Take the prices to-day in the Winnipeg market. First-class grain that has not suffered from frost is only 13 cents a bushel less than wheat sold in Chicago. If that is the price to-day, if the Canadian Pacific Railway sees fit in their wisdom—and I believe they will—to build large elevators for the storage of grain at Port Arthur, elevators which will store millions and millions of bushels, to bring it down in the winter time and store it and send it on by lake boats in the summer, I feel satisfied that grain can be taken in that way from Winnipeg to Montreal nearly as cheaply as it can be taken from Chicago to the same port, taking into account the superior quality of our grain. Thus, I believe that the farmers in the North-West, if they get over their present troubles, if they get upon their feet again, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company acts with wisdom in regard to that country and in preparing proper elevators for the storage of grain, have a bright future in store for them, even if no other railways were built in the very near future. The opening of the line north of Lake Superior is very important to the people of Ontario. By that line grain urgently required by eastern millers will be conveyed, and a large share of the implements required by North-West farmers, purchased in eastern Canada, will go over this line before the opening of navigation, and the amount of passenger traffic will be very large. A great many people have said you were building this road for the North-West. You are doing nothing of the kind. The people in Winnipeg are satisfied even if the money is not to be spent there. Not one dollar of that money is to be spent there, but most of it on the line east of Port Arthur, in the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec, or, at least, it will filter through those channels. We may get some of the money spent in the Rocky Mountains, though, judging from the past, it will be only a small portion of the money paid on construction in the mountains that will be spent in Winnipeg. But it is not for the people of Winnipeg, but for the people of Canada that that road is to be built. In the Province of Ontario, the railway is opening up and developing 8,000,000 of acres of arable land along the line. We in Winnipeg do not grumble at that. We only hope it will open up 80,000,000 of acres of arable land, and so make it more successful than it otherwise would be. We have been bearing our fair share of the burdens of the country. We went into Confederation knowing we should have to bear our full share of those burdens. We are prepared to do so. We have paid more *per capita* than the rest of the people of Canada.

We have put up with the National Policy, and this is the first year we have ever grumbled, because the people of the North-West believed that, in the interests of Canada, the National Policy was necessary, in view of the vast expenditure of money which was going on. As all the rest of Canada believed, in its wisdom, that the National Policy should be passed, we did not grumble, though we were the principal sufferers. The farmers of the North-West were buying their implements, but they did not grumble nor complain. The increase in duty was made last year, and the result was that the farmers, who were suffering from other causes, who were suffering as well from severe frosts, found the duty a grievous burden, in their opinion, and it is only now they are beginning to complain and wish the duty thrown off. We are prepared to take our fair share of responsibility in connection with the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we are not so interested as some people in eastern Canada imagine. A great deal has been said about the monopoly clause in the charter. That is not so important to the people of the North-West as some people seem to think. The monopoly clause does not affect the old Province of Manitoba, which was exempted from the operation of that clause. This is held by the Company, by the Government, and we hold it in the Local Legislature. But the Government considered it for the best interests of the country, and saw fit in their wisdom as they saw it to cancel some of these charters. But if you struck out the monopoly clause it would not make the position of Manitoba any better, because the Government could still exercise the power they have under the British North America Act, to cancel any charters connecting our country with the other Provinces, or with the United States. To do away with that monopoly clause would be of no benefit whatever, unless we had an assurance from the Government that they would never exercise that right again. But there is only one line of railway outside of the Hudson Bay Railway that could at all begin to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that is a railway that would come down to Duluth, and reach the nearest watering place where vessels can be loaded with grain. Therefore, I do not think the interests of Manitoba are so much affected that the monopoly clause should be struck out, because the Government can still exercise the same power under the British North America Act. Now, what would be the consequence of rejecting these Resolutions? The consequence would be a general paralysis and stagnation of business all through the North-West. To-day there are millions of money in England ready for investment in Canada, but capitalists there are waiting to see what we are going to do with these Resolutions and watching the future season in the North-West. In the past, English capitalists have invested in Canadian securities only to a small extent—excepting Government securities. They have invested in Grand Trunk securities, and we all know the result. They were dissatisfied; it is not a paying security; and the consequence is that English capitalists have been disinclined to invest in Canadian securities. They prefer to send their money to India, Australia, New Zealand and the United States. If you go to London you will find many business houses exclusively engaged in financial operations in these countries I have mentioned, but very few engaged in similar operations with Canada. But to-day English capitalists stand waiting to invest millions in our North-West in case the Canadian Pacific Railway Company succeeds in opening up that country. In the city of Denver, even, you will find many buildings erected by British capitalists, and that State and others have been developed almost entirely, or very largely, by English and Scotch capital. It is well known to-day that, if this railway goes on and develops that country as we expect it will, millions of money will flow into it, and we shall soon be independent of any foreign capital. In

that country, Sir, the people of Canada have a heritage so great that they scarcely deserve it, because they do not appreciate it. It is in that country that a true Canadian sentiment, of Canadian nationality, is to arise. It is there that the sons of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario are to be found labouring side by side, working out their own destinies, and at the same time working out the destiny of their country. And, Sir, if there is to be a Canadian national sentiment, a national sentiment such as is possessed by the people of the United States, you will find it growing up and taking root in the great North-West. To-day we are but a bundle of twines, and not a strong rope. I say that the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway will contribute to the rapid development of that country, and to the growth of a national sentiment. I hold that one of the most important needs of this country is to have one common feeling of sympathy and pride uniting the people of the several Provinces. We want a country that we, as Canadians, can feel proud of, and I think the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, giving us a line of railway from ocean to ocean, the largest line of railway in the world, with a country unsurpassed for fertility, and a climate almost perfect, I say, I think when we have a country thus opened up and developed, we shall be proud of it, and the national sentiment will become strong. Sir, there is no more intelligent and progressive people in this country than are to be found in Manitoba and the North-West. There are no more enterprising people anywhere than are to be found there; and none, Sir, so intelligent ever settled any Province or any State in the Union. I think, Sir, that if ever a Canadian sentiment is to arise at all, it will arise in the North-West. If there is ever to be a question on which we can all unite as one man, that question should be the development of the North-West, along with our national highway, and if we cannot agree on that, then, I say, Confederation is a failure. If the North-West is a failure, then Canada is a failure, and the sooner we realize that fact the better. Sir, the destiny of Canada, for the next five years, is involved in these Resolutions, is involved in the question now before the House, and hangs upon the vote to be given here to-night. If that question should be decided in a certain way, disaster and ruin would overtake, not only the North-West country by keeping back emigration and retarding its prosperity for many years, but disaster and ruin would overtake the whole of Canada. I say it would be very difficult indeed, for many years to come, to give such an impetus to the development of that country as the construction of this railway has been giving it for the last few years. It would shake the confidence of men who have invested there, or intend to invest there, and would seriously check emigration, and send a chill through the whole of the business circles of Canada. And, Sir, it is of the utmost importance that, just at this moment, when capitalists are thinking of aiding in developing our common country, we should not only throw no obstacles in the way and shake their confidence, but show that we had faith in that future ourselves. Mr. Speaker, I shall have much pleasure in supporting these Resolutions, not only, as I said, from a North-West standpoint, but from a Dominion standpoint, because I believe that if they fail, the result would be disastrous to both the North-West and the whole Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not propose to take up many minutes in discussing the question before the House, not that its importance would not justify me in doing so at a considerable length, even at this late hour, but, after so much has been said, I do not deem it necessary that I should address the House at any length now. With regard, however, to the remarks which have just fallen from the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), I may say, I am sure he has given us a most pleasing account of the natural resources of the

North-West, and I am sure that no one will more rejoice in the full development of those resources, than the hon. members who at present fill the important position of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this House.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh!

Mr. MULOCK. Hon. gentlemen on the other side appear to question that statement. They appear to think that they are the only friends whom the North-West has. I think that the future will show who are the best and truest friends of that great country. At all events, I think that it would be quite becoming hon. gentlemen opposite to allow gentlemen on this side of the House to express their views without interruption. I would prefer to hear the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) express his views on the floor of this House in the usual manner; he should recognize the fact that at present the member for North York is addressing the House. I was about to remark that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) has chosen to give his opinion as to the effects of the monopoly clauses on the interest of the North West. I am sure when he goes back to Manitoba the people will be pleased to learn his view as to the effect of those monopolies on their interests. He tells you that he attaches no value to the fact that these clauses are in the contract. He thinks it is no disadvantage to have them in the contract. And why? If they were not there, he says, the Federal Government, by virtue of their power to veto, could veto any Act granting a charter to a railway in Manitoba. Why, we are told every day now that, but for the vested rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, those powers would be withdrawn; and the Minister of Railways himself told us that he trusted, at no distant date, to be able to give relief to the North-West in this respect, and that Manitoba especially would be benefited by that concession.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him, as he labours under an entire misapprehension. I stated distinctly that the contract had no bearing on Manitoba; and why we propose to revise the policy of the late and present Government was not in regard to any provision in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but because we arrived at the conclusion that the interests of the country will be subserved by taking a different course.

Mr. MULOCK. When the Government exercised their power to disallow the charter for a railway from Winnipeg to the border line, it was disallowed as being an infringement of the rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. MULOCK. That is a matter at which we are at issue. The hon. member for Lisgar pleaded that one of the serious consequences expected to arise in case the contract was not rapidly completed, and in case the Resolutions were not passed, would be to paralyze the trade of that country. I ask the hon. gentleman what will be the position of the country at the end of two years. At that time, having gone ahead at break-neck speed, we shall come to a halt; and what hon. gentlemen opposite are now doing is but to postpone the event, which the hon. member for Lisgar says will certainly follow when work on the railway ceases. The hon. gentleman says he knows there are millions of money coming in for investment if these Resolutions are passed and the railway put through. Why, it is but a short time ago, in 1882, on the eve of the general election, since we were told officially that untold millions were awaiting investment in this country if the present Government were again returned to power. Has that prediction been fulfilled?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. No; I leave the country to pronounce on that question.

Mr. MULOCK.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Many millions have come in.

Mr. MULOCK. As I understand it, we have a simple issue before us to night. We have had but one official utterance from the Government, setting forth exactly their position in this matter. Supporters of the Government have expressed their views and have made numerous statements—as to their correctness I do not know—but we have only one official statement from the Government, and that is the statement furnished by the Minister of Railways, in moving the Resolutions, and on some subsequent occasions when he took the opportunity to address the House. If one reads these speeches of the hon. Minister, the burden of his remarks is to this effect: The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are able to complete their contract, they are seeking for no assistance whatever, they do not ask for the variation of a single feature in the contract, they are willing to be held to it in every letter; but the hon. gentleman says, it is to the interests of Canada to accelerate the time for the completion of the work, and for that consideration, and that consideration alone, he asks the country to place this large sum of money at the disposal of the Company. That, I believe, is the issue which he presents to the House. Now, I present this proposition: Before this Parliament ought to grant the desired aid to this work, even admitting the reasons assigned by the hon. Minister to be cogent and satisfactory reasons, Parliament must be satisfied that the Railway Company cannot, in the ordinary money markets of the world, obtain that financial assistance which will be necessary in order to enable them to accomplish what the Minister of Railways desires they should accomplish. I submit that they have not yet satisfied this House that they are in that position. The Minister of Railways has told us that they have in one way failed to obtain money—that they have failed in their efforts to sell sufficient stock to place them in funds to carry on the work. That is, so far as we know, the whole extent of their failure. It is true in passing he desired, and I think with some degree of unfairness, to charge that failure upon the Opposition and the Liberal party and press of the country. I think that the plan adopted on behalf of the railway Company to float their securities was in itself the cause of failure. It is well to be wise after the fact; but certainly, without assuming that they could have foreseen the future, there is the fact before us that they did adopt a certain policy which would convince anyone that they adopted the very worst policy in order to lead the public to take their securities. Having issued twenty millions of stock at a very great depreciation as regards its nominal value, namely, 25 cents on the dollar, is it reasonable to suppose that the general public, the money men of the world, are willing to become shareholders at very much higher prices? It is absurd to suppose that investors will be prepared to become shareholders and give 50 cents or 60 cents on the dollar, when they will only rank equally in the dividends with those who paid only 25 cents on the dollar. The failure to float their stock is attributable, then, I think, entirely to the mode adopted by the Company in order to dispose of their stock. But I say there is another course by which the Company might obtain relief, the course ordinarily adopted by railway companies in this country at least, and that is to endeavour to raise money by bonds. We see that the land grant bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are saleable and negotiable to-day—I think the quotation is about 98, a fraction under par. Why have not the Company attempted to raise money on the bonds in the usual way? Persons might be quite willing to advance money on bonds, thus obtaining priority over stock, while quite unwilling to come in as shareholders. Therefore, I say that until the Company has satisfied the House, until the Minister of Railways has satisfied the House, that money cannot be obtained

in this, the ordinary, regular way which railways adopt, the Company should not approach the House in the manner which has been adopted. I observe an attempt on the part of the hon. gentleman opposite to introduce into this question a false issue, to try and influence minds within this House and without it, by presenting to the public the alternative of passing these Resolutions or running the risk of the Grand Trunk Railway absorbing a large portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am not aware that such is the issue before the House. I would frankly admit that the country should make very considerable sacrifices to prevent what I would consider as not much less than a national calamity. On this point I believe all men must be agreed, that it would be detrimental to the interests of this country that there should be a complete railway monopoly; but when I say that, for I speak only for myself, I do not admit that the passage of these Resolutions is going to prevent that result. On the contrary, unless some further protection is afforded, the passage of these Resolutions will bring about that very result. It will enable the more powerful Company in the end to crush out the less powerful. From our present state between those two institutions, we will then be in the position of having enabled one railway to absorb the other—we will be in the position of having deposed King Log and set up King Stork. For these reasons, we should have that full enquiry which is asked for by the amendment; and unless it is granted, it will certainly appear that this House has been called on with undue haste at this season of the year to pass these Resolutions. Looking at the situation of things at present, I would ask what probability is there that this Company is going to stop the work. It is true we have a vague statement accompanied by a semi-official letter. But what evidence is that by which to establish to the House that the Company intends to stop work. On the contrary, I think the evidence furnished by the Minister of Railways goes to satisfy every reasonable man that the Company intend to continue the work. That hon. gentleman says that an army of 9,000 men are engaged in the work on the north shore of Lake Superior, that they did not stop on account of financial difficulties, and in fact have only discontinued operations in the mountain district by reason of the winter season having overtaken them. The whole position of the Company indicates, so far as one can judge, that they propose to carry on this work with their accustomed vigour. Certainly it is to the interest of the railway Company that they should do so. They have valuable franchises which are expiring; every year they have the road in working order is a year of profit to them, and therefore their interest is to finish it as rapidly as possible. The position of affairs indicates that they are completing it, and intend to complete it, as rapidly as they can. They have not furnished us with evidence that they are not able to complete it, that they cannot get money by bonding the road; and, therefore, I submit that the amendment is a most reasonable one, and that no harm will be occasioned by the adoption of the amendment which will enable a Committee of the House to obtain such evidence as in the absence of which this House will not be justified in pledging the credit of the country to such an enormous extent as is asked for.

Mr. LAURIER. Though this debate has already been protracted for a long time, and although hon. gentlemen opposite have certainly been prolific of arguments in favour of disposing of the Resolutions before the House, still they have been abstemious of explanations of the real question before Parliament, and that is, whether the reasons given to the House for advancing this large sum of money to the Company are adequate to the magnitude of the sacrifice which it is resolved to impose upon the country. The demand made upon the country is for no less than \$30,000,000.

That is a large sum for even the largest or wealthiest nation, but for a young nation like this, already burdened with a heavy debt, with liabilities ever increasing, with a revenue ever diminishing, such an additional burden might prove a cause of danger, and perhaps disaster, if the finances of the country happen to be otherwise crippled. The advance is one which should not be made unless it can be justified on the most urgent reasons of public interest. It is remarkable, Sir, that while the Company come here they do not pretend that they are unable to carry out their work according to the terms of the contract. They pretend, on the contrary, and assert, that they have abundant means to complete the works within the specified time, and the only reason they give is this: They say they have set to work to anticipate the time by five years, and that they want to complete the road by the end of 1885, and for these reasons, and for these reasons only, they ask the Government to grant them an advance of \$30,000,000. And the Government accede to their demand. Now, it is manifest that this is a departure from the policy adopted by the Government three years ago. The Minister of Railways, while introducing these Resolutions, said that nothing was changed in the contract, that it remained as it was. But everything is changed in the contract—there is a radical change. On the one hand you have the fact that the obligations of the Company are altered, and you have the fact on the other, that the obligations of the Government are also altered. But the question is, will this be the last change? If we are to gauge the future by what has taken place in the past, we may safely assert that this is not the last change, but that other changes will follow the present one. Without referring back to the policy of the Government, so far as the time when the policy of building the Canadian Pacific Railway was initiated, but only going back to the time when the present Government resumed power in 1878, we find that they have altered their policy no less than four times. In 1879, after resuming power, they came to Parliament with a new policy, and this policy was, that they were to build the railway with the price of the lands, supplemented, if possible, by aid from the Imperial Parliament. They had Resolutions passed by this House, setting apart 100,000,000 acres of land. These lands were to be placed in the hands of a Commission, and on that Board of Commissioners, the Imperial Government was to be represented. If that meant anything, it meant that the pulse of the British Government was to be felt, and if it was in sympathy, then the price of the lands was to be supplemented by good English money. The next Session they came with another policy, which was that the Government of Canada should build the railway and build it with the price of the land alone. That policy lasted for six months. In the fall of the same year, they came before this Parliament with the contract with the Syndicate, and we know the terms of that contract. The road was to be built by 1891, and the Government was to give to the Syndicate the constructed portion of the line, the parts under construction, \$25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land. That policy lasted for three years, and now we are in the presence of a new policy; that is, that the road instead of being completed in 1891, must be completed by 1885. Terms which were sufficiently onerous are to be supplemented by an advance of \$30,000,000. I repeat, is this to be the last change? There is at present through the country a feeling of uneasiness, and I believe that feeling is also pervading this House, that this is not the last change, but that the next change will be, that what is today before the House as an advance will turn out to be a gift. For my own part, looking at the power already wielded by the Company, looking at the appetite displayed by them, and their capacity for engulfing public money, I would as soon believe that the

waters would flow back from the sea to the lakes as that one cent of that money will ever come back from the Pacific Railway exchequer to the Dominion exchequer. In saying so, I do not mean in any way to impugn the sincerity of the Government. I am bound to believe that they are sincere. I am bound to believe that when they say that this is simply an advance, they mean that it will be simply an advance. But if I am sure they do not intend to deceive the House, I am sure they do deceive themselves; and is it unfair and unwarrantable to suppose that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are deceiving themselves when we recollect their past conduct? Why, Sir, no one supposed three years ago that they were not sincere when they told this House that this contract was to be final, that not one cent more was to go out of the Treasury of Canada for that road, but that henceforth the Canadian public would know what the road would cost. They did not intend to deceive the House at that time, but they deceived themselves. Now, what are the motives urged on this House for the advance of this sum of money? One motive, and the only one, advanced is this—that it is in the interest of Canada to anticipate by five years the terms set forth in the contract. Another motive has been put forward, though somewhat timidly—that we should make this advance, because if we do not do so, the Company will be bound to close their works, and their army of men would be left without employment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, I do not conceive that this is a very strong argument, and if it were pressed upon this House, it would be a dangerous precedent indeed. It is the communistic argument that the State is bound to give labour to those who have no labour.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no, no.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways takes issue with my statement. May I ask him what is the difference between the conduct of the present Government, who say to the House you must advance this money to that Company, because if you do not their employees will be without labour, and the conduct of the agitators in the streets of Paris to-day, who say to those who are out of employment: go and knock at the door of the Legislature and they will have to give you work. The difference is in the application, but not in the principle.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the difference, then? If I understand the hon. Minister, he gives this as a reason why we should vote the money, if we are to vote the money. Upon what reason do we vote it unless that when men are without employment we must give them employment?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, no.

M. LAURIER. Well, I shall be glad to hear at a future time for what reason this advance is to be made. At present, it seems to me that if we are to make this advance to the employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there can be no reason why the House should not furnish them with labour after the work is completed; and if we are to vote this money to give labour to these people, why should we not do the same for the operatives who have been thrown out of employment by the closing of the cotton mills since the National Policy has failed to give them the work that was promised them. The only motive adduced in favour of this grant, which has any force, is that we anticipate by five years the terms of the contract in regard to the completion of the work. Now, I am ready to admit that the speedy completion of the road would be of some advantage to Canada. That is not admitting much.

Mr. LAURIER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And under this arrangement will not cost us a dollar.

Mr. LAURIER. I think I shall show, before I close, that the hon. gentleman is totally reversing his policy by asking the House to make this advance. I say I am ready to admit that there is some advantage in having the road speedily opened; but what is the advantage? What substantial advantage has been shown to exist? No advantage that I can see, except that it is in the interest of the country that the road should be built when it is not built. I could understand the cogency of the motive if it were a fact that the North-West Territories were without access, if those fertile lands were locked up, and inaccessible to settlement. If that were the case, I would say that it would be worth a great sacrifice on our part to get that country opened for settlement. But am I again to repeat what is in the knowledge of everybody, that the North-West Territories are tapped by the railway system of the continent, and that there is communication with it by the lakes, and therefore not one more settler would go into that country if the road were opened through its whole length. It is true, we have heard it urged many times upon the floor of this House, as a reason why the road should be speedily opened, that settlers are liable to be enticed away from their destination by American agents, by passing over American territory. Well, Sir, it must be admitted, that that is a poor argument at best, because it is unlikely that more than a few stragglers will lag on the way, when we are told that immigrants are going into the North-West at the rate of 30,000 or 50,000 a year. I could understand the cogency of the argument if it were shown that the speedy construction of the road would have the effect of lowering the freights under which the people of the North-West Territories are now grumbling. But it is well known that the speedy completion will not have the effect of creating competition and of lowering the rates. It is known that all the lines of access to the North-West are now in the hands of this one Company, and therefore, whether we have three or four different lines, or only one, there will be no competition, and the freight tariff will remain the same as it is now. What exists to-day existed three years ago. Three years ago Parliament, knowing the facts which are presented to-day, deliberately entered into a contract for the completion of the road inside of ten years, at a cost of so much and no more; and nothing has since taken place why this policy should be departed from. If there is no valid reason in favour of these Resolutions, there are strong and potent reasons against them. The advance of this money means the early completion of the road, and the early completion of the road means an increased cost of construction. It is not in the interest of Canada that the road should be speedily built, if it should be dearly built. It is, on the contrary, in the interest of Canada that the road should be cheaply built, because it is manifest that if it is cheaply built it will have over all its competitors of the continent an advantage which must be a great benefit to the people of this country. It is manifest also that if the road is built at a dear price, that will be a permanent obstacle to a reduction in the freight rates under which the people of the North-West now grumble. The freights which to-day are imposed out of greed, will then have to be maintained out of necessity. Moreover, I hold that it is a vicious policy for a Government to run into debt and to mortgage its road, though the object be to speedily build it, and I can substantiate this argument by an authority which generally commands weight in this House—the authority of the hon. Minister of Railways himself. Last year he had occasion to give to this House his views with regard to a railway which mortgaged its property in order to carry out its undertaking. Speaking of the sale of the stocks of a company, he said:

"They are not bonds, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that he and every Canadian may thank God that they are not. I will tell him why. If they were bonds, when this great national road was completed, it would be in the position that the Union Pacific, the Central Pacific, and the Northern Pacific, and those inter-oceanic lines of railway were in. That having a bonded debt of an enormous amount hanging upon it, upon which interest must be paid, the interest must be found by obtaining it from the traffic of the road, because it is a mandatory claim which must be met, or the road will pass out of the hands of its possessors; whereas, if the money be raised by the sale of stock, as it is in the present instance, the hon. gentleman will see that although they pay—and justly pay—interest on the stock during the process of construction, the moment the construction is completed, there is no mandatory debt upon the property—the property is not compelled to raise a single dollar of interest, because all the interest that has to be paid, is going into the pockets of the owners of the road itself—there is no mortgages of any kind. And what is the result? The result is that, in Canada, we shall be able to point to a great inter-oceanic line of Canadian Pacific Railway that can compete, as I said before, even between San Francisco and Chicago, for the transport of the traffic of the Pacific coast, down through a large portion of country, for the reason that having issued no bonds, having only issued stock, the road is entirely in an independent position—in a position to deal by competition with other roads in a manner that no road could deal if it had a heavy bonded debt upon it—if it had a mortgage upon it and had to raise the interest under any circumstances."

The policy of the Government to-day is the reverse of what the hon. Minister then said. Their policy now is to bond that road, to mortgage it, to put a mandatory interest on it. Last year we were invited to thank God because the road had no mortgage on it; this year, thanks to the hon. Minister of Railways, our cause for thanking God will be taken away. We shall have no more cause to thank Him unless hon. gentlemen opposite are so pious that they will find cause to thank God even for the reverse of what they thanked Him for last year. Last year the road was to be in a position different from the Union Pacific, the Central Pacific, the Northern Pacific and all other oceanic lines. Last year, therefore, it had a unique position, but now all that is reversed and it is placed in the same category as the other. All the advantages which were to flow to us last year from the unique position in which the road then was, is lost to us this year. I think that if I had to choose between the two policies of the hon. Minister of Railways, I would choose that of last year. I would say to the Company, let your motto be *festina lente*; take your time but build your road, and it will be for your advantage and the advantage of the people as well. Again, I submit that whatever advantages may be derived from the speedy completion of the road are more than counterbalanced by the possible consequences of the policy which is initiated to-day. What was the basis of the policy suggested by the Government three years ago and adopted by Parliament? The basis of the policy when submitted, and the reason for which this Parliament adopted that policy, was that it was more in the interests of the people that this road should be owned and operated by a company than by a Government. That was the basis of the argument urged upon the people and the Parliament of this country, and that was the main idea that induced this Parliament to assent to the terms of this contract. Now, what is contemplated by the present contract arrangement? It is contemplated that, if the advance which is to be given to the Company is not recouped, the road shall revert to the Government and be operated by it. A good deal has been said upon the question of this guarantee, and I will not discuss that now, because I think it has already been discussed to the satisfaction of everyone. Is it unfair to suppose that this great Company, knowing the aversion of Parliament to have the road owned and operated by the Government, will show no very great desire to pay their liabilities, and if they should fail, what will take place? One or two things will take place—either the Government will refuse to enforce their claim, and then we lose our advance, and it becomes a gift, or if the Government choose to enforce their claim they will take back the road and the very policy which was initiated as the basis of this contract will be there set at nought; and we will have this result; that in order to anticipate by five years the completion of

the road, the Government has deliberately put itself in the possibility of defeating the intention and basis of the contract altogether. It has been asked, and it has been the cause of wonder to many, why the Government thus reverse their policy—because this is certainly a reversal of the policy hitherto pursued by them. We can see no other reason than this, that the Government are to-day controlled by a power mightier than they. They are like the wizard of old, who, through his incantations, gave life to a monster which made him its slave and in the end destroyed him. The Government are in the hands of a Company which it must obey, just as the servant in the Scripture, to whom his master said: "Go, and he goeth; come, and he cometh." What is the wish of the Company which has not been gratified? Why, Mr. Speaker, three years ago when they made the contract, the Company insisted that they should be paid by the mile; they were paid by the mile. Now they insist that they shall be paid according to construction; they are going to be paid according to construction. Last fall, three or four or five months ago, the Company asked the Government to guarantee the interest on their stock; at once the Government complied with their demand. The Company went on further; they asked the Government to become their bankers, and the Government consented to become their bankers. Now, they say, "We will not bank our money," and the Government say: "Here is your money." Last year they said; "We are determined to complete this road not, in the time specified by the contract by the year 1891, but in the year 1886; the Government said: "Glorious, we accede to that." Now they say: "But, in order to carry out our wishes, we must have an advance of \$22,500,000." Again the Government say "Glorious, here is your money." If that is not a justification of the statement I have made that the Government are altogether in the hands of the Company, what can it be? I am very much of the opinion, which is expressed in the French Conservative press in Quebec, that the power of the Company is too great, and we have not had a good reason for making any further advance or giving them any more advantages at the hands of the Government. The Minister of Railways, the other day, speaking on this question, said that the *Globe* newspaper had been the systematic enemy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the hon. gentleman repeats the statement now. He cannot certainly make the same reproach to the French Conservative press of Quebec. They have not been hostile to the Company, they have been just as devoted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as any member of the Government, or the Government, as a whole. Yet the hon. member is aware that the opposition of the French Conservative press of Quebec to these Resolutions is just as determined as the opposition of the *Globe* newspaper. In order that there may be no doubt about it, let me quote from one of the French organs of the Government, in the Province of Quebec. I cite from *Le Monde* of the 1st February. It is stated there as follows:—

"In what position will the Dominion be when it has yielded to this last demand of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? The position will be this—already paid by the Dominion for the portions of the road under construction before the transfer, \$28,000,000; cash subsidy, \$25,000,000; land subsidy, \$50,000,000; present loan demanded, \$22,500,000; total amount furnished by the Government, \$125,500,000; total amount furnished by the Company for the main road, nothing. In those conditions, if it is that the Government choose to pay all the cost of construction, it would be just as well and better that it should have also the property of the road, since the Company gives itself so little trouble to get out of its embarrassment. If I now enter into all these details, it is not that I am animated by any bad will towards the Company. Nothing of the kind. But, in showing the Company under its true light, I show that the Government does not grant its favours to the Company because the Company deserves those favours, but simply that the Government wants to give some encouragement to these gentlemen."

These, Mr. Speaker, are the words of a correspondent, it is true, but the statement is endorsed by the editor, and has been followed by numerous articles written in the same manner. Again, in the same paper of the 15th February, an article is written in answer to *L'Etendard*, which is the only paper in the Province of Quebec which supports the Government in the present position. The article proceeds as follows:—

"The calculations of *L'Etendard* are most ridiculous. It is this, that it imagines that the Government will pay 4 per cent. upon the \$22,500,000, and that the Pacific will pay the Government 5 per cent., thus netting a benefit of \$220,000 a year. It is a good joke to promise interest at 5 per cent., when it is well known beforehand that not a cent will ever be paid. As to the figures of *L'Etendard* concerning the gain, the advantage of the public by the North Shore Railway instead of the road by Chicago and St. Paul, it is enough to split one's sides. Who tells us that the Company will transfer passengers and goods at a cheaper rate than the American line? The Pacific Railway Company, without any competition on the north of lake Superior—can we reasonably expect that they will treat the public any better than the three or four lines that compete on American territory? Why should it be so, when it is well known that, notwithstanding the high Tariff, the service of the western section, that is to say, the section of British Columbia, will prevent it during many years from meeting the expenses. Moreover, if the only care of *L'Etendard* is to bring in immigrants to the North-West, why should we hasten the construction of the section so expensive in the Rocky Mountains? When we gave the contract in 1881, we then established the delays within which the road was to have been completed. Let us follow our agreement. Why should we make any haste? Does *L'Etendard* know that of this, \$900,000 a year in interest alone will be added to the liabilities of the country, simply by advancing the subsidy of \$12,500,000 by three years? What can the crossing of the railway over the Rocky Mountains do for the colonization of the North-West? Do you expect the Chinese or the Japanese to go and settle in the North-West?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was stated the other day by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) that this paper was not the organ of the Conservative party, but the organ of a well known railway speculator. It is generally understood, indeed, that this paper is in the hands of Mr. Sénécal; but, be this as it may, this is no isolated language. The language I have just quoted is the language of the whole of the Conservative press of Quebec, with the single exception of *L'Etendard*. All the other papers, all the papers which generally give their support to the Government, are hostile to the present Resolutions, and all endorse the language here spoken by *Le Monde*. And I submit that there is great meaning in that language. That language comes from men who have been unswerving in their allegiance to the present Government; but it also comes from men who have been witnesses, in their own country, to the fatal consequences which may follow lavish expenditure—that is to say, expenditure not calculated upon a good basis, and the note of alarm here sounded by these men is the note of alarm which should be heeded not only by gentlemen who come from the Province of Quebec, but by all those who value the counsel of experience.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron, Huron) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Allison (Lennox),	Fisher,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Forbes,	Platt,
Béchar, d,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Gunn,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Holton,	Scriver,
Barpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Gartwright,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Vail,
Catudal,	Lister,	Watson,
Charlton,	Livingstone,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	Mackenzie,	Wheeler,
Cook,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Davis,	McIntyre,	Yeo.—62.
De St. Georges,	McIsaac,	

Mr. LAURIER.

NAYS :  
Messieurs

Allison (Hants)	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Bain (Anoulanges),	Fortin,	Méthot,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Foster,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Fréchette,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Gagné,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Gault,	O'Brien,
Bell,	Girouard,	Orton,
Belleau,	Gordon,	Unimet,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Paint,
Benson,	Guillet,	Paterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Pope,
Billy,	Hall,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Hawkins,	Riopol,
Bodue,	Hay,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bossé,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hickey,	Ross,
Bowell,	Hilliard,	Royal,
Brecken,	Homer,	Rykert,
Burnham,	Houde,	Scott,
Burns,	Hurteau,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Ives,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Sprule,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kinney,	Tassé,
Chapleau,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Labrosse,	Temple,
Costigan,	Landry (Kent),	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper (Picton),
Coursol,	Langevin,	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Loeage,	Valin,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	Vanasce,
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers,	Macmaster,	White (Hastings),
Desjardins,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald,	Williams,
Dugas,	McGreevy,	Wood (Brockville),
Dupont,	McLelan,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McNeill,	Woodworth,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),		Wright.—182.

On the main motion being put,

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before this motion is declared carried, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope my hon. friend will not press that motion. I think it desirable for the House to go into Committee as soon as possible. We might pass these Resolutions *pro forma*, and on taking concurrence, the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman, will have full opportunity for speaking upon them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I understood the question would not be settled to-night. I wished to say a few words on the subject before taking the vote. It is a very important vote. But there has been so much discussion, and at this hour, I do not feel like speaking to-night. I would prefer not to be forced to go on, but I must speak, and if I must go on to night, why, of course, I will do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, we will let them stand over.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:45 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 20th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN.

The Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Charles Tupper, "That the House resolve

itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions (page 84) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway," being read,

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the debate last night, I desired to say a few words. I wish to say now that it would not be interesting if I were to make a speech in the present condition of my voice. With the consent of the House, I will therefore reserve my remarks until concurrence.

Mr. VAIL. As the hon. member has decided not to speak on this question, and as I conceive it to be very important that this House should come to a direct vote on the question in a proper parliamentary way, I beg to move the following resolution:—

That all the words after "that" be omitted, and the following inserted, "This House resolve itself into said Committee on this day six months."

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of the opportunity afforded me by the motion of my hon. friend to say a few words upon this question. I do not propose, after the very full discussion which has taken place, to trespass again on the time of the House by repeating in detail every argument which I had the honour to address on the former occasion; nor do I intend at this time to discuss some of the replies to those arguments, however disputable they may be, both with respect to the facts on which they were supposed to be based and the consequences which were argued as flowing from those facts. I desire rather to call the attention of the House to a phase of this question which has not been, if at all, very fully presented as yet, and which nevertheless it seems to me to be of very great consequence we should consider before reaching a conclusion in favour of proceeding further with these Resolutions. And if, for a moment, in the discharge of my present duty I should seem to deal with questions which have been already discussed, the House will bear with me, because I think hon. members will see, before I conclude, the import of my first observations upon the point which I shall have the honour to present. I said on the former occasion that the element of finality was one which had been very much pressed at the time when the original contract was proposed for our adoption. I pointed out that it was the consolatory ingredient in the cup of many sorrows which we were asked to drink. We were told, whatever were the difficulties, whatever the expense of the engagements to which we were called upon to commit ourselves, at all events we knew them; there they were, great or small, light or heavy, we knew them. It was no longer an undefined engagement to construct the Pacific Railway; it was an engagement to give certain dollars to complete a certain partially constructed work, and to give certain acres of land, in consideration of which once and for all, finally and forever, we implemented our obligations with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friend who sits on my left (Mr. Laurier), in his speech last night recapitulated with great terseness the various and changing policy of the Administration, and pointed out when he came to the era of the contract this element of finality, and he showed how very lacking in this prospect the contract was as viewed by the light of the propositions which are now submitted to Parliament. It is so, Sir. To-day we are called upon to deal with a supposed final obligation in a manner entirely contradictory to the notion that the obligation is final. But what I complain of is, that although we are asked to-day to largely commit the credit, and engage the resources of the country, in order to complete the contracted line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is obvious that we have not before us, as we ought to have before us, all the proposals, and all the information which ought to be submitted before we are asked to acquiesce in or to reject this particular pro-

posal. It is true that in a modified sense, and to a limited extent, the Government have recognized the soundness of the view that Parliament is entitled to have all the parts of this Canadian Pacific Railway policy presented for its consideration—to know the whole business through, I say, to a limited extent. We have before us on the paper, Resolutions designed to close one other element of the Canadian Pacific Railway bargain. We have before us Resolutions designed to settle the claims of British Columbia in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway; and we see from them what it is that is proposed to do in that direction; and, therefore, I am not able to complain that the proposition the Government have laid before us is in this single particular, incomplete. They have shown us, in so far as the extreme west of the country is concerned, what, besides the proposal which is now on the Table, we are to be called upon to do in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is quite true—without dealing with that proposal, which it would be quite improper to do at this moment—that that call does open a very serious consideration. I well remember listening to the Minister of Public Works when he declared, at a comparatively late stage of the controversies which have raged since the original bargain with British Columbia, that Esquimalt was, and must be, the Pacific terminus of that railway. How far that view is consistent with the arrangement under which the road, by which Esquimalt is to be reached, has surrendered to a rival Pacific railway, one of the American Pacific railways, I shall leave it to the astute mind of the Minister of Public Works now otherwise engaged, I am sorry to observe, to settle. There is another question which looms up now much more prominently, much more immediately, much more pressingly than we supposed it would, up to recent dates. I have said that there was a Pacific Railway terminus suggested by the Minister of Public Works, under the old Government, when he was in Opposition, and, so far as I can remember, in the new, at Esquimalt, as the true terminus for the through trade between the east and the west. But, Sir, even assuming that that view is abandoned, and that the Pacific terminus of a great trans-continental railway, which is to carry so many thousands of tons of precious freight eastward and westward, from the European to the Asiatic continent, even assuming that that terminus is to be found on the mainland of British Columbia, it is quite clear from the concurrent and undisputed testimony of the engineers, not unfrequently cited in this House, that Port Moody is not, and cannot be such a terminus. English Bay and Cove Harbour, further down the indentation in which Port Moody is situated, have always been stated to be the points to which the railway must attain, if it is to do a trade with the large steamers plying on the Pacific Ocean. And now that we have arrived at this point, that Parliament is to be called upon to deal with this question as a trans-continental question; that we are to sacrifice much, to engage much, to do much more than the people of this country ever supposed they would be called upon to do, in order that that consummation of a completed trans-continental railway doing a through trade may be achieved, within two years, it is certainly important to know what provision has been, and what provision is to be made, for a real available terminus for that portion of the trade which is to reach and leave the Canadian Pacific Railway on the Pacific coast. Yet we know that the expenditure, according to former estimates, according to the views of Mr. Fleming, Mr. Smith and other engineers, who alone have spoken on the subject, to reach even the mainland of the Pacific from Port Moody, is no insignificant sum. If I rightly remember, speaking now of a recollection some years old, it is somewhat between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000. Well then, Sir, going a little farther east you find that there are other questions with reference to the railway yet

unsolved. I have pointed out—and I just avert to it without discussing it—the circumstance that to-day when we are called upon to deal with this question as one finally settled, or one finally to be settled by the proposals now before us, we are dealing with a crossing by the Kicking Horse Pass—a crossing of the Selkirk Range. We are dealing with a crossing the possibility of which, from an engineering point of view, has not yet been demonstrated. We are dealing with a crossing the cost of which has not yet been ascertained, if it be at all feasible. It is proposed to us to accept the estimates of an unlocated, unsurveyed mountain line, when it is still within the range of possibility that another route across the mountain may have to be adopted. It is proposed to us to accept this estimate; and I am obliged just to infer, in the absence of that information which we had a right to expect, upon this proposal being brought before us, but which is not yet before us, I say I have to assume the accuracy of a statement, reported in the *Toronto Mail* and the *Montreal Gazette*, said to have been communicated to the *Mail* by Mr. Van Horne, as to the cost to complete from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops. He stated it at \$10,100,000. We are called upon to agree that there is sufficient evidence that this cost of the 290 miles, the 300 miles, or the 270 miles—for all these figures are given to us—of the unsurveyed and unlocated mountain line, when we know—once again dealing by estimation—subtracting, so far as we can ascertain it, the amount paid to the construction company for the work which has been done in the west, from the total to be paid them on their western contract—that the sum of \$11,000,000 or \$12,000,000 in cash, and \$25,000,000 of stock, were, a little more than a year ago, agreed to be paid for the construction of the work from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, which we are now told can be built for \$10,100,000. For less cash by far than the cash which was to be paid for it before, taking into no account whatever \$25,000,000 of stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was to be thrown in as a *bonne bouche*—as something very nice to look at if it was not very much to have. Then, Sir, when we come to the prairie country, we know that facilities for transport at moderate rates over a widely extended range of that country are of the last consequence to the future of the North-West itself, and to the future of the whole Dominion, deeply committed as the whole Dominion is to the future of the North-West. I do not myself suppose that there exists any question connected with public improvements of equal practical consequence to the question of what is to be done within the next two or three years in the way of lowering the rates and increasing the mileage of lines of railway in the fertile prairie country; and I need do no more than allude to the observation of the hon. Minister of Railways himself, in opening the debate upon these Resolutions, that the branch lines which he was defending were of greater consequence than many sections of the main line itself. Although we were called upon to make so many sacrifices for the early completion of the main line, he gave to the branch lines, not merely the absolute but the relative importance which I have just now described. But, Sir, in proposals of the Government, so far as they have been laid before Parliament, so far as we have been enabled to consider them, in none of the points to which I have alluded, running from Esquimalt into the prairie country, is there any suggestion for adjusting these questions. They are left unadjusted. Rather may I say, particularly with reference to the question of branch lines, that the putting in the forefront of the battle the construction of the main line through the two uncompleted links, the arrangement that the resources of the Company are to be applied either in that work or in reconquering the Government for the advance now made towards the execution of that work, are indicative that a policy of little or no construction of branch lines in the next two or three

Mr. BLAKE.

years, instead of a very liberal construction, either by the Railway Company itself or by other corporations unfettered by the exercise of the power of disallowance, is to be adopted. Then, Sir, getting farther eastward, we come to the Sault Ste. Marie Branch, and the importance of that branch is recognized, I think, by all. It certainly was recognized at an earlier date by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself, who laid down as a part of their policy, the construction, first of all, of a branch to Sault Ste. Marie, and afterwards of the main line by way of Sault Ste. Marie, and ultimately of a branch line to Algoma Mills, on the way to Sault Ste. Marie; and the line is now within eighty miles of that point. And that the view of making connections with American lines to be built and reaching towards the Sault, was entertained—aye, that even obligations have been entered into of that description, is shown by the interviews which have taken place between the president of the Company and the municipal authorities of Portland in the month of October last, when Mr. Stephen is reported to have said:

“It has just occurred to me that I have forgotten a point which I should not have forgotten, that of seeing an article in to-day’s paper from my friend, General Washburne, of Minneapolis. I will now simply say that we have about completed a branch line of the Canadian Pacific that is now within eighty miles of Sault Ste. Marie, the point General Washburne contemplates; and we have undertaken to build there eighty miles and reach the sea as soon as they are ready to meet us. We have engaged to meet them at Sault Ste. Marie, and when that connection is made it does not require a very fertile imagination to see what is going to be the effect on the ports of the Atlantic receiving flour from Minneapolis in enormous quantities. If we can manage to get the flour manufactured at Minneapolis shipped to Portland, you will have a very busy harbour.

“Alderman MARR. I would like to ask the gentleman the condition of this road from Minneapolis to Sault Ste. Marie. Is it merely contemplated or under process of construction?

“Mr. STEPHEN. I know nothing about it, except what I have heard from General Washburne. All the Minneapolis millers, I understand, and St. Paul people are interesting themselves in it. General Washburne says they are certain to build it. That is all I know about it. We have undertaken to meet them at Sault Ste. Marie, and we have only eighty miles to go.

“The MAYOR. I understand you to say they have undertaken to build the branch line.

“Mr. STEPHEN. It is beyond the region of talk now. I cannot tell how far. We are ready to build there whenever we have any object to build there. We shall only be too happy to take their flour when they get there.”

But here again, in the policy which is presented to us—which, as I have said, is a policy practically of a devotion of the resources proposed to be supplied to the now-existing Company to the completion of the main line, and the reconpment of the money to be advanced by the public for the main line,—we find no resources for the completion of these particular enterprises. Going further east, we come to the question of the Gravenhurst and Callander connection—a question of very great consequence—acknowledged to be one of very great moment to an important section of the Dominion—upon which we have been told from time to time that the Government would produce results satisfactory to us, and in respect of which we were told last Session that unless perfect independence could be secured, and absolute freedom from control on the part of either of the rival undertakings, a larger expenditure would be advisable than would be involved in the mere construction of the railway, under less favourable conditions, for the commerce of the country. But we have not now before us the result of the action of the Government upon the powers with which we invested them last Session; we do not know what the consummated policy with reference to the Gravenhurst and Callander Branch is; we do not know what guarantees are given; we do not know what cost is to be incurred; we do not know, in fine, whether the plan adopted last Session has been found feasible or not; or whether the Government itself is to build that link. Again, we have before us a private Bill proposing to invest the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with authority to lease and acquire branch lines in various directions—a

power of an indefinite character involving obligations of an indefinite description, which obligations will be debts of the corporation and may affect its power and capacity of paying. Upon these we have not the policy of the Administration developed. Going still further east we have the question of the summer terminus of the railway. Upon that subject, we know that varying opinions have been held. We know that the original notion was Callander and a connection with the lines which were to be built from Callander towards the Pacific; we know that a subsidy was granted to the Canada Central with the express view of its reaching Callander, or, rather, reaching whatever might be the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and it was supposed that the ocean would be reached by means of connecting lines. We know that when the contract was made, it was in contemplation that they might acquire, and they took the power to acquire, by amalgamation or purchase, the line of the Canada Central Railway and the line of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental, thus reaching to Montreal; and for a time it seemed as if the terminus that was intended, was to be a Montreal terminus, at any rate, as the summer terminus. But other ideas have, for sometime, taken possession of the public mind; other ideas have taken possession of the mind of the railway Company, other ideas have taken possession of the mind of important sections, and it is well we should understand in what these are to result. I was amongst those who regretted very much the step that was taken by the Quebec Government when they sold the line between Montreal and Quebec in such form as to render possible that it should, as it ultimately did, pass under the control of the Grand Trunk Railway. I believe that it would have been better in the interests of Quebec and better in the international interest, had that road been sold for a very much smaller price to the Canadian Pacific Railway than that it should be sold for the price at which Mr. Senecal bought it, and the enhanced price which he afterwards received from persons who are supposed to be in the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway. But that has been done, and the question is complicated by that transaction. Now we are aware, not in the proper manner, not in the manner in which Parliament ought to be aware of it, but we are aware, from the ordinary sources of information, that claims have been made and presented to the Administration with reference to this portion of the connection from ocean to ocean to which I am now advertising. First of all, the newspapers tell us that the Quebec Government has advanced a claim to be reimbursed, as a proportion of aid towards the construction of the national highway, \$12,000 a mile for the railway which they have built from Ottawa to Montreal or to Quebec, I do not very well understand which from the newspapers. But one or the other claim, the newspapers say, was preferred lately by the Quebec Ministers—first of all by a written communication, and subsequently in a conference here. We know also, from the same source of information, that other portions of the complicated question which is involved in this part of the whole subject, have assumed a dimension more than Provincial, because we see that the commercial authorities, the Boards of Trade, or Chambers of Commerce, if I remember aright, of Halifax and St. John, as well as that of Quebec, have made joint representations upon the subject of the importance of having an independent line between Montreal and Quebec in connection with the great trans-continental line. It seems as if the error which was made when control of that line was parted with, is now about to assume serious proportions, and we have before us the question what ought to be done, what can be done, if anything ought to be done, or if anything can be done, to redress that error and to obtain that freedom of communication between the Intercolonial Railway and the west, between the ports of the east and the west, the original

opportunity for which was lost for a time when the roads on both sides of the river between Montreal and Quebec passed into the hands of one corporation. We know that in the same connection, claims have been advanced in order to the completion and consummation of this great scheme of a railway bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec, to make a free connection between both sides of the river and between the railway system as it is projected. Now, the views which are taken upon this subject may be very divergent, but what is certain is that strong views are taken, and that, as the months roll on and the schemes of the Government develop themselves, we find still greater importance attached to the notion of a great trans-continental railway, and larger and larger views as to what the obligations of the Dominion are, and what the duty of the Dominion is in furtherance of the scheme of a great railway across the continent with Canadian termini. The question whether Quebec, as well as, or to the exclusion of, Montreal, shall be the summer terminus, is one of these questions, and the consideration of that question and of the claims which have been made, as I have said, that the Government shall secure the independence of the highway between the two cities by building a bridge across the river, and that the Government shall recognize the right of the Province of Quebec to a larger mileage subsidy for the work they have constructed, are claims which are to be measured, not by thousands but by millions, and probably engagements of one kind or another in connection with them, will come to the sum of something like \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000. Having got so far, we deal only with one half of the question. We deal only with the question of what the summer port or ports shall be, and what shall be the obligations of the Dominion, in order to obtain the consummation which is to be the policy of the country—to obtain a Dominion summer port. We yet have before us the question of a winter port. Now, upon that subject, at the same interview of the Company with the municipalities of Portland, to which I have already alluded, Mr. Stephen made this statement:

"In addition to that, we shall have by January or February, of this coming year, a line of railway from Montreal to Chicago, connecting at St. Louis with the Canadian Railway, giving us a through road from Montreal to Chicago. That brings us under the control of the Canadian Railway, and from the Pacific Ocean to Montreal, a line from Chicago, and it is not unnatural, having reached Montreal, and, as you are well aware, Montreal being only a six months' port, we should be looking to the question of reaching the Atlantic, and it is not unnatural that our eyes should be cast upon the most direct way, and whether we shall be able to accomplish our object will depend a little upon yourselves. We think, as I said before, that Portland has great capacity in that respect, and I may say for my colleagues and myself, we are anxious to do all we can to endeavour to get a foothold here. What the advantages, direct or indirect, of our coming here you are as able to foresee as I am. It is with that object in view that we are here to-night."

And once again the Mayor, addressing Mr. Stephen, says:

"The Canadian Pacific, who are represented here, speak for themselves, and say they intend to use it," that is the Portland and Ogdensburg Railway, "as a through line in connection with their road, is that what I understand, Mr. Stephen?"

"Mr. STEPHEN. Yes, sir."

"I would ask," says the Mayor, "how you are going to connect with your road when you get up through the mountains."

"Mr. STEPHEN. It is not very easy for me to answer the question the Mayor has put to me. The arrangement is anything but complete yet. We do not know very well how we are going to do it. All our efforts so far have terminated at Montreal. A bridge has got to be built which will take about eighteen months, and when we get across the bridge to Montreal we will find some way of getting down to connect with this road; and as to the connection we have that. A very good connection is over the St. Johnsbury and Ogdensburg, but, as I said before, we have not given these matters very much consideration yet."

So that it is very plain, both from the papers which have been laid before us, the very large expenditure of some \$1,500,000 or \$1,600,000 which has been made in acquiring an interest in the South-Eastern and the Montreal, Portland and Boston, the efforts to obtain the Portland and Ogdensburg, and the declarations of the president of the Company, as late as October last, which I have just read,

that what the Company seeks and thinks most direct is a Portland terminus, and perhaps they might have a slight leaning towards Boston as another terminus. Well now, even so early as the time of the contract itself, these were not the views that were represented to the House as those which ought to be adopted. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, in the course of the debate in December, 1880, announced contrary views; the First Minister, in the course of the protracted debates which then occurred in the month of January, announced contrary views; and, last year, in proposing the policy of subsidizing railways, which the Minister of Railways brought down, he elaborated at great length the rival claims of the various Canadian ports on the Atlantic seaboard, and declared that it would be a great calamity if the Canadian Pacific Railway should find its winter terminus in our neighbours' territory, and he pointed out, as a reason why some assistance should be rendered to the construction of divers lines, that they would tend to place the various ports which he enumerated on such a footing that they might compete with, at any rate, the port of Portland. Well, a year has elapsed, and the schemes of the hon. Minister, which he assured us he had made such enquiries about and reached such conclusions upon that the financial propositions which he presented to us would ensure their construction and completion, have failed, and we do not find it possible that, unless some other arrangements are made, those schemes can now be carried out. And, therefore, we must hold that the policy of the Government upon the subject of a Canadian winter port for the Canadian Pacific Railway is one which has been further considered, and which requires remodelling and readjusting, as so many other parts of their policy, when submitted to the rude test of actual experience, have required remodelling and readjusting. Now, Sir, there may be all sorts of opinions with reference to these various schemes, with reference to their practicability, with reference to their importance, with reference to their justice, with reference to their absolute merit, with reference to their relative merits; but there can be no doubt that, in one shape or another, they have attracted attention; there can be no doubt that, in one shape or another, a policy has to be proclaimed, a conclusion has to be reached; there can be no doubt that, if that policy is one of further expenditure, of further obligations on the part of the Dominion, it is the bounden duty of this Parliament, as true representatives of the people, to insist that they shall have before them, in one complete whole, the various parts of a policy of this description. That policy is now, you may say, if you look to the various speeches to which I have referred, to the various transactions which have occurred, to all the symptoms which display themselves, one policy. I differ from those altogether who say a transaction can be carried through piecemeal. My opinion is that, on a large financial operation, engaging the credit of this Dominion and calling upon its resources to the tune of thirty millions of dollars, it is of vast consequence that we should have before us what other proposals of a financial character may be made, so that we should be able to view the whole scene, and to consider, with the total extent of obligations which are proposed to us before us, whether we will accept the whole whether we will reject the whole, whether we will accept part or reject part. It has been said by the greatest master of finance of this and, I believe to-day I may say, of the last generation as well, by the present Prime Minister of England, that it is utterly useless for the House of Commons to attempt that control which it is essential it should have over the national finance unless the statement of annual expenditure and charge is a single statement; presents at one view the whole operations of the year. It is obvious that that observation is well founded, and I deeply regret to know that, in our ordinary transactions, we have so far departed from it. But, Sir, this is not an ordinary

Mr. BLAKE.

transaction. This is one single transaction of gigantic magnitude, with many parts, it is true, but they are all parts of the whole; and what we ought to know is what is this whole, this comprehensive whole. If it is to be said that nothing is to be done in the direction of further financial engagements or assistance towards any of these objects, there is a policy; we understand it, and we know then—and we know then for the first time—that, so far as the Government contemplates it, our obligations, enhanced as they are by the proposals of the day, are yet limited by the proposals of the day, and we are called upon then to consider whether, in our view, any other of these elements of the great problem of the Canadian trans-continental railway is of such paramount importance that some different application of the funds which the Government proposed to apply, should to some extent be made. On the other hand, if the Government does propose that there should be further assistance of one kind or another, that further public engagements should be made in order to carry out this grand idea, surely we are entitled to know what the plan of the Government is, what its proposals are, and to know it before we are called on to vote on these Resolutions; because, as I have said before, I now repeat, they are parts of a whole, and we want to know what the whole is before we vote on the parts; we want to know what is the sum of the obligations that the country is to be called upon to commit itself to. There may be, Sir, many views with reference to all the points to which I have alluded; there may be many differences of opinion upon them. I have not at any time expressed or implied, I am not now expressing or implying, an opinion upon any one of them. I recognize the responsibility and the duty of the Administration of the day, having the conduct of public affairs, having the confidence of a vast majority of the people's representatives, to propound this policy, to submit it to the House and to the country, and to challenge upon it criticism and investigation. I recognize that proposition with peculiar and added force as applicable to the question of expenditure which, under the wholesome and salutary rule of the British Constitution, incorporated by a hard and fast clause in our Constitution, forbids proposals for public expenditure otherwise than with the assent of the Crown—given, of course, upon the advice and suggestion of responsible Ministers of the Crown. What I am pointing out is, that in order that Parliament may discharge its duty of deciding upon the merits of the proposals of the Administration, it is right that Parliament should have before them the whole policy of the Administration, that we should not have it piecemeal, that upon a financial question of this description, we should know the end before we are asked to vote for the beginning; we should know what these plans are, once for all. If the question is settled there is nothing more to be done, so far as the Government is concerned. If there is something more to be done, what more is to be done? Upon that question we are entitled to be informed before we are asked to decide whether or no it is fitting to accede to the proposals which are now before us. I feel, Sir, that I would have been doing less than my duty if I had not stated these propositions for the consideration of the House; I feel that I would be doing less than my duty if I did not endeavour to take the sense of the House upon them formally, and with that view I move in amendment to the amendment, to leave out all the words after "following" in the amendment, and insert the following:

It is fitting that before asking this House to proceed with the consideration of the Resolutions for aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Government should lay before the House its proposals with regard to any further subsidies to be granted to Provinces or Companies, or any further aid to be provided, or any further works to be secured, in connection with the great scheme of a trans-continental railway with Canadian termini.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad to learn by the address which the leader of the Opposition has just delivered to the House, that the result of the long and interesting debate which we have had upon this very important question, has been to convince that hon. gentleman that he would be discharging his duty if, instead of adhering to his position of antagonism to the great measure before the House, he confined himself to a criticism of some of the details. I am glad the hon. gentleman has at last come to the conclusion, that, instead of joining issue with the Resolutions, as has been done by my hon. friend the mover of the amendment, in a bold and clear antagonism to those propositions, the hon. leader of the Opposition finds it necessary to amend a resolution of his own supporter proposing to read those Resolutions this day six months, and confines himself to qualifying the position he had taken, by asking for further details as to the policy of the Government. Now, Sir, I am not at all surprised that the hon. gentleman should have come to that conclusion. I am not at all surprised that this should be the case after the hon. gentleman had found, not only that the judgment of the vast majority of this House was in favour of the propositions that I have had the honour of laying before it, not only that a large majority of this House was prepared to sustain the propositions submitted by the Government, but that from his own supporters, from some of the ablest and most independent supporters of that hon. gentleman, he has had a lesson read to him in this House such as no leader of a great party should have needed in discussing a great measure like this. There is no hon. gentleman in this House who does not recognize, that in the able, the exhaustive, the argumentative and conclusive statements submitted to this House last night by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), this question has been placed in a position that shows the hon. gentleman that he is not only in antagonism with the Government, that he is not only in antagonism with the great majority of this Parliament, but that he is in antagonism with the public sentiment of this country. Sir, I have no hesitation in saying, that in my knowledge of parliamentary discussion, I have never witnessed an occasion upon which an hon. member of this House has discharged—discharged at the cost of party ties and obligations and friendships—a duty more ably, more independently and more efficiently, than that hon. gentleman discharged his duty last night. Do we not know that the object and aim of the hon. gentlemen opposite have been, instead of aiding us to develop the great North-West, instead of aiding us in carrying on this great national work in which Canada is so deeply and vitally interested, that they have endeavoured to thwart that undertaking? Does the hon. gentleman not know that, line by line, in the most conclusive manner, the hon. member for Lisgar convicted those hon. gentlemen of having, by the organs of their party, the great leading organs of their party, one of them edited by an ex-Minister of the Crown (Mr. Mills), and another organ of their party to which they all bow with deference, the *Toronto Globe*—that they done all in their power to put obstacles in the way of the promotion of this great scheme? The hon. member for Lisgar took up these two great organs of the party, and he proved to this House in the most conclusive manner, by the most conclusive demonstration, that these organs of gentlemen opposite were engaged in the unholy work of, not only endeavouring to break down the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but seeking to destroy the confidence of the public, and of the world, and of every person, in the great North-West. That is just the position of the question. If ever there was an occasion which warranted a man in forgetting everything but what he owed to his constituency and the country, it is the position of this question to-day. What is the result? The late ex-Minister of Militia, the colleague of

the leader of the Opposition, presents an amendment to-day, after last night's debate, during which an argument was advanced which I have no hesitation in saying will sink deep into the minds of members on both sides of the House, a presentation of the case, a defence of the great North-West and a defence of Canada, a statement of the case that will be heralded everywhere as of vast importance and value as meeting in the most full and efficient manner, by an hon. gentleman who knows whereof he speaks, all those calumnies and slanders which have been hurled at the North-West in order to break down the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I am not surprised, under these circumstances, that the hon. leader of the Opposition should find discretion is the better part of valour, and when his former colleague, the late Minister of Militia, ventured to ask this House to throw out these Resolutions and read them six months from to-day, the leader of the Opposition should say: "No, no, that is going too far; let me move an amendment which will prevent that disaster to the country, and ask the Government to bring down a little more information." The hon. gentleman is becoming so alive to the magnitude of this question that he actually proposes to go far beyond anything that the Government have asked the House to do. The hon. gentleman is not content with furnishing \$30,000,000 for the purpose of completing this great work; the hon. gentleman feels we have fallen short of our duty—I am not certain but that he is right—in not presenting for fair and just consideration the claims of other sections of the country in connection with that great enterprise. Finding himself in that position, the leader of the Opposition seeks an opportunity to place himself right on the question, to recede from the position of antagonism to these Resolutions from the position of stopping the construction of the railway of retarding its rapid completion, from the position of being placed before Parliament and the country in the attitude of combining with the organs of his party outside of the House to lower in the estimation of the world, the resources of our country in order to prevent the consummation of that great work. I am not at all surprised that the hon. gentleman should have taken that position, and he would have been wanting in tact and sensitive appreciation of public and parliamentary sentiment if he had not felt, what every other hon. member feels, that the result of this discussion has been to leave no doubt on the mind of any intelligent man in this House or out of it, who has an opportunity of reading the debates or hearing them, that the Government would have been wanting in the last degree, in what they owe to the country if they had failed on the present occasion, and in the present emergency, to come forward with the propositions we have submitted for the consideration of the House. The hon. gentleman is very anxious on the question of finality. He said the great argument which was used in support of our proposition when we laid it before Parliament, was that it would dispose at once and forever of the obligations on the Parliament of Canada in connection with the construction of the Pacific Railway. I say so now. I say we have evidence before us more conclusive than we ever had, that that contract has in it all the essence of finality, and it has been established beyond doubt that every dollar of obligation that would ever fall on the country in connection with this work has been embraced within the terms of the contract itself. Do we ask for an additional dollar of subvention? No. Do we ask the country to jeopardize a dollar of the advance proposed? Let the leader of the Opposition take his answer from the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming). I listened with great interest to the able address of that hon. member, and it was with no little satisfaction that I found him breaking away from the trammels that his associates of that side of the House had been endeavouring to weave around this question and himself. It was with no little pleasure I found

that the hon. gentleman, rising superior to the arguments used by his leader, and iterated and reiterated by various hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, and showing that this Company had abundant means and abundant resources to complete the railway. Not only so, but that the security of 21,000,000 acres of land which they were placing in our hands was a security from which we might confidently expect to obtain a return of \$9,000,000 in cash within two years. That was the statement of the hon. member for Peel. Let the hon. leader of the Opposition take this answer as to the question of security from one of his own followers, without regarding one word of the unanswerable arguments used on this side of the House. Let him take the statement of one of his own supporters as to the resources of the Company, and there cannot be a shadow of doubt in the mind of any person that the Government does not ask Parliament to contribute a single additional dollar for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway over and above that which the contract provided the Government should pay to the Company, that there is the most perfect finality in regard to it. We base our proposition to advance additional money to the Company, not on the ground of the inability of the Company to carry out the contract, but on the value to Canada of a continuance of the rapid progress of the work, and of its completion by the season of 1886. I repeat that the ground on which we rest this application is that, while we are not called upon to add a dollar to the Company's subvention, and are not called upon to jeopardize a single dollar, having the most perfect, ample and complete security for the return of the money, we would be wanting in our duty, knowing the vast importance of having the work proceeded with the same rapidity which has hitherto marked it, and of having it promptly completed, if we should hesitate to carry out this proposition, especially when the hon. gentleman's own friends tell him that from one source of security given by the Company we are going to secure a return of \$9,000,000 within the next two or three years. The hon. gentleman has referred very briefly to the terms of the proposal in respect to British Columbia. I need not follow the hon. gentleman into that matter. The hon. gentleman said himself that he did not propose to discuss the question, but only to allude to it; because I suppose his followers expect him to stand on his feet for a certain number of minutes and speak in regard to the resolution he moved. I utterly fail to see the bearing of his remarks on the question before the House. As to whether Port Moody or English Bay is the best port for the terminus, all I can say is that the Government selected Port Moody as the terminus of the railway, and in doing so they selected a port accessible from the Pacific Ocean, and which is declared to be the best port that is to be found on the Pacific coast. Her Majesty's vessels have, during the past year, surveyed the harbour, and we have the declaration of the officers who have been there—and they are the most perfectly independent and able sources of information—that we have made the most wise and judicious selection which could have been made, that the port is simply perfect, and that there is nothing on the Pacific coast superior to it. And they have now represented to the Admiralty the propriety of making Port Moody the headquarters for the Admiralty on the Pacific coast, as being the best location which is to be found there. The hon. gentleman, I dare say, would like us to go down to English Bay, because it would have compelled the expenditure of \$1,000,000 to get there, in the first instance, and another \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 to make a harbour out of an open roadstead, where there is comparatively no anchorage. I say, the Government feel that they have done all that is necessary, in relation to that question, when they carried the Canadian Pacific Railway to a terminus which was declared by the highest naval authori-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ties, to be unequalled on the Pacific coast. Then, the hon. gentleman ventured to say that we did know whether we could get through the Kicking Horse Pass and the Selkirk Range. I could hardly believe that he was so unacquainted with what is going forward, as to make such a statement. I told him that we know everything that is necessary to be known, in relation to the Kicking Horse Pass, and it has been stated in the fullest manner to the House. There is no doubt that it was not desirable to have as heavy grades as we have been obliged to encounter, there being, for a short distance, a grade of 116 feet to the mile. I wish, however, to refer for a moment to the grades of the Union Pacific, and every person knows that when I speak of it, that the line from Chicago to San Francisco is composed of the Union and Central Pacific, and that you cannot get to the Pacific ocean by the Union Pacific alone; you have to go by the Central Pacific as well, though they are under different charters and different companies. On the portion called the Union Pacific the grade is ninety feet to the mile, and on the Central Pacific portion it is 116 feet to the mile, and there is a great deal more of that grade than is to be found on the most severe parts of the Kicking Horse Pass and the Selkirk Range. On the Northern Pacific, the maximum grade is 128 feet to the mile, and in the Southern Pacific, it is also 128 feet to the mile. So that in point of grade, though it would have been desirable if possible to have avoided those heavy grades, yet when we are able to shorten the Canadian Pacific Railway something like 100 miles, and are only obliged to encounter for a limited distance grades of 116 feet to the mile, I think no person who knows anything of railways will hesitate to say that we would have adopted a most unwise course, if we had secured the lower grade at the cost of an increase of distance, amounting to 100 miles. The hon. gentleman is very anxious about the branch lines. I am glad that he is; for as he knows I have always attached the greatest possible importance to the branch lines. I have always said in speaking of the amount the Company were to receive for the construction of the prairie section—I have always kept prominently in view the fact that they would be compelled to construct branch lines all over the various portions of the prairie section, in order to make their lands valuable, and in order to make traffic for their trunk line. And as the branch lines were entirely constructed at their own expense, I have always felt that a fair subject for the consideration of this House is the expenditure involved in these branch lines. As to what the hon. gentleman has said, the only conclusion I could arrive at from his remarks—and I followed him attentively, as I always do when listening to words of wisdom—was, that we are asking too little money—I could not find any reasonable foundation except that, for the statements which he made to the House. He complains that we are not providing for the branch lines. He says, it is true you are providing for the rapid construction of the main line, but the branch lines are important, and what is to become of them? Well, Sir, that is a very important point, and I beg to tell him that it is one which has not escaped the attention of the Government; and I think he will not contradict me when I say that he and I have had no understanding that he should raise that question, and that I should answer it. I have no doubt that he will be delighted when I tell him that the importance of extending these branch lines has engaged the attention of the Government, and that it is provided by a private Bill which is now before the House, that in regard to these lines, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be enabled to bond that portion of the branch lines which is constructed, in order to provide the means for their steady and continuous extension. If we look at the district of southern Manitoba, we know that there are a vast number of people who have gone in there under the impression that

they would soon be reached by railway communication; and we felt that for the development of the North-West, and for securing the traffic, which is the foundation of the success of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is absolutely necessary that these branches should be extended. I am sure the hon. gentleman will give us a hearty support in the measure which we intend to submit to Parliament, and which has already engaged our attention for the purpose of steadily and profitably carrying out the branch lines in those sections of the country where there is a demand for them, and where their construction will not only develop the country, but secure a valuable traffic for the Canadian Pacific Railway. I may say, in reference to the speech of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming), that I was glad that he dealt with this question with a frankness which did him great credit, so far as that portion of his speech is concerned, by saying that these lands would give a return of \$9,000,000 in two or three years. He knows that under the Resolutions every cent of those \$9,000,000 will come directly into the coffers of Canada in meeting interest and extinguishing this debt. The hon. gentleman made a sound calculation and I repeat that it is a pleasure to be able to listen to gentlemen on that side of the House who break away a little from the trammels of party, which seem so to limit the mental vision of some hon. gentlemen—and discuss so great a question in the business-like way in which they would discuss any other practical question outside the field of politics. He said, you will not only get \$9,000,000 from the lands, but you will have over \$2,000,000 per annum of net profits from the working of the railway. I commend to my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, this remark of his friend, the hon. member for Peel. We are not only to give them assistance for promoting the construction of branch lines, so as to enable them to issue bonds on the constructed portion of the line, for the purpose of being applied to their extension, but, as the hon. member for Peel says, they are going to get \$2,000,000 of net profits per annum on the operation of the railway, for the purpose of carrying out and extending the branch lines in any direction which may be absolutely necessary in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friend is very anxious about Portland and Sault Ste. Marie. Well, I do not think it was a very extraordinary thing that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should have paid a visit to the harbour of Portland. The hon. gentleman knows that it is the nearest port on the Atlantic to the port of Montreal. No person requires to be told that one of our difficulties with regard to the Atlantic port for the Canadian Pacific Railway, is the advantage, which unfortunately for us—I was going to say nature, but I believe it was something of a more personal character which gave that which formerly, and rightfully belonged to us, to the adjoining country—that great misfortune placed the nearest Atlantic port to Montreal in the United States. Does the hon. gentleman think that if I, as Minister of Railways, found that to-morrow default was made, and this road were to come into my hands, and I were called upon to operate it—does the hon. gentleman not suppose that I would feel it my duty to get all the trade and traffic that comes from the old world into the port of Portland, and draw it to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and carry it away to the Pacific coast, if I could? I should be wanting in my duty to the country and to the enterprise in which I was engaged, if I did not do so; and I am quite certain, if my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were himself the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, he would have been down at Portland making arrangements for this trade, and directing attention to the fact that if the people of Portland consulted their own interest, they would give their traffic to the Canadian Pacific Railway instead of to any other trans-continental line of railway. What more, Sir? The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Stephen pointed out the advan-

tages that would be derived by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the people of Portland if Minneapolis and St. Paul and the western States were brought nearer to the ocean by way of the harbour of Portland. Well, Sir, would there be any great harm in the extension of the road from Algoma Mills to Sault Ste. Marie, which is not a very heavy work? Mr. Stephen told them frankly that if the American road was brought to Sault Ste. Marie, the Canadian Pacific Railway intended to meet it there in order to attract through Canada all the trade of the western States that he could obtain. The hon. gentleman knows that there was nothing very surprising in that, and there would be nothing very injurious to Canada if all that trade were carried through this country down to Montreal and even to the harbour of Portland. But the hon. gentleman says there is no provision made for the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie line. Well, Sir, he has been already told that if those railway magnates engaged in the construction of the railway in the United States, bring down their line to Sault Ste. Marie, means will be found to meet it there. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the proposed line from Gravenhurst to Callander. I may tell him frankly that the Government have not lost sight, and will not lose sight, of that question. We owe it to the North-West as well as the great commercial centres of Ontario, that we should get the cheapest and shortest and most efficient line of communication between the great commercial centres of Ontario and the North-West, just as we have provided for communication with the great commercial centres of the Province of Quebec. But the hon. gentleman is very anxious about this line to Quebec, and he has raised a very important and interesting question. Well, the House will remember that I have stated emphatically that since Confederation has taken place, since all, or the great bulk of the benefit that results from increasing the trade and business of any section of this country inures to the Federal Treasury, and not to the Local Treasury—I have stated my opinion again and again to this House, and I repeat it now, that you have not a right to ask, you cannot fairly demand, that the Local Governments of these various Provinces of which Confederation is composed shall deplete their resources by building a national line of railway for any portion of this country; and I say that if the Government of the Province of Quebec put their hands into the treasury of that Province, and, at their own cost, burthening their own treasury, built a line of railway that forms a most important link in the trans-continental line from the harbour of Quebec to Port Moody on the Pacific Ocean, it does form a just and fair ground for consideration on the part of the Government and on the part of this Parliament; and I am glad to find, from the enlarged sentiments which the hon. gentleman has thrown out, that, when we feel obliged to come to this House and ask fair consideration for the great expenditure made on an important section of our trans-continental line of railway, the hon. gentleman will be prepared to give us that hearty support which his statement here to-day shows that he will give. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the question of a bridge across the river at Quebec—because, as I said, he seems inclined to devise means by which we shall be in a position to come to Parliament with larger demands on the exchequer. He says, this parliamentary sum that you are asking amounts to nothing. No person knows better than the hon. gentleman that it forms no burden, and he uses his fertile imagination to conjure up means by which it may be made a little larger, and by which still greater national enterprises may be engaged in. No person doubts that would be the value of a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec, to connect the Intercolonial Railway, a thousand miles of which or thereabouts we are operating, and the Lower Provinces by the most direct communication with the old and important city of Quebec. No per-

son doubts for one moment the advantage that there would be in bringing the city of Quebec on to that direct line of communication, and I take it for granted that when the Government are able to devise any means or to suggest anything by which so important an object can be accomplished, we may rely upon the hearty support and co-operation of my hon. friend opposite. But he has very much favoured a winter port in the Maritime Provinces, and I was a little amused at the hon. gentleman growing facetious at my expense—though I must say he does not often sin in that way—because I pointed out that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are fully alive to the great importance of reaching the city of Quebec as an ocean port; and I am in a position to state that they do attach such importance to that subject that I have no doubt whatever that arrangements will be made by which the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway in summer will not stop at Montreal, where it now is, but will steadily go on until it reaches the great ocean port of Canada, the harbour of Quebec. From the very first hour that I have been in communication with that Company, I have not ceased to point out the importance, in my opinion, of making Quebec, the great ocean port of Canada, the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I know they are fully impressed with its importance, and the Government realize, not only the importance of having the Canadian Pacific Railway carried down to the port of Quebec, but what is still more vital, of seeing the city of Quebec reached by something more than lines under the control of one single Company. We regard it, Sir, as demanded by the interest of the country, that not only that Province, but the great Province of Ontario, should not become subject to one huge and giant monopoly in the hands of one Company, a policy the hon. gentleman knows, he and his party behind him are at this moment endeavouring to promote. The hon. gentleman knows that if that great Province of Ontario is not placed under the heel of a giant monopoly, which is to control every railway constructed within its borders, it is because this Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have stood in the breach, and have met all the hostility that has appeared in England, in Canada and in this House, and have stood by what we regard as the interests of the people of this country. It is very well to talk to us about monopolies in the North-West, where at this moment there is only 100,000 of a population; but even there we have recognized the importance and necessity of, at the earliest moment, taking measures to sweep away any such monopoly. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite, whilst shouting down monopoly in the North-West, to be banded together in a solid phalanx with a great corporation for the purpose of bringing the great Province of Ontario under the control of one powerful monopoly and preventing competition by other lines of railway in that Province. While it is our duty to stand by the rights and the interests of the great mass of the people, to protect them against any monopoly of that kind, it is equally our duty in the interests of the people that we should extend the same principle further, and see that the great and important harbour and city of Quebec shall be reached by something besides lines of communication under the control of one monopoly which can deal with the traffic as they choose. I do not intend to allude at any length to the communication that has been addressed by the Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway to this House or to my right hon. friend, but I may say this, and I cannot say less than this—I say that during my experience in Parliament of nearly twenty-nine years, I have never witnessed any attempt to overawe the Parliament of Canada to the same extent as this. I state this—and I know what I say will meet with universal assent—and every hon. member in this House knows that the Grand Trunk Railway have never had a firmer or more steadfast friend than myself. Every hon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

gentleman here knows that I have quarrelled with my own friends on this side of the House in relation to measures introduced which I thought were likely to cripple or interfere with the advancement and interests of that company; everybody knows that I consider that company has great claims upon the people of Canada, for the expenditure they have made in the country and the extent to which the commerce of this country has been carried on through their agency and by that expenditure; but while I say that I am prepared, as a member of this Government, to give the fullest and fairest consideration to every reasonable representation in their behalf, I trust the time will never come when that or any other company will be able to overawe this Parliament, and cause any step to be taken that the sober judgment of the Government and the Parliament of the country does not feel, can be taken in the interests of the country. To return, however, to the subject of which I was speaking, the necessity of a Canadian port in the winter season, there is but one opinion, and I have stated it frankly and fully to the House as I am accustomed to do when dealing with any question. I have said that we found it utterly impossible to rival the proximity of Portland by the Intercolonial Railway, despite everything that has been done, and a great deal has been accomplished in carrying a vast volume of freight over that road. During the last year, notwithstanding the position in which we stood, 299,000 tons of freight were carried over the Intercolonial Railway more than were carried over that road during any previous period of its history. Everything the Government could do has been done, and everything the Government can do is being done for the purpose of accomplishing that end which we had in view in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. But when we find that we cannot rival Portland as an ocean winter port, in consequence of its proximity, we are bound to take such measures as are found to be absolutely necessary in order to make our own ports second to none in that respect, in order to make St. Andrews, St. John, Halifax and ultimately Louisburg, 200 miles nearer to the old world than any of them, we are bound, I say, to take every measure we can to cause all the Canadian traffic possible to be carried over the lines that will come down to these Canadian ports; and I have no hesitation in saying that I believe this House is prepared to give full and fair consideration to any proposal necessary to accomplish so important and so desirable an object. My hon. friend was very facetious in referring to my statement that the Canadian Pacific Railway, in securing the control of the South-Eastern Railway, had secured the shortest line to New York and Halifax at the same time. That statement is perfectly correct. Let the hon. gentleman look at the map and examine where this road lies, and he will find it lies in an air line from Montreal to Halifax, and that, if they had no other object in securing it, they had this most important object in view—and one which they have always regarded as of the utmost importance in connection with this great trans-continental line of railway—that they should have, not a port in the United States, but an open port all the year round to be found within the borders of Canada. I say that road at Sherbrooke will connect with the international road. That road is also on an air line to the cities of St. John and Halifax and by its extension across a small portion of the State of Maine, it can be carried down to these ocean ports of Canada, and those ports can thus be brought nearly two hundred miles nearer Montreal than at present. The fact that the South-Eastern road rendered the Canadian Pacific Railway independent of the Grand Trunk Railway in their course to Portland, Boston or New York, was no reason why it should not, at the same time, be made to subserve the desirable object of drawing all the traffic possible out of the United States to Canadian lines, and also give the shortest and most direct

route to the ocean ports in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. I am glad this subject has attracted the hon. gentleman's attention, because I know from the mode in which he will deal with it, from the deep study he will give it, that he will be prepared to give the Government any aid that may be found necessary to accomplish so important and desirable an object. The hon. gentleman says he wants to know the end before beginning. That is just the fault I find with the hon. gentleman. These men who want to know the end before beginning never do begin; and if we were not to have the Canadian Pacific road until we could get to the end of it, I am sure we would have to wait a long time before commencing it. But I say this, and I say it with a good deal of pride, that the Government is able to point to the fact that from the first time we submitted this great proposition to the consideration of Parliament, not only had it all the elements of finality about it, but that every statement we have asked Parliament to accept has been verified and maintained. I told the hon. gentleman that we would not give over \$28,000,000 to complete that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was under the control and was being constructed by the Government, and I am glad to be able now, upon the very threshold of the completion of the whole of that work, to say that we shall not require more than the amount we estimated, but that the entire cost will be brought within the \$28,000,000. I ask my hon. friend and the House to accept that as an evidence that in submitting these estimates for the consideration of Parliament, the Government are entitled to some confidence and consideration at their hands. But, Sir, there is another point in this connection which is perhaps worthy of a moment's notice. The hon. gentleman says we know nothing as to whether we can get a pass through the Rocky Mountains. Why, the hon. gentleman ought to know that that pass has not only been surveyed, but that Mr. Sandford Fleming went through that pass himself from end to end during the past season, and cabled me to London that it was a splendid pass and he was perfectly delighted with it. The hon. gentleman ought to know that I could not very well have better evidence than that of a gentleman of such high standing and attainments as Mr. Sandford Fleming, after he had himself personally gone over the road and seen the engineers and examined everything in connection with it from end to end, and I give that to the hon. gentleman as the evidence that we not only know that there is a practicable pass, but that we know it is one of a very admirable and excellent character, and that its adoption has given the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and has given Canada, the enormous advantage of shortening our trans-continental line, and increasing our position to compete to that extent, by something like 100 miles. Now, there is a somewhat curious coincidence in reference to these estimates which I have now submitted to the House as to the cost of this work, when I am asking the House to accept my estimate at \$27,000,000, and it is this: No one knows better than my hon. predecessor the enormous difficulty and increased cost of the construction of the road between Prince Arthur's Landing and Red River, owing to its inaccessibility. My hon. predecessor knows that one of the great difficulties in the construction of that work within any reasonable time, one of the great difficulties in the construction of that work at any reasonable cost, was the fact that it was an entire wilderness of rocks and swamps from end to end of the 400 miles, that there was no population upon it whatever, but that it was an unsettled wilderness, and of as untoward and intractable a character as ever an engineer went over, I suppose.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suppose the hon. gentleman heard his follower from Cardwell the other night say that the great

mistake made by my Administration, and the mistake which was found fault with by the Conservatives, was that we did not begin at the middle instead of at the two ends.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know too much of my hon. friend from Cardwell to imagine that there has not been some error in the report of his speech.

Mr. BLAKE. There was—a great one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite certain that my hon. friend from Cardwell could not have committed so great an error. I think it is probable that what he said was this—

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; he said what I have quoted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it is probable that he may have said that it was incumbent upon the Government not to construct 228 miles of railway of a very expensive character at two ends, which were entirely useless until the middle was put in, without providing for the early construction of the middle.

Mr. MACKENZIE. So I did. That is not what he said.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is what he must have intended to say, and I think my hon. friend will agree with me that there is some reason in that. As I was saying, the work was of a very difficult character, and its expense was enormously increased owing to its inaccessibility. Why, the cost of getting material, of getting men, of getting machinery of any kind, of constructing roads of any kind to get access to it, was fabulous, and only persons who are acquainted with railway construction can form any idea of it, as my hon. friend knows. Then he knows that the cost of the Pembina Branch was very great. It arose from a variety of circumstances. It was thought wise to do the grading a long time before it was followed up and the track laid, and from a variety of causes, from the fact of its completion being hurried so as to get the rails down and the track over it, the construction of the 86 miles of railway from Selkirk to Pembina was very expensive indeed. The hon. gentleman knows, because he has given his attention to it, that the most expensive and difficult portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from end to end is that portion lying in the gorges of the Fraser River. He knows that through that country engineers had to be slung down by ropes fastened to trees, in order to locate the road; he knows, that it was one of the most inaccessible, one of the most difficult places in which it was possible for any person to undertake either to locate or to construct a railway. Let me draw the attention of the House for a few moments to a comparison between that work which the Government have now all but completed, and which three years ago I estimated would cost twenty-eight millions of money, and the work now before the House, based on my estimate to cost twenty-seven millions of money, and I think hon. gentlemen will see that we have good grounds for entertaining the belief we do entertain that our estimate of twenty-seven millions of money to complete this work is a very safe and reliable estimate. I take first the road built and being built by the Government, the 708 miles of road. From Prince Arthur's Landing to Selkirk the total is 407 miles. I am sure my hon. friend from East York will agree with me that 105 miles of that may be fairly classed as very heavy work. Then I class 182 miles as light work, and 102 miles as moderate work. I divide it into these three classes, and I am quite certain that my hon. friend's recollection will concur with me in the statement that it is a very fair division. Then, from Savona's Ferry to Port Moody, there is 90 miles of very heavy work—the heaviest work found on the Canadian Pacific Railway from end to end, and that portion in the gorges of the Fraser River—80 miles of heavy work,

and 43 miles of moderate work, making a total of 213 miles. Then the Pembina Branch I call 86 miles of light work, and that cost \$1,496,798. The Colville Branch is two miles of moderate work, making a total of 708 miles, which I estimate to cost \$28,000,000, and I am in a position to state that I believe my estimate will be equal to the charge. Now, as to the work remaining to be done by the Canadian Pacific Railway. From near Sudbury Junction to Nepigon, 95 miles of very heavy work, 175 miles of moderate work, and 210 miles of light work. I may tell my hon. friend that I have been pushing as rapidly as possible the copying of the profile which we have from end to end, and I shall be able to lay it upon the Table at once, so that any hon. gentleman can see for himself how far the statement I have made is verified by the profile. Then, from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Savona's Ferry, there are 15 miles of very heavy work, 211 miles of moderate work, and 30 miles of light work or 286 miles in all. This makes the total to be constructed by the Company, 766 miles. That my chief engineer has estimated, after the most careful consideration, at \$30,000,000, and, of the work done on the section from near Sudbury Junction to Nepigon, the grading is completed, ready to receive the track, on sixty-five miles, which we put down at \$1,200,000 of work done. That leaves \$28,800,000. There is one-third of the grading done on the ninety-five miles of heavy work, which I put down at \$1,800,000, which, deducted from the former sum, will leave \$27,000,000 to finish the work, and I believe that there is no engineer, that there is no railway contractor, who is acquainted with the character of the work which the Government engaged to do, and which will be accomplished within the \$28,000,000, and this work which remains to be done by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and which is estimated at \$30,000,000, \$3,000,000 having been already accomplished, who will not say that that is a fair estimate.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman say what is the estimated cost from the Rockies to Kamloops?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not divided here. I have estimated the total 706 miles at thirty millions, basing it upon the experience we have had with similar work elsewhere: and I mention that now because I think it would meet the point which the hon. gentleman spoke of as to having deficient information. I do not intend to detain the House any longer, but before sitting down I will say to the hon. member for East York, that what Mr. White is reported to have said, as stated here, is, "That what we complained of was—and it was the complaint everywhere—that the hon. gentleman milked the two ends and left the centre untouched, not that he did not build a railway. That was the cause of our complaint." I will only say in conclusion, that I did not expect to have added another word to this discussion. I thought the subject was pretty well exhausted by the able addresses upon both sides of the House. I thought, on all the most important points connected with this question, that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had been answered by more than one hon. gentleman behind him whose statements I thought fully met every point that required to be met in regard to these Resolutions. I leave these Resolutions in the hands of the House to be dealt with, quite certain that we will be gratified to find that the hon. leader of the Opposition is not able to give his support to the motion made by the hon. ex-Minister of Militia, that at any rate, he is satisfied that it is only necessary to have a little more information and further expenditure to make these Resolutions perfectly palatable to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. VAIL. We have heard the same old story and the same old charge made this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Railways. Almost every hon. gentleman who has risen  
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

to speak in opposition to the Resolutions, has been charged with being disloyal, and with being enemies to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman has thought proper to say that because I moved this amendment to defer for six months the consideration of this question, I must necessarily be an enemy to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I deny the charge, Mr. Speaker. This House has now been occupied for the last fortnight in the discussion of these Resolutions. We know, Sir, it must be very important for the Company to have this matter settled one way or the other as soon as possible. I say I am not an enemy to the Company, in fact I hold certain members of that Company, whom I know very well, in high respect—in much higher estimation than any hon. gentleman who sits on the Treasury benches. I would be the last man in this House to say one word against the gentlemen composing the Company, or do anything at all to interfere with the progress of the great work in which they are engaged in completing our line of railway to the Pacific coast. Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said on both sides of this question. I am not disposed, nor do I care, to follow members who have preceded me in this debate, and go over the same ground. It has become tiresome to me, and I suppose it has become tiresome to yourself. But there are two or three little matters I desire to refer to before you leave the Chair, and I will put them in the most concise form I can. In the first place I would ask, why are we charged with being enemies of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Do the Canadian Pacific Railway Company own this country? Are we bound, as representatives of the people, to do as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company want us to do? Are we bound to take \$30,000,000 out of the Treasury and give it to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company because they ask us to do it? Are our mouths to be shut on this side of the House from speaking against these Resolutions, by the charge that we are enemies of the Company? For myself I shall give my opinion on these Resolutions, undeterred by this charge. Now, if the House will allow me, I will refer to a few points in the past history of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When British Columbia came into Confederation the Government of that day agreed to commence in two years, and complete in ten years, a road through the Rockies to connect with the system of railways in the Province of Ontario. Subsequently, when that agreement was being ratified by this House, a resolution was passed which bound the Government not to go on with this work to an extent which would increase the taxation of the country. We know, Sir, what took place afterwards. We know that the Government of the right hon. gentleman fell in 1873, that my hon. friend from East York was called upon to form a Government. We know that after he formed that Government he found himself in a very awkward position in consequence of the arrangement with British Columbia. The first thing to which he had to turn his attention was the agreement with British Columbia, by which the Government was bound to build this railway. On the one side he was pressed by British Columbia, backed up by the British Government, to go on and complete the work and carry out the terms of the agreement: on the other side he found this resolution staring him in the face which debarred him from proceeding with the work if it increased the taxation of the country. He however succeeded in making a modified arrangement, by which he agreed to go on with the work as a Government work; and, instead of completing it in 1881, as the first arrangement provided, he was not to complete it till 1890. I mention this now, because I desire to show the House and the country that we are not bound, under our arrangement with British Columbia, to complete this road before 1890. Well, Sir, we know what took place at that

time. We know that these patriotic hon. gentlemen on the other side—or their friends—fomented discord in British Columbia. They induced the people of that Province to call public meetings and insist on the Mackenzie Government carrying out the contract. We know that in order to allay that feeling the Government went as far as they could in the direction of commencing this road, and that Mr. Mackenzie very soon afterwards took power from Parliament to commence the work. His policy was to commence it at the western end of Lake Superior, to build on to Winnipeg, and then to proceed with the road into the interior of the country and open up the North-West as fast as the country could be settled. This, I think it will be generally acknowledged to-day, was a common-sense policy, and the proper policy for the Government to pursue. He had till 1890 to complete the road to the Pacific, and it was not until near the end of that time that he intended to turn his attention to building the road north of Lake Superior. He made great progress in that work, had reached Winnipeg, and had done a good deal of work on the Pacific side. He had let the contract west of Winnipeg, and was prepared to go on and carry out his policy, utilizing the water stretches in order to reach the North-West. And, Sir, nothing more was required at that time for the North-West than a route by which immigrants could reach that country in summer. In 1878 the Government of my hon. friend was defeated at the polls, and hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. After they came in they began to let contracts that covered hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars. We know that the country became alarmed at the fabulous sums that were being spent on this road; we know that the country was anxious that the road should be built, and we know that the people were desirous of ascertaining what their obligations would be, and how much this road was going to cost. We know very well that it was urged that the road should be taken out of the hands of the Government. We know the supporters of the right hon. gentleman insisted that the Chief Engineer should be removed; he was removed. Report stated that the followers of the right hon. gentleman insisted on his removal; I may be wrong in that, but he certainly did retire from the position. They, it was said, induced the right hon. gentleman to place the road in the hands of a company. He spent a summer in England trying to get a company to take up the enterprise. It was only a short time before Parliament met that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed with the Government to complete the road on the terms of a certain contract. We know when the contract was submitted to Parliament that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, and the Minister of Railways especially, told the House that it was a very favourable contract for the Company and the country as well. The Minister of Railways said it was a gigantic work—that the Company must have sufficient money to build the road, otherwise they would be coming back, by-and-bye, for more money, and he wanted to settle the matter once for all, and the House and the country agreed that the contract should be ratified. It was ratified, and the Company were bound to complete the road in 1891. It is not necessary for me to refer to the indorsement of the bonds spoken of the other day—but when I heard the passage in the Speech from the Throne setting forth that some assistance was to be asked from Parliament for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I made up my mind that they were *in extremis*, that they required aid, and that the country, would perhaps, be justified in giving them some assistance, provided they could show good grounds for their application. But I was astonished, I was surprised, I may almost say, as a friend of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I was disappointed when the Minister of Railways, instead of telling us the exact position of the Company, the only reason why Parliament was asked to vote \$30,000,000, was because the Government want the road finished in 1885 instead of

1892. Had the hon. gentleman told us that the road had cost much more than they estimated, that they had gone on very rapidly with the work and that under the circumstances they must either stop work or the Government must render them some assistance—I say for one, as an Independent member of this House, if the matter had been put in that way, I would have hesitated some time before I would have voted against assistance being granted. But when the hon. gentleman stated that it was merely a question as to whether the road should be completed in 1891 or 1885, I say he gave up his case. When he asked the country to vote \$30,000,000 for the sake of getting a railway completed round Lake Superior in five years before it was required in the interests of the North-West, he was asking the country to do that in which no man ought to support him in. I ask my hon. friends from Nova Scotia—who, I am sure, are desirous of doing anything they can both for the Government and the Province they represent—if they have looked at the Public Accounts and the amount of the public debt, if they have noticed that in 1867, when the Provinces were confederated, the whole gross debt amounted to \$93,000,000, and that in sixteen years we have increased that amount to \$202,000,000, and it is now proposed by the Minister of Railways with one stroke of the pen to add \$30,000,000 more. I ask them again to consider whether, if it took 100 years for the four Provinces first confederated to roll up a debt of \$93,000,000, which has since been increased to \$202,000,000, it is not proper, as an hon. member said the other evening, that we should pause and ask whither are we drifting? I had hoped for the last year or two, as the protective policy introduced by the Minister of Finance a few years ago presses especially heavily on Nova Scotia, as it has been like a canker eating into the hearts of the people of that Province, that the time was not far distant when he would, considering the peculiar position of the Maritime Provinces, reconstruct his Tariff, or revise it so as to make it bear less heavily on the people of Nova Scotia; but I see no hope of this if the Resolutions carry. I ask my hon. friends who represent Nova Scotia if they have looked into the Trade Returns? If not, let them refer to the year 1878 and notice that the taxes paid by the people of that Province in that year amounted to about \$1,200,000, whereas, last year it reached \$1,833,469, an increase of 50 per cent. in the last five years. I do not wish to detain the House at any length, but I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Railways why it is that in asking for this grant of \$30,000,000, he did not, at the same time, ask something from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in return? He has stated that the Company would by-and-bye give up the monopoly, and that they would probably make a winter port in British territory. I ask why did he not insist on those conditions? Why did he not tell the Company: "If we grant you this money, you must give up the monopoly and adopt a port in British territory as your winter port." If he had done this, and I claim the Company were bound to do this, I would have been rather disposed to have supported the Resolutions. The bargain is, however, all one-sided as respects the Company. I do not see, while the Company were asking the Dominion Government to grant \$30,000,000 more, there was anything secured in return, except the completion of the road four or five years earlier than the date mentioned in the contract, which to my mind is a matter of no importance. In regard to the return of this money: I ask the hon. Minister of Railways, with his experience as to the difficulty involved in getting money back into the Treasury from a railway company, whether he really and honestly expects that the money will ever return to the Treasury?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, every dollar.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman told the country when this contract was made that the railway would not cost the

people a dollar beyond what the House was asked to vote, and the House would not be called upon to grant another dollar beyond that stated in the contract. Yet the Government are now asking \$30,000,000 more. How then can I have any confidence in the hon. gentleman's statement? No doubt he intends now that such shall be the case, but he may change his mind by-and-by. He will then put the case to the House in this way: The Company expended a large amount of their own funds on this gigantic work in which the country is interested, and we cannot ask them to pay it off now; they will probably pay the interest and we will give them ten or twelve years more to pay it. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company will say you have not collected the millions which you advanced to the Grand Trunk, why, therefore, should you ask us for this money. What answer can be given? Can we deal differently with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from what we have dealt with the Grand Trunk? I say no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the fact that we furnished all this subvention, out of which the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be built, makes no difference between this case and the case of the Grand Trunk? There is not the slightest parallel, and I am astonished at the hon. gentleman.

Mr. VAIL. I cannot see that it makes any difference as to the question of getting back the money, for we have no security whatever that we will get it back. The Grand Trunk gave us security, but it is now down at the bottom of the list, and that is where the Canadian Pacific Railway will be before many years. I do not suppose if the country was properly secured for the repayment of the money that they would be disposed to refuse it, provided there was sufficient evidence laid on the Table to show that they were in such a position that they could not go on without the money. The complaint I make against the hon. Minister of Railways is, that he refuses to give us the requisite information in connection with the subject. What would a bank say, for instance, to an individual who, after having received from it a sum of \$50,000 to carry out a certain contract, and the individual, after having spent the money, should come to the bank and ask for \$50,000 more? The bank would say: What have you done with the \$50,000 which we advanced you; you must convince me that you have done the work for that amount before we can advance you any more? And would not that be a reasonable request? That is what we ask the Government to do. We ask for a tabulated statement, showing the cost of the work and the position of the Company—showing that the money has been honestly and properly expended—expended in the interests of the country, and on this contracted line when they have done that it will be time enough to say that \$30,000,000 shall be taken out of the Treasury of the Dominion and given to the Company. Referring, to the motion for a six months' hoist, I think it is one in the interests of the country, and one which cannot be said to be opposed to the interests of the Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am anxious to lay on the Table of the House the profiles of the entire line. I wish to say, however, that these profiles are originals, and I hope any gentleman examining them, will be careful that none are mislaid. It would be extremely inconvenient if any of them were lost.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. McNEILL. I am desirous of saying a few words expressing the reasons for the vote that I feel obliged to give on this occasion. I intend to make my remarks

Mr. VAIL.

very short, for the debate has already been protracted to a very considerable length, and I am sure hon. gentlemen are not desirous that it should be protracted unduly; and for that reason I do not intend to enter at any great length into a reply to the remarks which have been made by the speakers who have preceded me. I do not intend to enter into a discussion as to the nature of patriotism. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson) pleased us all very much last night; I am sure we all enjoyed very much the magnificent oration which he made upon that subject. For my own part I feel a little difficulty in deciding whether I most admired the fine frenzy of passion into which he worked himself on that subject, or his remarks upon the subject of the gerrymander. As to patriotism, I would only say that I do not know that there has been any special charge levelled against hon. gentlemen opposite as to the kind of patriotism which he resented. He quoted Dr. Johnson who said that patriotism was the last refuge of a scoundrel; but I do not know that that kind of patriotism, or any other has been charged against hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. But, Sir, I quote just two lines with reference to this subject from one of the most famous writers of Dr. Johnson's own age, concerning an element of patriotism which I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to. The lines are to be found in the *Traveller*, and they are:

"The patriot's boast where'er I roam,  
His first best country is his own."

I hope hon. gentlemen will lay these lines to heart, and act upon them. I would have attached somewhat more importance to the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition in which he asked for further particulars with regard to the moneys expended on the railway and a number of other matters, had I been able to believe that any information which the Government could afford him, or anything that could be said upon the question, could have induced him to alter his opinion with regard to these Resolutions. From the observations which fell from the hon. gentleman when he spoke previously in this debate, it seemed to me almost a little farcical that he should suggest that any information, or anything that could be said by the Government, or by other hon. members on this side, could in the smallest respect alter the determination to which he had come, which was, if possible, to vote down these Resolutions, and keep back the completion of this great national enterprise. With regard to the hon. gentleman who spoke last, I was very glad to observe that he had, in one respect at all events, answered the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who last night stated that the members of the Syndicate were as bad as bad could be. The hon. member who last spoke said that on the contrary he had the very highest esteem for them, which was very satisfactory as far as it went. Now, Sir, I am one of those, as you know from the observations I have addressed to this House, who think that railway companies have too much power in Canada. I think they have it in their power to a large extent to treat the public of Canada very much as they please, and I think it is the duty of the Government to attempt to devise means for their more efficient control; and, Sir, when I learned that it was the intention of the Government to supplement the great powers which this Company already possessed—powers which, whether rightly or wrongly, they are accused of having used very improperly—at all events, complaints are very numerous and very loud against them—when I heard that, I must confess that I was very much surprised and a good deal alarmed; and just as I felt it my duty, from my place in this House last Session, to oppose the views of the hon. Minister of Railways, and just as I would have felt it my duty, though very reluctantly, I confess, to vote against his views on that occasion had I had the opportunity, so I believed, when I came down to this House this Session, that it would be my duty also to record

my vote against the proposals of that hon. gentleman. But, Sir, in approaching a great question of this kind, a question which is admitted on all hands to be charged with results of the first importance to the people of this Dominion, I think it is one's bounden duty to endeavour as far as possible to lay aside all pre-conceived opinions, to get rid of all prejudices, and to view the question purely upon its merits. Now, I venture to say—I am sorry to say it, but I am obliged to say it—that that is by no means the spirit in which this great question has been approached by hon. members on the opposite side of this House. What has been from first to last the burden of their complaints? Has it not been, Sir, that this Company come back to this House to ask for more money? Now, Sir, I venture to say that it would be impossible to present this matter in a more unfair or misleading light than to put it in that way. Has this Company come here to ask for an additional grant of money to enable them to complete in the time specified in their contract this colossal work, which is admitted on all hands to be of such great importance to the unity, the prosperity and the development of this country? If they had come back to ask for a further grant of money to enable them to do this, then there would have been some reason in the statements made from the other side of the House; but as we know they have done nothing of the kind. We know that, owing to convulsions in the stock markets, and owing to other causes over which this Company had no control, they have been obliged to encounter difficulties in the completion of this work which, to gentlemen of less ability and less energy, would probably have proved altogether disastrous. Do they come here, then, to ask for further time in which to complete their contract? If they had done so, there would have been some reason in the charges preferred against them from the other side of the House. But, Sir, it is very well known that they ask nothing of the kind. It is well known that they ask to be relieved in no degree whatever from the provisions of the contract into which they have entered. We know that this Company have astonished, not the people of Canada only, but the people of the whole world, by the rapidity with which they have prosecuted this work. We know that they have astonished, not only the people of Canada, but the whole world, by the statement made a short time ago that they were prepared to complete this colossal work in about half the time in which they had agreed to complete it; and though hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House may endeavour to minimize the effect of that promise, gratuitously made on the part of these gentlemen, it is a fact that it was received with delight, not only by the people of Canada, but by all the friends of Canada in Europe. Well, Sir, the Company found that, beset with the difficulties to which I have referred, they were unable without assistance to fulfil this gratuitous promise, and they come here and say—we are unable to do this without assistance, but we are still prepared, to complete our work within half the time laid down in our contract, if you will only do—what?—not give us one solitary dollar—but if you will advance to us on security which the hon. leader of the Opposition has not ventured to say is not ample security, the sum proposed, and upon terms which will not add one single dollar to the burdens of the people of this country. That, Sir, is the proposal these gentlemen make to this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: "Oh, the Government said they would not come back, but we warned the Government and this House that they would come back, and here they are back." Well, the hon. leader of the Opposition is a great logician, and he must know very well that a more perfect example of the vulgar fallacy called equivocation or ambiguity, could not be produced than was produced by almost every speaker on his own side

of the House. They come back, it is true, but they come back to offer Canada better terms than she had under her original contract; they come back to say that, without adding to the burthens of the people in any respect whatever, they will build this road, which hon. gentlemen opposite declare they could not build in ten years, in half that time and give the people of Canada the benefit of that early completion. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite spoke as if the proposal of these men were something monstrous; as if they were asking for some wonderful favour. As if they could not fulfil their contract, although member after member on their side has risen in his place to state that the Company were in possession of funds sufficient even out of the profits they have made in this transaction to complete the work in the time specified in the contract. What we have to consider is simply, as I have already pointed out, whether they are likely in the first place to complete the work in the time they say they will, and whether in the second place the security they give is sufficient. As to the first we know that they have done a great deal more than they promised to do; we know that they have proceeded with the work much more rapidly than it could have been expected they would and that they have performed it with a degree of perfection which was altogether unexpected and which is beyond anything required in the contract. It is only fair therefore to give these gentlemen credit for what they have done in the past; it surely is only fair to give them fair play even though they do happen to be a railway company. Now hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured as far as possible to get rid of this remarkably plain case which is presented to this House in two ways. They have endeavoured to get rid of it by talking about a great many other matters in no way connected with this question, or at all events not in any way involved in it, and by the very usual process adopted in such cases of endeavouring to create a prejudice against the gentlemen who come here to ask us to agree to these terms. They have endeavoured to create prejudice in several respects. In the first place they have said that these gentlemen have expended the money which they have received from the Government, not upon the work they contracted to perform, but upon the purchase of other lines of railways. As has been already pointed out it certainly is a rather remarkable coincidence to find hon. gentlemen who have been inveighing against monopoly endeavouring to saddle the people of Ontario with the most gigantic monopoly known in modern times. In the first place with reference to the allegation that these gentlemen have expended the money they received in the purchase of other railways. It was absolutely necessary to the proper carrying on of the work they were in the act of constructing that they should secure an eastern extension. And in the next place I say it is not the fact that they have expended on these lines money which they had contracted to expend upon the main road. I say that it is patent that they have expended upon the main line west of Callander, a great deal more money than they have received from the Government. They have expended \$23,000,000 on that line as is not denied by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Lambton whose speech was so highly complimented by the hon. member for North Brant admitted that that amount has been spent on that part of the line. But he argued that they had only spent between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000 more than they had received from the Government. His argument in that respect was somewhat original I think in this House but we cannot say it was ingenuous. It amounted simply to this that he calmly suppressed those other items of expenditure which had been laid out on that part of the line. He altogether left out of consideration the fact when he stated that the Company had expended \$23,000,000 on that part of the line that

they had also expended \$6,500,000 in rolling stock which was a part of their contract and that in the material of construction they had also expended over \$4,000,000 cash making nearly 11,000,000 without speaking at all of the hundreds of thousands of dollars which they had expended in the improvement on the Government line and without speaking of the amounts they had expended on the branch lines which were all beneficial to the North-West. I am not speaking of the line down to Algoma Mills. In those three items the \$23,000,000 expended in the construction of the road the \$6,500,000 on rolling stock and the \$4,000,000 in material of construction they had expended on that main line west of Callandar about half as much more as all the money they received from the Government, that is than the \$22,000,000 which hon. gentlemen accept as the amount received. Therefore I say that the contention that these gentlemen had deceived the people by expending the money which they had received from the country upon work not contemplated in their contract and then coming here to ask for more money to enable them to carry out their contract is altogether unfair, untrue and misleading. But I am prepared for the purpose of cutting short this discussion to make hon. gentlemen opposite a present of this contention. I will not follow them into the thicket of figures and details in which they have endeavoured to involve this question. There is a little fish we all know of that is in the habit when he is closely pressed and nearly captured of darkening the water around him. Just in the same way hon. gentleman opposite knowing the position in which they stand in regard to this question, knowing that the question is one of the simplest ever presented to the people have endeavoured by throwing out a cloud of figures and details to darken the subject and to escape under the cloud they have raised. I will make them a present of the creditable insinuations they have made that these gentlemen are coming here with cooked accounts and on bended knees after having expended the money they received from the country in purposes outside the contract, and will simply refer to figures which on both sides of the House are admitted to be correct. Before doing so, I wish hon. gentlemen opposite to bear in mind two facts; that in the past the Company have completed the work they have done very much more rapidly and very much better than they were obliged to under their contract, and that, in the second place, the money which I hope and believe is about to be handed over to these gentlemen, the loan that is about to be made to them, will only be handed to them just in proportion as the work is done and not until after it is done, and then I will make hon. gentlemen opposite a present of this creditable contention that the accounts are cooked. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Company make default. Suppose that they do not complete the agreement that they now make, and that we are obliged, if the worst comes to the worst, to take over this road. I wish to point out to the House and to hon. gentlemen opposite, upon figures which are admitted by themselves, what the cost of this road to this country will be under those circumstances, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to controvert these figures, because they are figures that are notorious to every one. In the first place, there is \$28,000,000 which the Government line will cost the country; in the second place, there is \$25,000,000 of the money subsidy; in the next place, there is this \$22,500,000, which, we may consider, as my hon. friend from Cardwell said, is exchanged for the lands which, under those circumstances, we will get back again; in the next place, there is \$9,000,000—I believe it is a little less, but I am dealing with round figures—which they have received for the lands sold; in the next place, there is the \$7,500,000 which will be due in November, 1888; then, there is the \$5,000,000 of a charge on what I call the eastern extension of the road, and there is \$1,000,000

Mr. McNEILL.

of a charge on the lands which we would receive back again in the case of the failure of the Company to complete their contract. These figures all added together, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to say there is one solitary dollar more paid by this country for this road, amount to \$97,000,000 or thereabouts—I believe a little less—and that includes the whole line from Montreal to Port Moody. The hon. the leader of the Opposition last Session and this Session, from his place in this House, has distinctly stated that this line was worth to the country \$120,000,000, and that is without taking into consideration the Eastern Extension at all. Let us leave out of consideration that part of the road, which the hon. gentleman does not deal with, and the branch lines also not included by him. The branch lines have cost the Company something like \$3,250,000. It is notorious that the Eastern Extension has cost the Company \$8,500,000. That makes \$11,750,000. Subtract that from the \$97,000,000 which the whole line would cost, and you have the result, that this road, which the hon. gentleman told us is worth to the country \$120,000,000, will cost this country \$85,250,000. That is the frightful result which will take place if the Company make default; that is the terrible result we have heard inveighed against so strongly from the other side of the House; that is the terrible result the hon. gentleman who spoke before me lamented over, and his speech reminded me of the dismal dirge of the melancholy ocean, from which, I suppose, he took his inspiration. But the leader of the Opposition says that there will be no exaction of the penalty. He refers to the Grand Trunk, but my hon. friend from Cardwell has I think very satisfactorily disposed of that matter, and has shown that there is no similarity between the cases at all. I wish to call attention to one other matter which has not, I think, been referred to in this debate before. It is that the Government have no option in the matter at all. They have in this particular case no option if the Company make default in regard to taking over this line. The very fact of the default vests the property of the Company in the Government, and I venture to say the Government cannot get rid of that property without coming here to ask for an Act of Parliament to divest them of it. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that we are constructing this road too fast. Sir, I think we all admit the hon. gentleman's great ability. I think every one on this side of the House admits that he is a great debater, a great lawyer, and a great destructive critic. I do not hesitate to say, myself, although I differ from the hon. gentleman essentially on many questions, that he discharges his duties in this House, mainly—though on this occasion he is not doing so; I have a right to think so—but I think he mainly discharges his duties in this House in his position as leader of the Opposition, with great advantage to the people of Canada. I believe, Sir, that the people have confidence in the hon. gentleman as leader of the Opposition in this House; I believe they admire his great ability, I believe they think the cast of his mind is well adapted to this position, and that they will keep him in that position for a long time to come. But I say that when, in order to make out a case against the Government, this great lawyer, one of the greatest lawyers in this country, is obliged to advance the extravagant assertion that this road is being built too fast, then all I can say is that I think it is one of the most extraordinary positions in which a man of his ability can be placed. When, in spite of all his great ingenuity, in spite of all his legal acumen, and in spite of his experience in debate, he is obliged to take such a position as that, I think it shows what a very bad case he has got. Aye, Sir, the hon. gentleman says (he is forced to say) that it would be better to delay for seven years the completion of the work. Well, if it is wrong to complete the work in two years it would be still worse to complete it in a month. He thinks it would be better to delay for seven years to come the completion of this great means of communication between Province

and Province, this great highway which hon. gentlemen opposite admit to be so essential for the solidarity of the Dominion. It would be better, the hon. gentleman says, to force these poor people in the North-West, whom he loves so much, the poor people with whom he sympathizes so much under the cruel exactions of a grinding Tariff,—it would be better to force them to pay the enormously increased freight rates which they must pay for seven long years to come, when navigation is closed, for want of the completion of that part of the line north of Lake Superior. It would be better, the hon. gentleman thinks, that these poor people should be forced for seven years to pay these increased freight rates than that the line should be completed. It is better, he thinks, that the Company should be prevented for seven long years to come from devoting their energies to the construction of these branch lines that the hon. gentleman says are so essential; it would be better the hon. gentleman says that this should be done. Sir, I cannot help saying to myself that if the hon. gentleman belonged to a different party from the party to which he does belong, I should almost be inclined to think there was some reason unknown to himself which actuated him with reference to this matter; I should be inclined to think the hon. gentleman, perhaps unknown to himself, was desirous that these difficulties should continue in the North-West; I should be inclined to think that he was desirous, for some reason unknown to himself, that the people in the North-West should suffer a little longer from the difficulties and inconveniences from which they are now suffering. I know very well the party to which he does belong; I know very well that it is not such a party as that to which I have referred. If it were a party that had been teaching the people of this country to set one class against another; if it were a party that had been endeavouring to teach the labourer that the employer of labour was his natural enemy; if it were a party that had been endeavouring to teach the farmer that the manufacturer was his natural enemy; if it were a party that had been endeavouring to set creed against creed, Province against Province, race against race, in this country; if it had been a party that had been endeavouring to teach the people of Ontario to view with suspicion and dislike, if not with positive hatred, their fellow countrymen of the Province of Quebec; if it had been such a party as that, that the hon. gentleman belonged to, I might have thought that if he had searched in that chamber of his mind in which the motives of his actions dwell, he might have been able to find there some lurking desire that that difficulty, that these inconveniences, should, for party purposes, still continue in the North-West. I know the hon. gentleman does not belong to such a party as that. He belongs to the great party of progress, the great part of patriotism, the great party of purity, that party which has unfurled to our gaze the banner of political purity—"mystic, wonderful," indeed! But, Sir, the hon. gentleman thinks it would be better that the people should be forced to pay these additional freights, that they should not be provided with these branch lines for seven years longer. He thinks it would be better to give competing lines seven years longer to consolidate their traffic, and to secure their trade; because the hon. gentleman is not sure whether, in the competition that is to follow, it would be any advantage to them at all. Therefore, he would give them seven years longer for the purpose of consolidating their traffic and consolidating their business arrangements. I have always understood that it was one of the most difficult things in the world, in any kind of trade, if it was once thoroughly established, to lead it to flow into other channels. But the hon. gentleman does not seem to think that the Canadian Pacific Railway would have any difficulty. He says that eventually, if they have better opportunities, if they can offer better advantages to those desirous of sending their

freight over these other lines, he thinks that eventually freights will come to the Canadian Pacific Railway; but it does not matter a straw whether the Canadian Pacific Railway has in its infancy to contend with these difficulties or not. The hon. gentleman thinks also that it would be much better to risk the effect on European opinion of a sudden cessation of the work; he thinks it would be better to risk the effect upon the credit of the country of a sudden announcement that we were not going to complete the work in the time we had stated to the world that we would complete it. He thinks that it would be better to risk the effect on immigration also. Now, Sir, I have ventured to speak of the credit of the country, and I say it would be most injurious to our credit if we were suddenly to announce to the world that the work which we had stated we were going to complete in the course of two years, would not be completed until the end of 1891. Because, hon. gentlemen will remember that it is to Canada that the credit or discredit belongs. It is not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that is looked upon in Europe with reference to this work—it is Canada; and the result will be, if this work suddenly ceases, that it will be said that the resources of this country have not been sufficient to complete the work in the time we said we were going to complete it, and this argument of the detractors of Canada could be pressed home with crushing effect by reference to a speech delivered on the floor of this House in the course of this debate by the late Finance Minister of Canada, because he told us in effect that he did not consider that the resources of this country would warrant our endeavouring to complete the road in that time. That hon. gentleman has the courage of his opinions, as it is said; he has the courage of his convictions with a vengeance, because he tells us distinctly that, in his opinion, it would be far better than that the work should have been prosecuted as rapidly as it has been if it had been left to the settlers there to do the work, to build it out of their own lands, I think he said. It naturally occurs to one that, under these circumstances, there would have been very few settlers to build the road, but I suppose that would have been all the better, because then the road would have been built all the slower, and that would have satisfied the hon. gentleman so much the more. But the hon. gentleman has necessarily opposed these Resolutions, because, irrespective altogether of the peculiar nature of the question, irrespective altogether of anything that may be said with reference to this particular subject, it is essential to the hon. gentleman, it is essential to his consistency, that he should oppose this loan. There is only one argument that can be adduced by the Government, to warrant them in making this loan, and that is that the loan will advance the interests of the country. It is the hon. gentleman's rooted conviction, it is an essential element in his political creed, it is one of the fundamental principles of his philosophy, to which he adheres with all the adhesiveness which is so characteristic of him, that a Government cannot advance the interests of a country at all. The hon. gentleman had stated so in words which have been impressed upon the minds of the people of this country, in words which have become almost proverbial in Canada; he has stated that any one who says that a Government can advance the interests of a country knows nothing of what he is talking about. Therefore, it is natural that he should oppose this vote, which was to advance the interests of the country. I will read the hon. gentleman's words. He lays down the duties of a Government, and the capabilities of a Government. He says:

"The country may stand or fall, may be prosperous or the reverse, and we are flies on the wheel; and those who say that the Government can advance the interests of a country know nothing of what they are talking about. The Government of a country is utterly helpless to advance its interests. All that they have to do is to draw their salaries, discharge the administrative duties of their offices, and leave the country to

stand or fall, as the case may be, without putting out a hand to save it or give it relief in any way.<sup>17</sup>

Those are the hon. gentleman's words. That is a fundamental principle of his political creed, and it would be unreasonable and unfair to expect the hon. gentleman to support these Resolutions. But, although the hon. the leader of the Opposition may be assumed to hold this view also, because he has gone to so much trouble to get the benefit of the advice and assistance of the late Finance Minister, although he must be supposed to hold those views with respect to the Government of the Dominion, I am happy to know that the supporters of hon. gentleman opposite in the country do not hold those views, because when I ventured to publish them in a printed address to my constituency I was almost reviled by a personal friend of the leader of the Opposition, the late local member for North Bruce, on a public platform for having dared to have said that the late Finance Minister was capable of having used such language. It was alleged that the statement was simply concocted and manufactured by the hon. Minister of Railways, and a gentleman who was a supporter of the late Finance Minister made use of this very ingenuous argument in order to prove that the hon. gentleman never made use of those words. He said Sir Richard Cartwright is a clever man, and I ask you whether you think a clever man would make use of such words—he used an expression which I will not repeat. It was a very short word, however, which did not imply that the person holding such views was very clever. That is how the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite met that statement of the hon. gentleman whom the leader of the Opposition has taken such pains to bring back into his counsels. I do not agree with the gentleman who spoke in such disparaging terms of the ability of this utterance of the ex-Finance Minister. I think it is very clever. I think he has made a clever and logical deduction from, and a *reductio ad absurdum* of the principles on which he founds his whole political creed. I think it is not a stupid statement on his part; it may not have shown a great deal of wisdom but it has shown a good deal of cleverness. The hon. gentleman, as I have said, holding the views he holds was obliged to oppose the Resolutions, because the only argument in their favour was that they were for the advancement of the interests of the country, and he placed no reliance on any such argument. If the hon. gentleman considered that this advance was to be made simply for the benefit of the Company, he was of course in duty bound to oppose the Resolutions. I think the Company are by no means unworthy of our consideration. They have conferred great benefit on the people of this country already, and I believe if this money is advanced they will confer still greater benefit on the people. But in the consideration of these Resolutions I do not regard the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but I regard the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not know whether this enterprise is likely to be profitable or unprofitable to the shareholders of the Company. If it should be profitable to them, it would for them be all the better, and I venture to say it would be none the worse for Canada. I do not know how that may be, but this I do know, that we, the people of Canada, have a glorious heritage committed to our charge, a country which, while it possesses a climate as healthful and as agreeable to many people at least as that of any other country, is also endowed with a wealth of resources in mine, and plain, and forest and river unsurpassed I venture to say in magnitude and majesty by any nation of the world. Sir, this country, I believe, is destined to become, and will soon become, one of the most potent factors in the noblest empire ever known to man. And, Sir, in the consideration of this question we must remember that into our hands her destinies are committed. A great trust is committed to us. To us, Sir, is the peril that we may, in the measures we adopt, do that which will hinder or prevent the development of her magnificent resources; and

Mr. McNEILL.

to us also belongs the glory that we may, by the measures we adopt, promote and hasten their full development; and I feel in common with every man of intelligence in this country, that the prosecution of this great national enterprise is essential to their development. I see that the work already accomplished has been followed up by such an inrush of immigration, such an opening up of the country, such an unveiling of hidden treasure, such an unfolding of unsuspected riches before the eyes of the people of Europe as even the boldest advocate of this railway could not have ventured to predict; and for my part, I feel, that I cannot, I dare not, by opposing these Resolutions do that which might tend to stem that great tide of immigration, to divert it into other channels or hinder or impede that great development which is so successfully progressing in this country.

Mr. AUGER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy much of the time of the House at this late stage of the debate; but I cannot give a silent vote to this question. It is a most important question; it is a question involving \$30,000,000; it is a question involving even more than that sum, because I think while this is not the beginning, it is the middle, but not the end of these applications. I have listened with much attention to the speeches delivered on both sides of the House, especially to the speech of the Minister of Railways, and I endeavoured to find in what he said good reasons for giving away this money to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I call it giving away, because it is well known that money lent to these companies never comes back. Now, I have failed to gather from the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways, any good reason for supporting the Resolutions; and when I heard that hon. gentleman make the eloquent speech which he did make, when I heard him speak of the magnitude of the work, and the magnitude of the country which we were settling, saying that the Company was well able to fulfil its contract, saying that they did not come before the country, and before this Parliament, as beggars; and when, on the other hand, I heard him say that their stock was down on account of the cries of the Opposition, when I heard him raise the party cry, I felt I had to look closer into the matter, because I knew there must be a "nigger" on the fence somewhere. If the case had been a good one in itself, all the Minister would have had to show, would have been a true statement of what the Company had done, and what they were going to do, and then ask the House to vote \$30,000,000. But, as I said, when I heard so many words, when I saw the hon. gentleman trying to raise the party cry, I mistrusted that he had no good reasons, and that he took that means to attract the attention of the House. Now, we on this side of the House have been accused of being unpatriotic, of running down the name of the Canadian Pacific Railway, of running down this Government and our own country. Mr. Speaker, for one, I deny the charge. I think we are as patriotic as any gentleman on the other side of the House. I say that we never have decried this country; and if the country has been decried, if this Company has met with opposition on the money markets of the world, we have not done it. I must say, however, that I do not believe that this Company has received any more opposition on the money market than any other Company of the same grabbing disposition. Who commenced this war with the Americans, and with the rest of the world? Was it not this Government who by their National Policy began to raise the cry against the Americans? Did they not try to run down the Americans, their laws, their lands, their country, their morals? Everything far and near that was American in its character, was run down by the party who sit on the other side of the House, and they praised this country. But what did the Company do? Did they not try to run in opposition to all other railways—to the Grand Trunk, and the American

railways, and because they have been worsted in the fight, they come here whining and crying and saying you must give us some more money. I think if the Company had used the money we gave them for the purpose for which it was given, they would not now be obliged to come before this House for more money. I will speak of only one railway, one in which I am interested, namely, the South-Eastern. That railway, from what I could understand from the Minister of Railways, was a road which ran pretty nearly everywhere—it was like the gun of a certain hunter who bent it because he wanted the ball to go all round, and hit everything. What did the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do? They bought the South-Eastern. Did they get it for the purpose of running that great line from the Pacific to the Atlantic? No, Sir. But more than that, they advanced money to a certain party, and then by not keeping their word, they have forced the president into bankruptcy, and many hundreds of men in my own town and county suffered by the loss of their wages; men who had been furnishing ties and wood to this Company lost their money by means of this Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, how should I be able to go back to my county and face my constituents, if I voted to give more money to this Company? I could not do it. The hon. Minister of Railways in his speech to-night said that by the South-Eastern Railway he could go down to the Lower Provinces. Of course he can do it by going around, but if he went by the South-Eastern Railway he could not do it. The South-Eastern Railway runs from Montreal to Newport, and of course if he were to go by way of Boston he could do it. They have also purchased a branch line from Sorel to Sutton Junction, which is of no earthly use for them to get to the sea. Besides they have taken over from the South-Eastern the lease of about 30 miles of the Montreal and Portland Railway, which is the only portion of the South-Eastern they can use to reach the Lower Provinces, passing by Sherbrooke. So the excuse given by the Minister of Railways is not a good one. We heard the Minister of Railways say that the Company were more than able to finish their contract, and almost at the same moment he said that their stock was run down; and we were given to understand by that that they could not go on. Other hon. members in their speeches have said that if we did not grant the money, the work is going to be stopped, and that this would do a great deal of damage to the country. This shows that the Company are coming here as beggars. One hon. member says they are not coming on their knees. No, they are straighter than that; they are powerful, and I rather think they are forcing the Government. I am afraid the Government is in the hands of that Company already, and I am afraid that by granting this \$30,000,000 we will add more strength to that Company, so as to make it easier for them to force the Government hereafter. Now, several speakers on the other side of the House have raised a great cry about the monopoly of the Grand Trunk. Well, who has made the Grand Trunk what it is but the Government? And if the Grand Trunk is a monopoly, the Government are going to treat this Company in a way to place it in the same position. Some hon. members have spoken about the grievances of the people of Manitoba, on account of this Company's monopoly, and on account of the way they treat the people there; but are the cries from the poor settlers of Manitoba heeded by hon. members on the other side? The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) exclaimed that he was almost indignant that these people should dare to come and ask redress for their grievances because their fathers, the first settlers of Ontario, had not a railroad, but had to carry their meal and flour on their backs, and I suppose he wants the people of the North-West to do the same. He says those people are spoon-fed. Well, this Company are not spoon-fed; I believe the Government feed them with a shovel. Now,

Sir, I am not going to give you figures. I believe you have heard figures enough in this debate; but when I heard the hon. Minister of Railways state the amount that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company required to finish the road, I was reminded of a story I heard of a school inspector who went around to examine school children. He came to a little boy, and asked him what was the circumference of the earth. The boy told him in round numbers. The inspector patted him on the head, and asked him, "My boy, how did you find that out?" The boy answered, "I guessed half, and multiplied by two." I think the hon. Minister of Railways must have guessed half of the amount required by this Company, and multiplied by two. One reason given for the rapid building of the railway was to help immigration, and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), who was praised a good deal by the hon. the Minister of Railways, told us that the building of the road so fast was injurious to immigration, because it had the effect of scattering the people all over the country. He told us that a great many people who went far west, found that they could not do well, and they had come back and settled within sixty or seventy miles west of Winnipeg; showing that the policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition was the true policy for settling the country—the policy of building the road more slowly, which would induce the people to settle up the country closely as the road was built, instead of being scattered here and there. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Brecken) said the other night that a great many of the people of Prince Edward Island had gone west, and had come home again, because they could do better at home. If that had been said by a Liberal, we would have been shouted at by the Government party, but it was said by one of their own friends. I do not wish to decry the North-West. I know it must be a great country, but I am afraid we are boasting of it a little too much—saying that we are the greatest nation in the world, that we shall be everything, and everybody else nothing. That brings to my mind the speech of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster). He boasted of being an Independent member, which touched me, because I claim to be Independent. If he had boasted of that to his grand-children, it would have been better, because it is well known that he always votes confidence in the Government. Of course, on other questions, he votes according to his reason, and the fact that he often voted with us shows that we had reason on our side, and that if he was not bound to the Government, he would always vote on our side. Now, I am in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I think it is better for this Company to use their own energy and means than to use ours. It would do them good. I have boys, and I have noticed that when I do the work and let them look on, it is not so good for them as when I make them do the work while I look on; and if the Government made the Company do the work, they would not have so many bad ideas about construction companies and things of that kind.

An hon. MEMBER. And palaces.

Mr. AUGER. I am willing that they should build palaces if they do it with their own money, but let them build the road before they build palaces. But while I am in favour of opening the North-West, I do not believe it is prudent to beggar the east for the sake of the North-West. If we have a great North-West, we must also remember that there are Provinces in the east that have not been built up by the North-West, but have built up themselves. We are in debt now. We are not lords. I am afraid there are more beggars than lords in the eastern Provinces, and I am afraid that the policy of this Government with reference to this railway will have the effect of making lords and beggars in the country. Now, in my county we have built two railways, and we have paid for them.

The Government has helped us only for one. We felt the need of those roads, and we built them, and are now enjoying them. I am sure if the Government use more of the people's money in connection with this Pacific Railway, their course will not meet with their approval. Hon. gentlemen opposite say the people approved of it. I deny that statement. The Government never went to the country on this question. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) said they did, but the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said they did not. Now which of those hon. gentlemen tells us the truth? It is well known that the Government went before the country in 1878 on the National Policy and on nothing else. They came into power. They appealed to the people again in 1882, although they should have waited until 1883, but they were afraid the National Policy would not last so long so they went in 1882 before the people on the strength of the National Policy, and were again returned to office. There was nothing then said about the guarantee of 3 per cent. or these Resolutions. If there had, I am sure the country would have been opposed to it, and the best proof that the country is opposed to these Resolutions is that the press of the country almost unanimously—if you take off the mercenary press which is paid for supporting the Canadian Pacific Railway—is opposed to granting this additional aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The leading French papers of the Conservative party, all the independent English papers, and the Liberal press are opposed to it. What better evidence can we have that the people are against it? From what I have heard from speakers on the other side, I have found out the reason why this money is required. It is to enable the Government to tide over the present commercial crisis. If these \$30,000,000 are brought into and expended in this country during these hard times it will help the hon. Finance Minister greatly in his financial report, and in three years from now when, of course, the times will be a little better, because fair weather always follows a storm, we will have new elections. They will say nothing then about the \$30,000,000, but they will say the country is prosperous because we have the National Policy. I will not detain the House any longer, as this question has been well discussed already. A great many have found fault, and among them the last hon. gentleman who spoke, with hon. members on this side, because, as they say, they have spent time in discussing subjects foreign to the question; but I think the hon. gentleman himself and his friends have been the greatest sinners in this respect. They have travelled a great deal outside the subject under discussion; they have taken us to Rome, France, Ireland, everywhere except where these \$30,000,000 are coming from—the pockets of the people. The time is coming when the people will see the enormity of this transaction, but then it may be too late. Many will be blamed, but there will be no verdict against any one in particular. The guiltiest will have left the arena of politics, but the people will always remain to foot the bill.

Mr. SPROULE. In occupying the time of the House by taking part in this important debate at this late stage of the discussion, I make no apology, for although I may not succeed in changing a vote on this question, or in changing the minds of any hon. gentleman who is directly interested in this discussion, still, outside of that, I have a duty to perform to my constituents and to the country. I have to justify the course that I have taken and that I take to-night on this question. A stranger sitting in this Chamber, unacquainted with the history of this country and listening to the debate which has been carried on for several days in reference to this question, would be led to suppose that never was it known in our history that a great corporation had failed in carrying out its undertakings. One would almost imagine, from the speeches

Mr. AUGER.

made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it was unknown in the history of this country that a corporation ever had to appeal to the Government or any outside power for assistance. If we look back over the history of this country, we will find that such appeals have not been at all uncommon—that they have been made repeatedly. Considering the uncertainty of many of these undertakings, the impossibility of estimating them correctly, the impossibility of correct human foresight with regard to events that transpire from day to day, or that naturally arise, in any country—considering these things, it does not appear to me at all unreasonable that men should fail in carrying out their undertakings, especially in an enterprise of this kind, the magnitude of which is probably unparalleled in the history of railway undertakings. The Grand Trunk Railway, a corporation not nearly so large as this one, with a work to perform not nearly so extensive, had to appeal to the Government for assistance to enable them to carry out their great work; and had the Government refused that assistance, as hon. members opposite wish this Government to refuse the assistance asked to-day by the Canadian Pacific Railway, what would have become of that undertaking? Where would the Grand Trunk Railway be to-day? And where would be the benefits the country has received through the construction of that line? The Northern Railway, another short line, scarcely 125 miles long, was, at one time, so crippled as to be compelled to apply to the Government for assistance to keep it afloat; and in like manner many other undertakings have had to fall back on some source or power for assistance, and had that assistance not been granted the result would have been greatly to the detriment of the country and would most probably have led to insolvency of those companies. In considering the question now before us, there are certain things connected with it which we require to know to enable us to decide correctly whether it is in the interests of the country that this additional aid should be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, whether the money already voted has been judiciously expended or not, and whether the Company, in the event of the aid not being given, can go on and finish the work inside the time in which it is essential in the interests of the country that it should be completed. This involves two other questions. One is the ability of the Company and the other the time in the interests of the country within which the road should be finished. Again, I think we were entitled to ask what remuneration will the country receive for this additional money if we vote it now, and is it any injustice to other incorporations in the country if we give this additional aid? There are various methods of reasoning that may enable us to arrive at satisfactory conclusions in our own minds. If we accept the calculations of hon. gentlemen who have opposed this scheme, they would lead us to believe almost anything or everything. One hon. gentleman has endeavoured to prove that, if the Company received no additional aid, they have already made out of the transaction \$35,000,000 at least. Another hon. gentleman, who appeared to be as well versed in arithmetic as the hon. gentleman who had sat down a short time before him, endeavoured to prove that they had made \$9,000,000; another made it \$3,000,000, and others made it different figures; but I noticed that not two amongst the whole number who spoke against the Company, were able to arrive at the same conclusion from their calculations. The impression created upon my mind was, that their figures, like their logic, were entirely at fault. I have noticed that every hon. gentleman who has addressed this House on the opposition side during the course of this debate, has made it his first duty to tell the House and the people of the country that he was a patriot. They found it necessary to defend their patriotism in this House; their patriotism was assailed,

and they were so jealous of their patriotism that they must tell the world that they were patriots. Some two or three of them went on to explain, that according to the celebrated Johnson, the definition of patriotism was the last refuge of a scoundrel. If one kept a record of their speeches through the country, and of the press which supports that party, he would come to but one conclusion, that one of the main objects of their lives was to avoid getting into the scoundrel's refuge. The question upon which we are entitled to satisfy our minds, is, first, has this money been judiciously expended? We are enabled to estimate about the cost of building railways in different parts of the world. We know what it cost the United States to build the Union Pacific Railway, the Northern Pacific Railway, and the Central Pacific Railway, roads which run through a country almost similar to our own, and, when we remember that these roads were built at a time when labour was much cheaper and material was much cheaper than at the present day, I say that, in making a comparison in the cost of building these roads, one must reasonably make an allowance in the event of our road costing a little more than they cost. But we find, on looking at Poor's "Manual of Railways," that the Union Pacific is estimated to have cost \$113,000 a mile. An hon. member, no longer ago than last night, gave us a very interesting piece of information in reference to the mode of watering stocks in the United States, and I have no doubt that the watering of stocks accounts for the very high price which the Union Pacific cost. But the Northern Pacific Railway also cost a very large amount, and, if we look over the number of railways in the United States, taking them as a whole, we find that the average cost of railways, in the United States, since they commenced to build the first railway, is \$44,255 a mile. The average cost of railways in the Dominion of Canada up to 1871, as stated by Trout in his "Manual of Railways," is \$75,350 a mile. If we take the amount of money spent by this Company—and we can calculate closely what they have spent—we find that, on the line of the railway which they have built and completed, leaving out the amounts paid for branches to enable them to connect their railway with the market centres of Ontario and Quebec, so as to get an outlet to the seaboard, the balance spent on the main line of the road, was \$36,028,962, and with that thirty-six millions of money they built no less than 1,400 miles of railway. If we divide that \$36,028,962 by 1,400, we find that the average cost of the railway, already built, is somewhere about \$25,750 a mile. If we compare this with the cost of railways in any other part of the country, either in the United States or in the Dominion of Canada, it will prove to us conclusively, that the money has not been squandered in the building of the Railway so far. Again, we have heard from some hon. gentlemen in this House, and many of them have endeavoured to prove, that the amount of money which the Company has got from the Government was quite sufficient to build the road without additional aid at all. What are the facts of the case? Up to the present time, they have received \$21,318,222 in cash from the Government, and with that, they have constructed of their main line 1,400 miles, that is only giving them a Government subsidy of \$13,400 a mile, not quite \$1,000 more than was given to the Canada Central Railway, to assist them to build that part of the line through a country which was well settled, and where it was easy to build a railway. If we look to either of these calculations, we must admit that the company has judiciously expended its money, and that the Government subsidy had to be largely added to from some source or it would have been impossible to build the road. I think that is all I need say with reference to the judicious expenditure of this money, because I apprehend that the arguments that have been brought forward in justification of the purchase by this Company of the lines of railway necessary to enable them to connect their system with the

seaports of the country, have been sufficient to satisfy any reasonable-minded man that the money so spent, was judiciously spent, that it was necessary that they should have these connections with the sea-board and with the great commercial centres, especially of the western part of the Province of Ontario. The next question is, is the security offered sufficient? There are many hon. gentlemen in this House who have taken part in the discussion, who appear to assume at the outset that this money is given away. They seem to forget that it is only a loan for a very short time, seven years, and that, when two years of that time are up, and the last portion of this loan will not be advanced until then, over one-fourth of the time within which it is to be paid back, will have elapsed. It must be borne in mind that the country has not to pay the interest without any return, for the Company pays it. If we calculate again, and look at the securities offered for this work, I think there is no reasonable man but must admit that the security is all that can be desired. The line when built from Pembroke to Port Moody, and against which there will be no lien or debt, is 2,664 miles. If we divide the \$30,000,000, the additional aid that is to be given to the road to-day, by the number of miles, we find it only amounts to something like \$3,445 per mile. Now, if the Grand Trunk Railway had been in that position at the time the Government came to its aid, with a new road built and equipped, and a traffic before them that would ensure a permanent return for the running of that Railway, over and above the cost of operating the road, we would not have been, as we are to-day, without any return for the aid given to that railway. I would like to ask any man if he does not consider that road, which will cost \$40,000 a mile as a whole, will be a good security for \$8,000 per mile, which it is proposed to loan it? An hon. gentleman who spoke before six o'clock, said that if he could satisfy himself that there was good security for this money, he believed he would be justified in supporting the Resolutions; and he cited the Grand Trunk as an instance, to prove that it was not good. But the Grand Trunk had no land grant whatever, and if it was enabled to make something out of the operations of the road, it was heavily bonded at the time, and with no other resources to fall back upon, its profits would not be more than sufficient to pay the cost of operating and interest, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is evidently in a much better position. If the Canadian Pacific Railway never made a dollar out of the road until it was built, if they only made enough to keep the road running, they could still make sufficient money out of the land, and a great deal more, inside the time the money is to be paid back to this country than would pay this claim. I apprehend there is not the slightest danger in the world; there is no reasonable probability that every dollar of this money will not be paid back, inside the time mentioned. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger) said there was no probability of this money being paid back; it was always the case with Governments. Well, Mr. Speaker, I heard the same argument made when the proposal was first made to this House to enter into the first contract with the Company. It was said we were saddling on this country a heavy burden, for which we would receive no return. The Minister of Railways replied that, according to the arrangement, he believed we could secure enough from the sale of the lands to pay every dollar back to the country. Almost every member who got up and opposed that Bill, said it was unreasonable to expect that it could be done, that this money would never be paid back, that the money from the sale of these lands would be all eaten up in the cost of administering the lands. But what does the experience of the last three years prove? It has proved the fallacy of the logic of those gentlemen. As from year to year this money is paid back to the Treasury, we have the satis-

faction of knowing that the contract is being fulfilled, and also that in a short time every dollar of the expenditure that has been incurred in building this magnificent railway will be recouped to the people of this country, and there will not be a dollar of taxation imposed upon the country for that purpose. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask, what is the remuneration the country will receive in return for this outlay, provided we give it. But, I might here make a remark on the question as to what were the necessities of the country. Was it necessary in the interests of the country that this road should be constructed rapidly or slowly? I think if we remember the situation of the people in Manitoba, if we look at the hundreds and thousands of people in the North-West to-day, upon whom the hon. gentleman has been pleased to say there is the heel of a monopoly that is grinding them down, if we look at their condition, we must agree that it is of the utmost importance this railway should be opened at the earliest possible date. What is that monopoly under which the people of the North-West are groaning? Most of the hon. gentlemen who addressed this House say it is the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, the injurious monopoly that that people have to contend with to-day comes, not from the Canadian Pacific Railway, but from the American lines of railway over which we have to send our goods, and over which we have to go ourselves to get there, during seven months of the year. If you travel over the American lines you reach the Canadian Pacific Railway at Emerson and how much do you pay? On the St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Manitoba road, you have to pay 4 cents a mile; but when you reach the Canadian Pacific Railway, 3 cents a mile; and yet we have no control at all over the actions of those men who control that road. We cannot compel them to reduce their freight rates, we cannot in any way interfere with them. But we find that the Canadian Pacific Railway are lowering their freight rates, and giving every consideration for those parties who are settling in the North-West to-day. Now, I might give a single instance of how the Canadian Pacific Railway Company get blamed for what they cannot help. Two years ago this winter a car was sent from my part of the country destined for Winnipeg. The agent at that station said the car would be taken at a certain figure for freight rates. When that car was sent on to Winnipeg it was found by the party to whom it was consigned that there was \$75 more against it than he had been told. The parties who sent that car blamed it on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I look upon as, in many instances, a long suffering company; in this case it did not come to its own defence, but the only thing they said was that it was something over which they had no control. The fact is when this car reached the St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Manitoba road, they refused to take it without imposing this additional amount, and it had to be paid, but because the Canadian Pacific Railway had to collect it, they received all the blame. Now, Mr. Speaker, from my view of the subject, I apprehend that this is the injurious monopoly, that is hurting the people of Manitoba and the North-West to-day. It is an injurious monopoly that is equally affecting the trade of the people of the older Provinces, especially of Ontario and Quebec, because, although we are endeavouring to supply the people of that country with the goods and produce which they do not produce themselves, we are handicapped in that commercial enterprise; because every car of stuff that goes there costs more than it would if this line was built north of Lake Superior. The people of Manitoba, in sending their grain east, stand in the same position. If grain is raised to-day in large quantities in Manitoba, it has to pay such heavy freight rates as to leave little or no margin of profits for the farmers. Again, they are

Mr. SPROULE.

virtually shut up for seven months in the year, during the winter season, grain cannot be taken over these American lines without at exorbitant prices; and the people of Ontario and Quebec who were sending stuff up there, have to go to the trouble, annoyance and expense of sending their goods in bond, and then paying a very high figure in freight rates after that, before they can send stuff to that country. As a consequence, many people who desire to send freight up there do not attempt it at all in the winter season. I next ask, are we doing any injustice to other railway companies, or any other corporation, by giving this additional aid? The greatest opposition we find from any company appears to emanate from the Grand Trunk Railway. We have had pamphlets distributed among the members of this House, containing a number of letters that have passed between the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway and the leader of the Government, with reference to the question. After failing to accomplish all they desire, they have adopted what they are pleased to call the constitutional means of appealing to the people to defend them in their position. And what is that position? Now, we might allow some of the arguments to pass that have been advanced by certain parties against the Grand Trunk Railway; because when we remember that they are directly interested, as railway operators themselves, an argument coming from that source does not appeal to us with the same force that it would from disinterested parties. But there are many disinterested parties, who have had some reason to know the grievous monopoly of the Grand Trunk in various parts of this country. That company has petitioned the Government to give into their hands the control of the whole system of railways in Ontario and Quebec. What would be the position of Ontario to-day provided the Government saw fit to acquiesce in that proposal? What would be the facilities of its trade centres in shipping produce and manufactured goods to the markets of the world if they were entirely under the control of that monopoly? My knowledge of the Grand Trunk is about this: For the last quarter of a century they have been fighting strenuously every enterprise launched to give us increased railway facilities. One after another, the lines projected have been burked or so crippled in the money market as to render their promoters unable to carry out the undertaking and give the advantages of competition so much desired. Why did we find Ontario municipalities granting such large bonuses to railways? It was to counteract this oppressive monopoly. Many of them have railways to their doors, but they do not serve the purpose desired. Parallel lines run through the same sections of country controlled by the same company. We find in some parts of the country, take the county of Grey for example, that the people were so anxious to secure competition that they have taxed themselves in large amounts, one township having agreed to give a bonus of \$80,000, another \$65,000, another \$60,000 and a town \$32,000. This is in the constituency which the hon. member for South Grey represents. I have said the people feel the importance of having competition so strongly that they are willing to impose heavy taxes on themselves to secure that object. What, I ask, would be the result to-day if the Government saw fit to grant what the Grand Trunk asks? It would destroy the competition which is thought to be a boon to the people. I have a word to say in regard to the arguments of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) when addressing the House on this question. He said: That the Minister of Railways by those resolutions would impose taxes on the people far greater than the municipalities had imposed on themselves; that the House being composed of 211 members, the \$30,000,000 would give \$150,000 to each constituency. The hon. gentleman's figures, like his logic, are entirely at fault, because a calculation shows that instead of the amount

being \$150,000 it is only \$142,000. The hon. gentleman went on to say that this tax is a great deal heavier than the taxes imposed by the people on themselves by municipal bonuses, and he asked the First Minister to submit a by-law in each Riding for \$150,000, declaring that in his Riding at all events, it would not be carried. I have taken the trouble to make the calculation. Whereas the average of the bonuses distributed over the six municipalities comprising his Riding would give an average of about \$51,000, the amount of the proposed loan, if distributed in like manner, would give \$21,000 for each municipality. That suggests to my mind that some hon. gentlemen who have dealt with this question have not apparently desired to deal with it fairly, but have thrown figures together in a hap-hazard way with a view to create the impression that great injury was about to be inflicted on the people. But where is the parallel of comparison between these cases? The one is a direct tax, the principal and interest of which must be repaid in twenty years; the other is a loan arranged by the Government, involving no tax, because the Company will pay back both principal and interest. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) told the House he had had some experience in railway building; and therefore I presume he thought his argument would have correspondingly more force with the House. I might say of his experience, as an hon. gentleman said a few Sessions ago in regard to that of another hon. member, who said that he had some experience in railway operating. He has been connected with a line of railway, which was so extensive that he could stand on an elevated stump and survey it from one end to the other. Although he was the financial centre of that great scheme, did the hon. gentleman carry it through without making a second appeal? He did not get it graded and the track laid, even though he obtained bonuses from the municipalities, before he had to come back to the people for more money for that very extensive and enterprising scheme. Yet the hon. gentleman condemns the Minister of Railways because he is willing to assist a Company which has undertaken a scheme that stands to the hon. gentleman's undertaking as one thousand to one. I was very much amused at the line of argument he adopted. He said the farming community would not be benefitted by that railway but would be injured. He stated that our experience would be the same as that of the United States, where, after the railways were opened in Kansas, the price of land in Illinois was lower than before those roads were built. From my knowledge of the arguments used by that hon. gentleman when he went before the farmers of North Wellington to get a bonus for the scheme in which he is interested, he endeavoured to prove that the railway would enhance the value of the lands, in some cases double, and in some cases one-third more; but in every case ten times more than the amount of money they were going to give to the work. The argument used to-day is a very different one, that it will not enhance, but rather depreciate the value of lands. I wonder that an hon. gentleman with his experience, knowledge and astuteness, should pretend to tell the people of this country, who know what has been the result of railway building, that the construction of railways will not increase the value of land. If he had been as honest in discussing this question before the House and the country as he was when he was endeavoring to convince the farmers in North Wellington that it was their interest to build a railway to Durham, he would not have adopted the line of argument which he followed. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said that if he were convinced that the railway would be in the interest of the North-West and would tend to the settlement of the country, he would be disposed to support it. He says:

“What will be the amount of settlement in that country if there is a delay of five years? The whole territory from Winnipeg to the Rocky

Mountains will be thickly settled by that time. If it is built rapidly, the country will be but sparsely settled.”

Who ever heard of the rapid building of a railway having an injurious effect upon the settlement of a country? Is not the knowledge that men can get all the modern conveniences for transportation into and out of a country one of the strongest inducements to settlement in it? He goes on to say:

“This is the experience of every new country. If there was delay, settlement would rush out from Winnipeg, Brandon, Calgary and other places, and the country would become thickly and well settled. Adopting the other course, and handing over \$30,000,000 to the Company, settlement and prosperity will be alike retarded.”

I have yet to learn that the expenditure of a large amount of money in the building of a railway, in any country, will have the effect of retarding the settlement and prosperity of a country. That is contrary to common sense, and it is contrary to the experience of every railway project and of the experience of every hon. gentleman present. He says that the system adopted by the late Government was the correct one, and that if the same principle had been carried out the settlement of the country would have been more rapid. Let us look into the facts. Statistics show, that from 1871 to 1880—a period of nine years—there were only 64,755 people taken into that country. This was during the period in which, according to the hon. member, the right policy was being pursued, and which he declared would result in the rapid settlement of the country. But let us take the period of three years from 1880 to 1883, and we find that no less than 149,000 people have gone into the country, as against 64,000 in the preceding nine years. Could any stronger evidence be given of the fact that rapid settlement of the country would result from the rapid building of the railway. But there is another question involved, and that is the amount of wealth brought back to the country. If we take the trade and navigation returns, we find that the amount of settlers' effects taken into that country from 1880 to 1883, was no less a sum than \$15,000,000; that being the case, if the road is built to completion at the same rate as it is going on now, we may expect to find when it is finished, that we will be able to recoup ourselves to a large extent by the quantity of settlers' effects which have been taken in by the large number of immigrants going to that country. The next question we may reasonably ask, is what remuneration are we likely to have for the expenditure of the money? At present, settlers are handicapped by the monopoly of the railway system in the United States over which they and their effects have to pass, during seven months of the year; by the competition of this line that will be done away with forever, and that accomplished in two years, but refuse this, and it must continue for seven years. This is a matter of importance to the people in the western part of Ontario; and I am rather surprised to find that a most every hon. member from that part of the country, sitting on the opposite benches has condemned the rapid building of the railway. To-day we have manufacturers producing every kind of stuff that is wanted in the North-West, but we have to pay a great deal more than we would have to pay if that railway was built, in taking these manufactures to the markets of the country. We have other checks put in operation which very materially tend to handicap those who are competing for that trade. Besides, we find that a great amount of the produce which is being used by the men who are building that road is supplied from the western part of this Province. Will hon. gentlemen who oppose the rapid building of the road deny that it is in the interests of our part of the country that this large outlay for supplies to these men should be distributed among us during the next two years? Or will they deny that it is one of the greatest sources of prosperity that we have? Where is the food coming from which supplies those 9,000 men who are build-

ing the road north of Lake Superior? It all comes from the western part of Ontario. I am surprised at the hon. member for South Grey opposing this scheme, because a very large portion of these supplies are from the county which he and I have the honour to represent. I find, for instance, that during the last year there was shipped from Owen Sound, no less than 22,217 tons of freight, and that from the same port, 3,160 head of cattle were shipped, bought largely in the part of the county of Grey represented by my hon. friend. While we have an eastern market to fall back upon, it is a great advantage to be in the position of having a market both east and west, so that we can select the one at which the best prices can be obtained. During last season's operations, no less than 760 vessels came into the port of Owen Sound, principally for supplies for the men working on this railway north of Lake Superior and in the North-West, and the tonnage of these vessels amounted to 307,152 tons. Notwithstanding these facts, hon. members will rise in their places and state that it is in the interests of the people of that country that they should oppose giving them additional aid and prevent the construction of that road at the rapid rate at which it has gone on during the last two years. The figures I have given represent only one port, but there are a number of others, among them Sarnia, Windsor, Kincardine, Southampton, Port Elgin, Wiarton, Meaford, Thornbury, Collingwood and Midland, every one of which employs a line of steamers to carry stuff from our Province to supply the army of men who are building that road, and the trade of the north-western county resulting from this road being built, and money is paid for everything that the former has to sell for these supplies. And yet we are told that it is of no benefit to these people that that large number of men are employed there, and that this money should come back to the farmers of my section at least. I have one word to say with reference to the reports that the Grand Trunk Company will soon control the whole railway system of Western Canada. If there is one evil to be guarded against in this country, more than another, it is the granting of what is asked by the Grand Trunk Railway. That Company have insidiously taken under their control one railway after another, until there are only three roads in Western Canada to-day that are not under their control, and they are still attempting to buy up more lines and control more ports. They now control Windsor, Port Colborne, Sarnia, Southampton, Port Elgin, Wiarton, and Midland, and there are only three or four ports left which they do not control, namely, Collingwood, Owen Sound, Meaford, and Penetanguishene, yet they are anxious to get these. Yet hon. gentlemen would ask this House to hand over the control of the entire traffic of Western Canada to that corporation, who have been strenuously opposing almost every railway enterprise that has been introduced into this country for the last quarter of a century. What did we find when the Credit Valley Railway was being built? The people were willing to impose on themselves municipal taxes to the extent of \$1,000,000 for the purpose of getting competition; and yet, when Mr. Laidlaw was carrying out that project, he was opposed at every step by the Grand Trunk Company—both when he went to the municipalities to get their aid, and when he went to the financial markets of the world to raise the money necessary to complete that work; and had it not been for the fact that Mr. Stephen, a gentleman connected with the corporation which is building the Canadian Pacific Railroad to-day, came to the assistance of the Credit Valley, I believe the Grand Trunk would have been successful in killing out that enterprise. I can only say that I am glad that there are three railways in Ontario to-day that are not under the heel of that corporation; those are, the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, leading to Owen Sound, the Northern, leading to Collingwood, and the Credit Valley, leading to the West.

Mr. SPOULE.

Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are in the happy position of knowing that they have an outlet to the east and an outlet to the west, and that consequently they will be a successful competitor with the Grand Trunk Railway so long as they hold the roads which they at present control, and which I have reason to believe and hope they will long control. I think it will not be out of the recollection of hon. members of this House that a few years ago there was a Bill before the Railway Committee of this House to revive a charter which had been granted some years before, for building the Toronto and Ottawa Railway; and the history given to that Committee was to the effect that for nine years the company holding that charter had been making every effort to raise money to build that road, but that every time they tried to do it they were opposed by the Grand Trunk, which had tried to balk them or buy them out, and that until then they had never been successful in doing anything afterwards it was brought up. The Ontario and Quebec railway was also chartered for the purpose of giving competition, and no sooner was that scheme projected than we found the same corporation trying to buy it up; and to-day they are very magnanimously, I am told, offering to build the remainder of the Canadian Pacific Railway, provided the Canadian Pacific Railway Company hand over to them the Ontario and Quebec system of railways. Had they been able to carry out their avaricious scheme, we should not be to-day in the enjoyment of the blessing of competition in Ontario, that we possess, small as it is. Sir, this country, I believe, can never estimate the damage that has been done to it by the opposition of that great railway corporation to every railway scheme launched in this country during the last twenty-five years. I can only say that I sincerely hope and trust we shall live a long time before we shall see that corporation controlling any more of the lines in the western part of Canada than they are controlling to-day, for I believe it would be a sorrowful thing for the people of this country if they did. It is important that this road should be rapidly built, especially to the western part of Canada. What does it mean? About four-sevenths of the line yet to be built is in the Province of Ontario, and, as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) said last night, the money to be spent for the building of this part of the line will not go to Manitoba or the North-West, but to Ontario. It means that the supply of the men will come from the east, and the money will go back there. It means that we are opening up for settlement a part of the Province of Ontario of the extent of between 500 and 600 miles, which is not yet eligible for settlement. In addition, the line from Gravenhurst to Callander, a distance of 120 miles, will be opened up in two years, if this road is constructed in that time, for the purpose of securing for Ontario its share of the trade of the North-West, this means an expenditure of \$3,000,000 more in Ontario during the next two years. We must remember, that this Company, to complete their line, must spend about \$13,000,000, and four-sevenths of that money will be spent in the Province of Ontario in addition to \$3,000,000, which is the estimated cost of the Gravenhurst-Callander Branch. In attempting to account for the depression that existed from 1873 to 1878, the hon. member for North Norfolk said it was largely due to the fact that the Union Pacific and the Northern Pacific had been checked in their operations. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if, because these roads, through financial straits, were compelled for a short time to desist in their work of construction, so great a depression was caused in a country composed of over 45,000,000 people, how much greater would the paralysing effect be here to-day if a stoppage of the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway were caused. I have always thought, and I now think, that had the foresight of the late Government been such as to induce them

to carry out the same principle of completing the railway as that which is being carried out to-day, and thus caused to be made from 1873 to 1878, the expenditure of the money that is now going on, we would never have experienced the hard times we then passed through. We would not have had tens of thousands of men in the country unable to find employment which would furnish them with the means of support to themselves and their families. This country would receive the greatest paralytic stroke it ever received or can receive, if the Government should decide not to assist this corporation in carrying out the great undertaking they are now endeavouring to carry out, and which I believe they will succeed in successfully carrying out. I have no doubt at all that these Resolutions will be carried, and that, in the experience of a few years, we will find out the fallacy of the arguments that have been used to prove that it is against the interest of the people to grant the loan asked for. We will find that every dollar will be paid back, that not a burden of one dollar will be imposed on the people by giving this additional aid, which is only a loan for a short time. The security is ample and the Company have given every reason to lead us to believe they are sincere and that they will carry on their operations at the same rapid rate as heretofore. I feel that I will be fully justified in going before my constituents and defending my position and the action I intend to take in supporting these Resolutions, and if after a few years, I should go back to my constituents again and ask them to re-endorse the opinions I have expressed here to-day, I have no doubt they will return me to the position I now occupy. I think I can safely rely on their support,—as I believe can also every hon. member on this side on the support of their constituents—in voting for these Resolutions, and that my conduct to-day will receive the same approval that it did in the past when I voted for the first Resolutions giving this work to this important and able Company.

Mr. PLATT. The extreme length and I may say the extreme breadth, to which this debate has already extended affords ample reason why I should speak briefly, but I think it affords no reason at all why I should remain silent. There can be no doubt that the discussion, long as it has continued and broad as it has become, has been of immense value, not only to the members of this House, but to their constituents throughout the country. We know, Sir, that upon occasions like this, when vast amounts of public money are to be taken from the public Exchequer and put into any great public work, the people of the country themselves feel a deep interest in it, and look particularly to their representatives, to see that they act cautiously and prudently in allowing the Government to handle their hard earnings. For this reason, the fact that this is a genuine money vote, the fact that a large amount of money is to be extracted from the public Treasury, the representatives of the people, above all others, are expected to take an active interest in the debate. Hon. gentlemen on both sides will, no doubt, feel pleased when I announce that I am not going to follow the usual course of debate by referring at any length to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has preceded me. Were I to do so, I would not only take up useful time, but would not perhaps succeed in making as good an impression on the House as if I took my own course. There is one expression, however, which fell from the hon. gentleman's lips that to my mind is worthy of notice. I think that the hon. gentleman's friends in this House will not thank him for having referred to the history of the moneys given to different railways in this country. I refer to his allusion to that unhappy circumstance of the money that was given to the Northern Railway and to his statement that dire consequences would have occurred if public assistance had not been given to that line. I suppose he meant that dire consequences would have occurred to

the Conservative party. We know that if public money had not been given to that road, the magnificent testimonial to the chieftain of his party would not have been so magnificent by \$4,000, and that the subscription to the chief organ of hon. gentlemen opposite would not have been so munificent by \$5,000 or \$6,000. I suppose, on the same principle, the hon. gentleman believes that the public chest should be relieved of \$30,000,000 in order that the Canadian Pacific Railway may be benefited, and that thereby the Conservative party in this country may suffer no very great disadvantage. I have referred to the necessity of a lengthened debate on this question. The people have the right to expect that when they have been deprived of information on this subject, which they had a right to reasonably expect from the Government at the earliest possible moment, their representatives here to continue the debate until the country, if possible, can become awakened to its importance and have an opportunity of expressing their opinion. The country has been accustomed to occasions like this, when large sums of money are taken, in the middle Session of Parliament, and when election comes round we hear very little about it. Party strife and party differences will arise, and the chief questions which agitate the public mind during the Session of Parliament may not be brought into discussion at all during the elections. It seems to me, that the spirit of our constitution, and the genius of our system of Government demand first, the earliest possible information upon all questions of this kind. Have the people been afforded that early information? The Speech from the Throne delivered at the opening of this Parliament, indicated to us that the intention of the Government was known, at that time, to themselves. If so, what reason was there why that information should not have been vouchsafed to the people then? Not only Parliament, but the people of this country, have the right to demand full information. Full and complete information has not even yet been given. What mean all these various motions and amendments which have been made, especially by the leader of the Opposition, since this debate commenced? What mean these various motions for papers and returns on various subjects cognate to the subject which is under discussion but this, that we have not at the present time full information on this subject? What means the amendment upon which we are shortly to be called upon to vote? It means that, even on this night, when we are expected to decide this great and important question, we have not all the information the country has a right to demand at the hands of the Government. The position of that political party in this House, to which I have the honour to belong, has been assailed in the manner in which we met this question on the very onset, and to-day the Minister of Railways, with all the vehemence he is capable of commanding in this House, says he believes that by this time every hon. member in this House must be convinced of the righteousness, and the justice, and the necessity of the Resolutions which he asks us to vote upon, thereby intimating that any hon. gentleman who votes against these Resolutions or opposes them in any way, must be either incapable of comprehending the fullness of the question, or is going to vote and speak against the dictates of his own conscience. Now, I am not prepared to silently occupy either of those positions. I believe that the position that has been taken by the leader of the Opposition, and the position which I, as an individual member of that Opposition, have taken upon this question, is one that will be justifiable before my constituents, at least. We have been accused of flying at the throat of this proposition the very moment it was laid upon the table of Parliament. I do not think the *Debates* will justify any such conclusion. The ground that was taken, the very first ground that was taken by the leader of the Opposition, was that there were reasons to doubt the propriety of passing

these Resolutions at that time; that we must fully consider whether it was in the interest of the country to grant this proposal. We have demanded time to consider them, and we have demanded information, and that is all that has been done; and, as fast as that information has been vouchsafed to us, as fast as that information has been given to this House by the hon. gentleman, the discussion has proceeded, and, as I stated before, we have not yet sufficient grounds upon which to grant the Resolutions which the hon. gentleman proposes to the House. We think, perhaps, that, in the absence of full and complete information, the fact that there is a necessity for passing them is not apparent, and it is our duty in the interest of our constituents to oppose these Resolutions. That is a sensible and a reasonable ground for us to take. There is one part of our position which, it is true, may appear a little unpleasant to us. We are placed necessarily in the position of being apparently opposed to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and its interests, but that opposition is only apparent. We are forced to that position by opposing these Resolutions, and although we may be well-wishers of that Company, and although we may not wish to detract from their reputation or standing in the country, or to retard the progress they are making in their great work, we have still one duty to perform, regardless of the Company's interests, our duty to the people of this country; and if, in protecting the interests of the people, the interests of the Syndicate suffer, so much the worse for the Syndicate. We have no quarrel with the gentlemen who constitute that Company. We respect them for their ability. One of them, at least, has a history; "That fellow Smith" is well known in this country, and there are particular reasons why he still has a warm place in the hearts of gentlemen on this side of the House. We cannot blame them at all for watching with such intense interest this debate, almost from the beginning. This, to them, is an important Session. To use the cant phrase, it is to them a Session when the goose is expected to lay the golden egg, no small nugget, to be sure, but one to the amount of \$30,000,000; and, when the cackling of the flock announces that the feat is accomplished, these gentlemen may be expected to descend from the galleries and take up the prize. I dare say, if many gentlemen on the floor of this House were equally interested, they would attend the debates more attentively than they have done. The position, as I understand it, which the opponents of these resolutions have taken up on the main question is, that there is no absolute necessity for this extreme measure being passed at this time. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the Opposition, and those who have generally supported him in Parliament, have always taken the ground that there was no necessity for mad haste in building the two ends of this railway. We contend at the present time that all we wished to have accomplished in that respect we have accomplished already. We have in Parliament, and out of Parliament, stated that the advantage of this country demanded the speedy building of a railway that would supply a means of ingress to the North-West country, and would be extended across the prairie regions of that country as fast, or even a little faster, than the settlement demanded. We have all that, and why should we be called upon to conclude that there is an absolute necessity for spending \$30,000,000 more at this particular juncture of our history, simply to speed the building of the two ends of the road? I am satisfied that our opinion is very largely endorsed by the people of this country, and even by this Parliament. The present Opposition are not alone in the expression of that opinion. I suppose I may be allowed to call supporters of that opinion even from the Ministerial benches themselves. I remember having read a pamphlet some years ago, issued by an hon. gentleman who now holds a position which may justify his being considered

Mr. PLATT.

the gentleman chiefly interested in the adoption of these Resolutions, for the Minister of the Interior is supposed to know as much about the requirements of the North-West as any hon. gentleman in the Cabinet or in the House. That hon. gentleman issued a pamphlet, and in that pamphlet we have the cool, deliberate opinion of a gentleman expressed, not in the heat of debate on the floor of this House, but the cool, deliberate opinion expressed in a pamphlet which was spread broadcast over the country, purporting to be addressed to the people of Simcoe, Grey, and Bruce. That hon. gentleman says:

"My opinion always has been that we should have been content for a time to use the United States lines for our all-rail route to Manitoba and begin our Pacific Railway at Pembina, thence to Winnipeg, and on through Manitoba and the North-West, combining with its construction a comprehensive and attractive scheme of immigration, under which immigrants would be assured of employment first and lands afterwards. The lands retained by the Government, owing to the settlement of adjoining lands, would have been enhanced in value, and their sale would have produced funds to aid in extending the railway, as required, without overburdening the Dominion Exchequer. In this way, the Canadian Pacific Railway east of the Rocky Mountains could have been built as fast as required for very little money, and our prairie country would have become thickly peopled. \* \* \* \* Had this policy been adopted, the Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, would have been more prosperous than it is to-day. We should have been free from the heavy engagements that weigh upon us, and free also from the financial peril that stares us in the face—imminent, if not inevitable. Our expenditure to this time upon the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been small, and would increase only as might be convenient, for it would be subject to our control."

Here is an opinion expressed by a gentleman, in cool deliberation, who now occupies a seat on the Treasury benches, and I regret that he has not a right to sit in this House, because I would like to hear an explanation from him, or from some gentleman who represents him here, as to whether his views at the present time coincide with the extravagant views of his colleagues. Now, Sir, I think I have shown you that the Opposition in this House and country have a right to urge that it is not an absolute necessity that this money should be voted at the present time. But, even granted it were necessary, even granted that the Minister of Railways is correct in the opinion he expresses as to the requirements of this Company—granted it were advisable to construct the two ends of that road as speedily as possible—even then there has been no proof given of the absolute necessity of passing these Resolutions. We are told that the security offered for this loan is abundant. Well, I am sure there are not many on this side of the House who will waste time in discussing that question; it is not a matter of particular moment to us just now. I am sure, however, that the Minister of Railways and many of his supporters were disappointed that a grand rush was not made at the security. Most of the speeches on the other side of the House have been filled with very large, extensive, and exaggerated figures in order to prove the abundance of that security. Well, Sir, let us take for granted that that security is good. We were told, I think, by the hon. member for Kings, N. B. (Mr. Foster), that the security was ample, that it was \$5 security for every \$1 they wished to loan. Well, if this security is good for the Parliament and people of Canada, I think it ought to be good for the money lenders of the world. If that security is useless in the money markets of the world, have we not reason to doubt that it is of very much value to us? The money lenders of the world are just as shrewd, probably, as the Government of this country, and what they have refused to accept as good security, we may at least look upon with a certain degree of suspicion. But, Sir, we have not been told that that security has been offered to the money lenders of the world, and consequently we cannot know whether the money could have been raised upon this security if it had been placed upon the money markets of the world. If it has not been placed upon the money markets of the world, why has it not been so placed? Why are this Parliament and Government called upon to constitute them-

selves money brokers, instead of the Company applying to the usual sources for loans? Why, Sir, I believe it is almost a maxim, that Governments, whether of this country or of any other, have no right whatever to engage in speculation simply for the sake of speculation; and if these gentlemen have not shown that they have made every possible effort to secure a loan in more legitimate quarters, they have no right to come here, and tell us that it is an absolute necessity that this country should advance this loan. Now, Sir, I am going to call evidence that I am not alone in this opinion, and that hon. gentlemen opposite held the same opinion. I repeat, this Government should not at this juncture be called upon to make that loan, until the Company have exhausted all their resources, and all their efforts, to get a loan from the money markets of the world. Do we wish to benefit the Company? Is it from any love we have for the Company, that we are going to step in between them and the money lenders, and offer them greater advantages? I can see an advantage in borrowing money at 4 and lending it at 3; but here it is proposed that we borrow money at 4 and give it to them at 5 per cent. If we are not giving them an advantage by making this loan to them, then what is the use of the country being called upon to make that particular risk? I state again that this Government has no right to speculate with the people's money. In evidence, I will call the hon. Minister's pamphlet, and I am very glad he wrote it, because of the opinion expressed there by himself. The Minister of the Interior says: "I think it will be admitted that Governments have no business to speculate with Government funds," that is, "they have no right to spend the people's money until it is absolutely necessary to do so." Has it been shown that it is absolutely necessary that the Government of this country should make this loan of \$30,000,000 at the present time? I submit that no proof has been offered to that effect, and consequently, I submit that it is unwise and inexpedient for us to do so. It may be contended, of course, by the Government, and adopted as a policy, that wherever they find a sinking institution, wherever they find a Corporation in need of money, it is their duty to rush to the assistance of that company, no matter at what risk. Well, Sir, some Governments and some men may, at times, be particularly bold, financially, when they are handling money that is not their own, but I do not believe the people are prepared to endorse the policy which says that the Government are justified in rushing to the rescue of either a sinking railway company or a sinking Exchange Bank. But, Sir, we have been told that in the interests of immigration, this was a matter of great importance, indeed. Why, Sir, immigrants used to go into that country before we had a Canadian Pacific Railway at all. Most of the people that are now in the North West got there by some other means than by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and thousands of emigrants can now be accommodated by the route already provided. Now, Sir, it seems to me to be a very weak argument to say that, in order to take immigrants to that country over Canadian soil exclusively, it is necessary for us to entail a great risk upon the country by making this loan. It has been shown by members upon the floor of this House that for the season of the year when immigrants arrive here we have already a continuous route to the great prairies of the North-West. Take the advertisements of the Canadian Pacific Railway themselves; take the folder of that company that has been laid upon our desks, in this House, and there you find described in glowing terms the beautiful passage, and the quick, expeditious and cheap trip, that can now be made from the seaboard, even to the prairies of the North-West. There is only one disadvantage mentioned, and it is this: The very title page of the folder which has been so extensively circulated throughout this country and Europe is enough to frighten immigrants from our

shores. We read on the first page, these remarkable words: "The Canadian Pacific Railway, the *only* route to the great North-West." I say, Sir, that this must have a chilling effect on the intending immigrant who reads it: "The only route to the great North-West!" If there is only one route into the great North-West, there can be only one route out of it. I think this will give a bad impression in England to intending emigrants and they will say: "We will wait until there is one or two other ways of getting into the great North-West." It is said to be very important that these emigrants should be got there without being exposed to the seductive charms of the United States. In fact, Sir, the policy seems to be laid down that it is the duty of this country to get these emigrants there under false pretences; that the advantages which we hold out to induce them to go there are not as great as the advantages offered by our American friends; therefore, it is necessary that immigrants, destined for the North-West, go through no portion of American territory. Why, Sir, I might suggest as the simplest method of carrying out this policy to make some arrangements whereby these poor people should be blindfolded when they are passing through American territory, so that they may not know what kind of a country they have passed through until they have got to Manitoba. We boast that the North-West is a great and magnificent country, but if we have such a country and are able to hold out such inducements to intending immigrants, why should we fear their passage for a short distance through United States territory? I think that is a very weak argument indeed to advance for making this loan. Well, Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways, in introducing these Resolutions, left us in great doubt as to whence this proposition came—whether he had discovered it in the interests of the Company, or whether the Company had discovered it and proposed it in the interests of the country. He described in such glowing language the great advantage it was going to be to this country, that one would almost have thought that he had made the proposition to the Company, and that they had reluctantly accepted it. But we heard as the debate progressed, a different tale. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company were in actual difficulty, and that they required this loan in order to enable them to complete the remainder of the line. I am sorry for the Company if they are in difficulty, and every member of the Opposition feels alike regret. But there are a great many people in difficulty in this country, and I do not suppose that very many of them expect the Government to come to their relief. What have been the causes of that difficulty? It has been shown on the floor of this House that the first cause was the too rapid construction, and consequently too great cost. Bad management and extravagance constituted another cause of difficulty. They looked more to immediate profit than to the future good, either of themselves or of the country. By the organization of what is termed the construction company, they took from the hands of the Railway Company proper the funds which should have gone into the completion of the road. Then we have lately their quarrel with the Grand Trunk. Who is responsible for the quarrel between the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Who inaugurated that quarrel? I do not think the people of the country feel called upon to interfere. There is competition, we know, going on between those two great corporations; but what business has this Parliament or the country to express, by a vote of \$30,000,000, their favouritism for one side or the other. Let the corporations continue the quarrel, and it may prove in the interests of the country. But to check the competition and crush one of the competitors, the country is now called on to grant a loan of \$30,000,000! Is that fair play? May not the Grand Trunk justly complain that the people are not acting impartially? Give them a fair field, grant money no more

to one than the other, stand aside, and perhaps the interests of the country will be advanced. I believe the people will not be content to have been forced against their will to interfere in this great contest. We have been told, in addition to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are in difficulty, that they did not come begging to this Parliament, but that they came here walking erect on their feet. That was a most astonishing statement. I never heard it seriously charged that those gentlemen were in the habit of walking on their heads or hands; but we now know that they came to Parliament walking on their feet, standing erect and looking straight with their eyes. I believe they have been guilty of moral obliquity in certain transactions, but we never heard that it was owing to their being cross-eyed. There are two ways in these modern times of getting money. When a man, woman or child wishes to obtain a small pittance, he or she comes with hat in hand and humbly implores it. There is another class of gentlemen who, when they wish to get a large sum, at one particular time, do not come with hat in hand, but, "walking erect on their feet and looking straight with their eyes," they say, "stand and deliver—\$30,000,000 or your life!" Is that the way in which hon. gentlemen wish us to understand this Company comes before Parliament and the country? I think, Sir, that is more correct than to say that they came imploring the Government and the people for this loan. I fear it is too true that those gentlemen stand in a position in which they can come to the Government and say, "your money or your political life." But if that be the case, the sooner the people know it the better for the country, and perhaps the better for the Government also. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, after all, have not so much to complain of, even if they do not get the proposed loan. There is one thing they have obtained in addition to the \$25,000,000, "that outrageous bargain," as some hon. members have ventured to call it, and that is free advertising. No other corporation has had the amount of free advertising which has been vouchsafed to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. On all times and occasions, in season and out, the Government and their supporters have taken every opportunity to talk about the trans-continental, ocean-to-ocean railway, and to praise their energy and the manner in which they were acting in the interests of themselves, and especially in the interests of the country. On the floor of Parliament, praise of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been introduced in the preface of the hon. gentlemen's speeches, or dovetailed into the context, or sandwiched between the paragraphs of the peroration with as much ingenuity and as little regard to relevancy as the puffs of St. Jacobs Oil, or Holloway's Pills are sandwiched into the newspaper articles of the day. That has been going on for a long time. What about other corporations? Do we hear praises of the Grand Trunk in the halls of Parliament? No; all the praise is given on one side. The money is also given to one side only, and that is the fair and impartial way in which this Parliament is called upon to act between the two great corporations struggling for the trade between the east and west. Let me say that the tendency to monopoly at present existing on the part of the Grand Trunk has only existed since the Canadian Pacific Railway Company commenced the game. The Grand Trunk did not commence to gobble up smaller railways until after the Canadian Pacific Railway Company began that course, and the Grand Trunk was forced to do so in self-defence. If there is any complaint to be attached to these great corporations in this regard, the fault lies with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and not with the Grand Trunk. As I have said, I should like to be an onlooker in the contest between these two great corporations, and I am not prepared by my vote to take position against one or favour the other. There is another reason Mr. Speaker why I feel justified in

Mr. PLATT.

rising on the floor of the House here at this late hour. I will refer very briefly indeed to that part of the debate which has been strongly characterized on this side of the House—I refer to the manner in which the debate was opened, not only by the Minister of Railways, but also by his supporters, who made sinister allusions to the patriotism of members of the Opposition. I noticed, however a very great depression in that kind of stock after the hon. member, for Queen's had made his speech. And after a certain learned gentleman gave a lecture in one of the halls of this city, it fell flat, and we heard little more of the patriotism on that side of the House, or the lack of patriotism on this. The hon. member for Brant, last evening, gave us the key note as to the effect of that kind of discussion on the floor of the Canadian Parliament. He told us that there could be but one effect upon the minds of the world, one effect upon the credit of Canada, and that was that the people of the world would be called upon to believe one or other of two statements: either that one-half of the people of this country were traitors to the interests of their country, or that the other half were falsifiers of the facts, and traducers of the characters of their political opponents. One or other of these two positions must be true, and I ask which is the worse to go to the world—the belief that certain gentlemen at certain times, have stated the facts in connection with the condition of the country, or the belief that certain other gentlemen are their traducers and their slanderers. I hope that hon. gentlemen see the force of these remarks, and if they do, I do not think that the charges they have made as to our lack of patriotism will be repeated, at least during the present Session. But I have no doubt that when occasion requires, they will be referred to again; when argument is lacking, these substitutes for arguments will be resorted to. If it were not for occupying the time of the House to tediousness, I think I could show that by the conduct of hon. gentlemen in the past, they have laid themselves open to the charge which they have been hurling so frequently at us. We all remember distinctly the caterpillar brigade of 1877-78. We know that in those years the caterpillars, the grasshoppers, the potato bugs, the midges and other pests, were magnified by hon. gentlemen and were looked upon as curses brought on this country in consequence of the evils of the then Government. But now that they are safe on the Treasury benches, we find that a change has come over the spirit of their dreams, and instead of grasshoppers and caterpillars, potato bugs and midge being pests to the country, these interesting little insects appear to be welcome additions to the science of entomology. We have the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), lecturing this side of the House as to how they should conduct themselves in their speeches with regard to the misfortunes of the country; but we all remember well how that hon. gentleman, in the press and on the platform, told his story with regard to the misfortunes of the country in 1878. When, however, his party regained power, a great change came over that hon. gentleman, and to-day he rises to applaud the man who described the floods of his country as a magnificent overflow of the Red River. Instead of lamenting the wonderful exodus of our people in the W. States, we may expect him to speak of it at a delightful trip to the wilds of Dakota, and should a deluge unfortunately overwhelm the North-West so that steamers would be able to ply athwart the railway tracks of that country, we may expect him to describe it in the newspaper which he so able conducts, as a heavy dew in the prairie province. I do not think it is necessary at this late stage of the debate that I should enter into a consideration of the figures which I have noted, as I think enough has been given to prove the necessity of obtaining further information as to the financial condition both of the Company and the

country before we endorse the Resolutions now before the House. In conclusion, allow me just to draw the attention of members to what they might justly do on this occasion. We have not time, of course, to find out from our constituents exactly how they feel on this matter. But suppose every member had command of a telephone, and suppose he should tell the people of his constituency that a vote was about to be taken, and should give them a summary of the facts, what would be the answer? We might remind them, and remind them honestly, of the fact that the debt of this country is nearly \$200,000,000. We might remind them likewise, of the debt of their own particular Province. We might remind them—if it be true—that they have barely enough revenue to carry on the Government of their Province, and that direct taxation stares them in the face. We might remind them—if it be true—that there is no revenue to spare even more, that they are now labouring under a heavy taxation in order to meet the engagements entailed by municipal bonuses granted years ago to railway schemes. We might remind them with truth, that this grant is, in fact, but another bonus asked by the Government from their own particular county; and though I shall not take up time disputing the figures of the hon. gentleman who preceded me, relating to his discussion with his colleague from the county of Grey, I say it makes but little difference whether the amount be \$142,000 or \$150,000 for each county. Let us, for the sake of peace, come down to \$100,000, and suppose hon. gentlemen were to enquire whether or not they should vote to inflict such an obligation upon the country, what answer would they get? They can tell their constituents honestly that there is no finality about the matter—that we are not promised that this is the last time of asking—that the probabilities are this same Canadian Pacific Railway Company will again approach Parliament and, perhaps, looking straight with their eyes, and walking erect on their feet, will demand another thirty millions! Nobody can tell; but we do know that the security they pledge for this loan exhausts their supply of that commodity and shuts them out of the markets of the world, and having no security to give, in order to obtain funds elsewhere, they will of necessity, if more is needed, make their appearance again at the doors of this Parliament. And if the same gentlemen should be at the head of affairs then, the request will be acceded to without a word, and we on this side will be accused, as we are today, of a lack of patriotism if we refuse to give them another \$30,000,000. Mr. Speaker, the conception of duty to my constituents and to the country in this emergency afford good reasons for the position I have taken, and the vote I intend to record, and I shall have great pleasure in voting for the amendment to the amendment, and, failing to carry that, I shall have equal pleasure in opposing the Resolutions of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. HOUE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make a lengthy speech, as the House seems to be tired, having already heard a very lengthy debate. On the other hand, it would perhaps be difficult to throw upon the subject now discussed any more light than that which has already been thrown on it by the hon. members who spoke before me. I do not rise to make a speech. I simply wish to explain the vote which I am called upon to give. I simply wish to give a short and simple explanation, which I owe to myself, and which I owe to the electors whom I have the honour to represent here. At the very outset of the discussion, Mr. Speaker, I declared to all those to whom I had occasion to speak on the subject, that I had made up my mind to examine this important question, and to deal with it according to its merits, and independently of all other considerations. Now, my opinion has not varied from this point. I have always been in favour of the build-

ing of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because I considered this great work as being conducive to the development and progress of the country, and to the binding up together of all parts of Confederation, but I was in favour of it, provided that the work could be carried on in a prudent manner, and with a view to national interest. I say in a prudent manner, inasmuch as it ought to insure the existence of a great trans-continental railway, built entirely on Canadian territory. Such has been, Mr. Speaker, from the beginning, the double standpoint from which I have considered this question, and to illustrate this fact, I beg to quote two short extracts of an humble speech, which I had the honour to deliver in this House on the 13th of February, 1880. I said then :

"The construction of 120 miles of railway, to be commenced early in spring and vigorously proceeded with, is a tangible proof of the desire of the present Government to do justice to the inhabitants of that Province. The country will approve of the course of thus redeeming, as far as possible, the promise given in its name; as it must see with satisfaction that the Government seems to be of opinion that these works are proportioned to the resources of which it can at present advantageously dispose, and that, before putting the remainder under contract, they will, as I fancy, endeavour to procure the necessary means, otherwise than by new foreign loans, so as to avoid too much drawing on the future or incurring the risks of burdening the present inhabitants of the old Provinces for the over-exclusive benefit of a population not yet located in that country, and which, when they come to dwell in it, will have contributed least to these costly public works."

And a little further on I added :

"The public will learn with satisfaction that, thanks to the able and economical management of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, the Intercolonial Railway, which those who opposed its construction said would be the ruin of the country, has already ceased to be a serious charge upon the public chest. There is now no doubt but it will become a lucrative undertaking for the trade of the country, whereby the completion of the Canada Central and the extension eastwards of the Pacific Railway to the western terminus of the latter, or of some equivalent branch, will have placed the Q. M. O. & O. Railway in direct communication with the North-West, and a suspension or other bridge across the St. Lawrence, above Quebec, will have linked the latter with the line from Lévis to Rivière du Loup. This would be a sure means of largely increasing the traffic on the Intercolonial, while doing justice to the Maritime Provinces, and the Province of Quebec, and of avoiding the danger of the trade of the West being diverted from our railways, waterways and ports, in order to replenish the railways, canals and ports of the Americans, after passing through but a small part of the Province of Ontario."

Well, Mr. Speaker, having frankly taken this position four years ago, and having never had since any occasion to alter my mind, could I consistently, could I logically, could I honestly vote in favour of the Resolutions now submitted to our consideration? I do not think I can do it, for if I look at the question from the original standpoint, from the point of view which I took in the first instance, I find that, in order to meet the unreasonable requirements of the Company, we are obliged to negotiate a large loan abroad, which I do not think is in the interest of the country, but which, I think would, on the contrary, burden the tax-payers of the old Provinces. On the other hand, as I have always been in favour of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because, among other reasons, it has always appeared so very important to this Parliament, and to the country, that this railway should be built, so as to secure for us a trans-continental line, built entirely on Canadian territory, can I be satisfied with the policy followed by that Company, which has refused on every occasion to use our Canadian sea-ports as its eastern terminal point, and which has spent so much money, in a manner that is useless, and even dangerous for the interests of the country, to reach the American ports, to our detriment—I mean to say, at least in so far as the trans-continental traffic is concerned? In 1881, Mr. Speaker, when the contract with the Pacific Syndicate was submitted for our ratification, I had serious objections against it, and the hon. Ministers remember it, for I made them aware of my opinion on the subject. There were in that contract clauses which I did not like, and it lacked clauses which I should have liked to have had inserted. Still, I finally gave it my support, in consid-

eration of the general features of the scheme, which were better than the details, and in consequence of the representations which were made to us that that would be the end of our sacrifices. But, Mr. Speaker, it was not the end, as is evidenced by the present Resolutions, which propose to loan a sum of nearly \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that at a time when we will be obliged to go and borrow from abroad another very large sum to redeem part of our public debt, and at a time when Canada shall need all its credit to borrow with advantage. Yet, one thing makes me a little less diffident on this point, and it is the success which has heretofore crowned the financial policy of the Government. When these Resolutions were introduced in this House, Mr. Speaker, I found myself in a state of great perplexity, and on the 7th of February, inst., I deemed it my duty to inform the hon. leader of the Government, for I desired then, as I desire now, to be able to reconcile the allegiance I owe to my party with the dictates of my conscience and the duty I am bound to discharge towards my country. I have listened with great attention and I have tried to examine with impartiality the reasons invoked in favour of the present Resolutions, but despite the great confidence I had in the skill of the hon. Ministers, and in their desire to promote the interests of the country, despite the sincere devotedness I felt towards them, I have not been able to arrive at their conclusions. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that at this moment I find myself in a very painful position, so much so that, after the expressions of opinion which I have heard until now, I shall be about the only one—out of the numerous phalanx of friends with whom I have agreed until this, and with whom I still hope to agree on other points of Governmental policy—to disapprove of these Resolutions. I foresee that I shall be about the only one to dissent from my friends on this important question, but I was placed in the alternative to dissent from my party, or to sacrifice what I believe to be in the interest of the country. Now, I do not believe that the Ministers would think more of me if I sacrificed the interest of the country for the party, for I have once heard the leader of the Government himself saying, that the interest of the country should be preferred to the interest of the party; and at all events, Mr. Speaker, this has always been my principle, and it is by acting in accordance with this principle that I have always found the best reward for the work, sacrifices and annoyances inherent to parliamentary life, and to journalism, a profession which I have followed for several years. To be as short as possible—besides I have not the strength to speak lengthily, for I am suffering with a severe bronchitis, as you perceive—and to state in as few words as possible the reason why I take this position to-day, I shall say that I feel it my duty to vote against the Resolutions now submitted to the House, because I have no confidence in the promises made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; because I consider that the reasons invoked in favour of the adoption of these Resolutions can always be invoked with as much force whenever the Company, in consequence of its carelessness, of its extravagance, or of other reasons, will be pleased to come again and knock at our door to ask further aid; that is to say, whenever the Company may feel disposed to threaten us with stopping the work, thus involving for the country unfortunate consequences—consequences which, in my opinion at least, are more or less imaginary in the present case. It has been said that the Company had the means required to promote the execution of their original contract. Well, I regret that it has not been thought proper to compel them to carry out their agreement, and that these Resolutions have been introduced to give them the additional aid which they are claiming to-day, and which, in my opinion, ought not to be granted to them. I am, furthermore, opposed to these Resolutions, because I cannot understand, judging from what is taking place now, where the

M. HODGE.

unreasonable claims of the Company may lead us. For my part, I think that we have got far enough, and I cannot go any further unless I turn a deaf ear to the dictates of prudence, and unless I sacrifice the true interests of the country.

Mr. GILLMOR. In speaking of this important question, I do not, of course, expect to affect the decision of the House. But this is my eleventh Session in Parliament, and I think that during the time I have been here I have heard every speech that has been delivered on every important question. Hon. members who remain silent until the close of the debate are no more obliged to ask permission to speak than those who have spoken first. We cannot all speak at the same time, and those who have anything to say on the subject have just as good a right to be heard at the close of the debate as those who spoke before. I did not at first intend to speak on this question, but the turn the discussion has taken has convinced me that it is my duty to make a few remarks before the vote is taken. The speech made by hon. Minister of Railways this afternoon brings before the House and the country very definitely the question of the winter port. That is a question which has occupied the attention of the Maritime Provinces ever since Confederation, and for some time before. We have been told that this railway is a great trans-continental highway. I believe, since so much money has been granted, and so much more is asked, we have a right now to ask that it should be finally determined where this road is to begin and where it is to end. I think we in the Maritime Provinces are entitled to be told whether one end is to be there, or at Portland, in the United States. During the eleven years that I have been a member of this House, that question has met me on every occasion, because the port of St. Andrews is in the county I represent, and it has been urged against me at every election, that I was not able to get the winter port of Canada located there. The hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Minister of Railways both have residences at St. Andrews, and have resided there. At every election, it has been put forward as a reason why I should not be elected, that I had no influence to get the winter port located there; so that this is a question of local importance to me. I am aware that it is difficult to determine which is the best winter port for this great trans-continental railway; but I think the Government have had time enough to define it, and I think the people of the Maritime Provinces ought to be informed where it is to be before they are called upon to advance \$7,000,000, which is about their share of the \$30,000,000 now proposed to be given to this Company; but they do not know yet whether the winter port is to be in the Dominion of Canada or in the United States. I think, however, from all that has been said in this discussion, and from the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways, that the evidence is that the winter port of this great railway is going to be at Portland, in the United States. The Government have decided where the terminus of this railway shall be on the Pacific Coast, and I think they have had time and opportunity to decide, and they ought to have decided before this, where the Atlantic Coast terminus is to be. I agree with the hon. Minister of Railways that, for commercial purposes, perhaps Portland would be a preferable port; but this is a great national work, to which all the Provinces have contributed; and although the people of the Maritime Provinces are now asked to contribute \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 more, we do not know whether the road is to go there or not. We know that it is to start at Port Moody, and that it is going to avoid the United States all the way to Montreal, but from that point it is to be a commercial enterprise, and from that point the interests of the Syndicate are to be considered, instead of the interests of the people of this country, and especially of the Maritime Provinces. Is this not a

matter of importance to the people of the Maritime Provinces? What mean the meetings of boards of trade and other bodies? What mean the deputations sent to Ottawa, and the pamphlets issued on this question on so many occasions, if it is not important? And ought the Lower Provinces not demand that the Government shall define whether the Atlantic port of this great trans-continental road is going to be in Dominion territory or not? The importance of this question is the reason that has induced me to make a few remarks upon it to-night; but while I am on my feet I may say something on the Resolutions which have been discussed for so many days. I am quite well aware that discussion does not amount to much in the way of convincing any member of this Parliament. Party Government is no doubt the best system that we can adopt; but as for this being a deliberative body, I have long ceased to have any faith in it. Yet our discussions are valuable, because they go to the country and the electors get information that they would not get but for those discussions. I do not suppose that our talking ever changes a vote, party lines are so strictly drawn in this House. Now, I do not intend to take up the time of the House in reading extracts; I only wish to express certain thoughts that have occurred to me while sitting here day after day, listening to the discussion. One of the points urged by hon. gentlemen opposite is, that this idea of a great trans-continental line of railway was conceived by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches; and those opposed to them have no credit for anything they have done. Of course, having decided to undertake that work, it is of little use now to discuss the wisdom of it. I think myself that it was premature to begin this work at the time it was undertaken; but whether it was or not, it was undertaken, and the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did all that they could do, consistent with the ability of the country, in carrying out this great work. And they laboured under very great difficulties at that time. I need not repeat what the House has so often been reminded of, that the business of this country was depressed and the revenues very much reduced; but notwithstanding all that, the Government went on vigorously to open up the North-West, and every reasonable man will admit that they did everything that was necessary. The first immigrant that went in to the North-West went on the line that was built by the late Government—the Pembina Branch. They proceeded to build the road from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, and conducted their operations upon that part of the line as long as they continued in power. They proceeded far enough and fast enough to meet all the requirements of settlement of the North-West. In every respect, they did their duty faithfully and fully, and instead of being blamed they ought to get credit for what they did. I shall not trouble the House in regard to the contract under which this Company is now acting, as we all know the history of that. I believe it to be one of the most profitable contracts ever given to any company since the inauguration of railways. It was so profitable that with a very few days' notice another company offered to do the same work for \$3,000,000 and 3,000,000 acres of land, which land is now worth \$2 per acre, making \$9,000,000 in all; and as a guarantee of their readiness to carry out that proposition faithfully, they deposited \$1,500,000 with the Government. But that company failed to get the contract and the country lost \$9,000,000 by refusing to give it to them, although that company was in every respect equal to the present one. That, however, is past and gone and there is now no remedy for it. The Canadian Pacific Railway then began their operations. I knew nothing about the gentlemen who compose that Company; I had nothing to blame them for in having made the best bargain they could, and I desired they might succeed. I do not know the reasons why this Company may

be now embarrassed financially, but I do know that when they were before this Parliament asking for an Act of incorporation and about to enter into this contract, they were represented as men of vast wealth and financial skill and ability—as men of unbounded resources. I believed at the time and I believe still that they were men of wealth and skill, but I believe they have failed to manifest their skill in this matter. How is it that with so profitable a contract and with so great resources, they have not been able to raise the money they require in the markets of the world, where there is plenty of money seeking investment, and are obliged to demand Government aid in order to complete the work? I do not know why they have failed on the continent, in England and in America. That is a matter I know nothing about further than what I have learned from various opinions expressed here and elsewhere, but that they have failed to inspire confidence in capitalists, who are always ready to invest in safe speculations, shows there is something lacking in this Company. I regret this on account of the gentlemen who compose the Company, and on account of the work, but I do not regret it enough to vote for the Resolutions and tax the people \$30,000,000 more. Hon. gentlemen talk about these sums as though they were of little importance. They talk about \$30,000,000 as though it was an amount of little importance, yet if the Dominion of Canada were called on to pay \$30,000,000 out of its own capital, it would take every dollar in circulation in Canada to do so. In every branch of business and trade in Canada, there is not more than enough to pay this amount down. I do not know who is to blame for this, but I know this application is before us. It is a pleasing feature in human nature that when an appeal for benevolence is presented before them, almost all men would like to contribute. That is the first impulse, but in matters of this kind second thoughts are best. There is another feature in human nature which is not so pleasing, and that is, while we are disposed to aid those who are in want we are always more disposed to aid them with other people's money than our own. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches should wish to aid this Company, nor am I surprised at the peculiar form of their benevolence. We had a specimen of their benevolence last Session, when they went back seventeen years, to pay claims outstanding, for which they of course had their own good reasons. I must confess that I had some leanings myself towards this Company, and felt that now, when the Company was embarrassed, and in want of means, they should be helped, without taking the people's money, by the Government entering into the guarantee. I had no doubt when that guarantee was given, that this Company would have no trouble in getting all the money they required, and was not disposed to blame the Government for taking this action. I would, perhaps, have been inclined to go still further, if I found the Company, from whatever reason, were unable to succeed in the money markets. I do not say what I would have done, but I would like to see them helped to a moderate extent over their difficulty. If their floating debt were \$6,000,000 or \$8,000,000 in addition to the guarantee, I do not know but that I would justify the Government in helping them to that extent to enable them to get over the difficulty; but when the Government comes before this House and say this Company are abundantly able to carry out its contract, that they have all the skill and the resources necessary to complete the road, but that they cannot complete it so soon without this aid, I say let them go on and complete it under the terms of the contract, and no other. Almost every hon. gentleman who spoke on the other side said it was so important this road should be completed within two years, that we should lend them this money. I differ from them in that

respect. I do not think it is very important that this road should be so speedily completed. I do not believe that the country will suffer in any respect if that Company are allowed to go on under their contract and have the road completed in 1891, and if they want any more time, I think it would be better to give them more time rather than advance the \$30,000,000. I believe this country, if consulted calmly, outside of political excitement and party feeling, would say give them any time they require, but do not tax us any more if you can possibly avoid it. You have facilities enough now to carry immigrants, all that we can get—I only fear we are not going to get half enough—into that country; you have ample facilities to carry on trade between that country and the other Provinces; you have everything required to promote the industry and the prosperity of this country, and there is no real advantage in having this road finished sooner. I cannot see any advantage to any industry in any part of the country that will be materially benefitted by completing the road north of Lake Superior or through the Rocky Mountains in two years. All that is necessary for the Government to do is to help the Company over their present emergency. That is the way the question strikes me. I have no feeling against this Company. I do not know anything against them, and if I did, I am slow to say anything against anybody. I think, and I am very sincere in that, that there is no necessity, in the interests of the country, to urge on that road so rapidly. I think the argument made use of in reference to that matter has been exaggerated. If men are sincere in what they say about it, I think they are mistaken. That is my opinion, and I would say to them, "By all means, in the interest of the country, take your time; you only agreed to build it in 1891; take all the time the contract gives you, but do not press us for so large an aid as this." Taking the guarantee as well, it amounts to \$30,000,000. It was thought that \$25,000,000 was an enormous sum three years ago, and so it is an enormous sum, but now they are getting \$5,000,000 more than the cash subsidy given them under the contract, and for that reason I am opposed to this vote. The tax-payers of the Dominion of Canada have done a great deal for the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have advanced in cash a great deal for that enterprise—all they are able to advance. They advanced to that company—of course I speak nothing about the lands—the tax-payers of this Dominion have put \$5,000,000 into that undertaking in the way of exploration and surveys, they will have spent \$28,000,000 in construction on the Government division, when that is completed, and they have given \$25,000,000 in cash, when it is earned, making \$53,000,000 in cash up to this time already, given to subsidize that great work. That is a magnificent subvention, as has been remarked by the Minister of Railways, so many times, and now we are to give \$30,000,000 more—it is going to be voted, I know—that will be \$83,000,000 in cash given to the Company. And, if the land is worth \$2 an acre, as hon. gentlemen who are well capable of judging have stated over and over again, that will make \$50,000,000 more, making in all \$133,000,000 that the people of this Dominion have given for the purpose of building that trans-continental railway, and that has all been given to this Syndicate. I am surprised that this Parliament should think it necessary now to give this last \$30,000,000. The sum, if these Resolutions are carried, that the people of this Dominion will have to give to this railway, will be more than twice our national debt, when we entered into Confederation. We had been a people, we had been colonies for a hundred years. We had gone on with our enterprises and our railways and had been creating a public debt for all that time, and we are putting into this one work alone, more than twice as much as we had put into all Governments works previous to that time. It has been stated by hon.

Mr. GILLMOB.

members that this is only a loan. Hon. gentlemen will not interrupt me. The debate up to the present time has been conducted very fairly. I think the majority have behaved magnanimously on the whole, better than I ever knew them to behave before, and I hope they will maintain their good character and behave so to the end. They can afford to be generous. They are going to have their own way, and, if this is as just and noble and patriotic as they say, they will get a great deal of credit, without annoying me in the few remarks I am going to make. They say this is only a loan. It may be so. I am not a prophet. I cannot say whether the Company will pay it back or not. But there may be great securities offered which are not very valuable. If the canals of the Dominion, upon which we have expended forty millions, were in private hands, were in the hands of a company, and they proposed to give them as security for twenty millions, or for ten, or for five millions of dollars, do you think, with all the forty millions expended on the canals, that were going to be such a paying investment, that that would be a good security? I do not think any capitalists would think so. I do not think it is any security at all. Then there is the Intercolonial, on which we have spent forty millions. Is that any security, if it were owned by a company and they wanted to borrow any money upon it? It would not be accepted as a security at all. Look at the loan made to the Grand Trunk Railway. It is no security. Is the Prince Edward Island Railway any security? By no means; and I do not think this road is a very much better security than that is, and that is my honest opinion. I do not think it is any security at all, and I do not believe this money will be refunded. I hope it may be, but that is my impression. However, I would have the Company go on more slowly, and not call upon the people of this Dominion to mortgage their property to raise this money to loan it. I know that, when you are talking upon great national questions, it is not considered very patriotic to refer to anything that is very local. It is considered in this House to be rather a limited view to take of matters, and altogether too local, and not patriotic. Now, in regard to New Brunswick—and, whatever you may say about Confederation, New Brunswick is still a separate Province, no doubt about that, and we have to look after the interests of those we represent and of the Province we represent—New Brunswick bound for four millions of dollars of the cash that has been put into this undertaking; quite a large sum for that Province. They are paying the interest now upon \$1,000,000 in that enterprise. We are asked by these resolutions to increase that by \$2,000,000 more, to make our contribution in New Brunswick \$6,000,000 to that great undertaking, and, if we were going to get the winter port at St. Andrew's or at St. John, there would be some propriety in asking it, because we would get some return—we would get some remuneration for this contribution. New Brunswick, I believe, has not been often before this Parliament asking for aid. New Brunswick has gone into Confederation, and she has got to live, and carry on the business of the Province, and make her advances to public works as best she can out of the revenue at her command, and therefore I think we ought to be very careful, knowing that we want railways, and other public improvements that will tax our resources to the utmost—I think we ought to be very careful how we tax our people to carry on this work, unless it is absolutely necessary, unless we can see that we are going to get some return. Now, take the county I represent, the county of Charlotte. The proportion of the debt we have contracted which would fall to my county would be some \$300,000, and we are asked now to add to that \$200,000 more, according to the calculations I have made, which are subject to correction. This is cash, mind you—no land. If we had our proportion of the land according to population it would increase

the contribution of the county I represent to \$800,000. Now, I wonder what the people would think if their municipal council or local legislature were to place upon them liabilities of that extent without consulting them. This is a consideration that influences me. The people who pay these bills are not considered enough. I do not always sympathise with these appeals to the people that play upon their prejudices, but when you come to the question of taxation, the people ought to be considered. In other countries, older and richer than ours, the whole nation would ring with indignation if this was done without submitting it to the people. These questions are never submitted to the people by the present Government. When the original contract was made was that submitted to the people? No; it was not their policy. They entered into the contract, and the Company was in operation two years before the Government went to the people, and now they tell us that it was submitted to the people? What did the people say? I put the question to my people and they returned me, but I do not know whether they approved of the contract or not—I do not think they did. The policy of the present Government is a very cunning policy, and it succeeds well. They are going to vote \$30,000,000 now, and they pretend to tell us the people know all about the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, the people know nothing about this \$30,000,000. It has only been for a few weeks under consideration and there is no time for members to consult the people on any of these questions now. This expenditure has become so large that the people seem really not to be alive to the question at all. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard some arguments about this great national highway for at least seventeen years, ever since Confederation; all these speeches and all this spread-eaglesism, all these fine sayings were presented to the people at the time of Confederation. I have heard them, and I always thought that they were extravagant. We have heard about this great national highway, and what a wonderful people we are. Yes, we have heard that we were on the high road to greatness, that we were the germ of a wonderful nation, and that Confederation and the trans-continental railway were going to build us up into a great nation. We have been seventeen years in Confederation, and I think, so far as nationality is concerned, that Confederation has been a failure. That is my opinion. I think there is no more national feeling to-day than there was seventeen years ago, when we entered Confederation. I know that there is a good deal more party feeling, but I pretend to say that so far as the real principles that constitute a nation are concerned, we are not to-day any stronger than we were then. I think Confederation might have been made a success. I was opposed to it. In great questions of that kind I want to be true to myself. I thought there were some reasons for Confederation, but I thought the reasons against it preponderated—at least they did in my mind, and I opposed it. I have been willing to make the best of it, but when hon. gentlemen pretend here to talk in this high-flown strain, and with these far-fetched, magnificent sentences, I don't believe it. It is not railways that constitute a nation; it is not these great expenditures that help to make a happy and contented people. The most important thing to build up a national feeling is to make the burdens on the people as light as possible. That is the way to make a happy people. You may under excitement, carry your schemes for increased taxation, you may deceive the people and the country by party warfare and party excitement; but the real elements that constitute a nation have not been advanced since Confederation. The burdens of the people, instead of being lightened, have been enormously increased, and we have gone on in that direction at railroad speed. Now, we are often pointed to the United States—to that great nation which I venture to say is now the greatest

nation on earth, at least it will be in another decade. That nation, in 1860, with a population of 35,000,000, had a debt of only \$64,000,000. They are a progressive people, but that was the extent of their national debt. We, with 4,000,000 of people began Confederation with a national debt of \$70,000,000, and we have now a debt approaching \$200,000,000. Now, I think this Dominion has a great many places that are very desirable to live in. I have travelled a little over the Dominion, and from all I have seen of it, I think the valley of Annapolis, in Nova Scotia, is the garden of this Dominion. There is no place in this Dominion, notwithstanding the praises of the great North-West, that I would go to live in so soon as to the Annapolis valley of Nova Scotia. We shall continue to live here, and our children after us, from generation to generation, but to say that this country, geographically and climatically, is to be compared with the United States, is extravagance and a mistake. It makes people extravagant in their opinions, and extravagant in their expenditure, and makes them try to be what, I think, they will not soon become. This country would make a very excellent border, a very excellent fringe, for a nation and that fringe is ornamented for a very large part of the year with beautiful white snow. But notwithstanding all that, we have a great many resources, and we could become a happy, industrious and progressive people if you would keep the taxes down. But if you go on increasing the people's burdens, you make them dissatisfied, and after the excitement of it over they will begin to think about paying the bill—as a good many representatives do. The United States had 35,000,000 of people before they undertook to construct a trans-continental railway, and I think they did not give much money, but a land grant. They had a large and thriving population on the Pacific coast; in a word, they were a great nation before they undertook the task. They waited until they were able to carry it out before they undertook an enterprise of such great magnitude. I think we are entirely too hasty. The United States undertook to aid a railway of something like 2,000 miles in length; we have undertaken to construct a railway 2,550 miles in length, to Montreal, to say nothing about the distance to the sea board; and we have given \$88,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 of acres of land, which, at \$2 per acre, would bring the amount up to \$138,000,000, a sum altogether beyond the resources of the country. All our revenues will pretty soon be consumed to pay the interest on our public debt which bring no direct revenue to the Treasury. I know something about the workingmen, about the people who elect me. We forget, when dealing with the people's money by millions, to think of those who have to pay the bills. In our population of four millions the producers of wealth constitute a very small proportion. The Ministers of the Crown do not produce—the workingmen have to pay the money for their salaries. Doctors, who are very necessary, do not produce, and the working people have to earn enough to pay them; and lawyers are also non-producers—even my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) who is a very industrious man, appears before the Courts, attends tribunals, such as the Fishery Commission, and argues cases in the Supreme Court—does not really produce a single dollar. The interest on the public debt has to be paid by those who use the spade, shovel and hoe, who go upon the ocean and catch fish—these are the men who produce wealth. They have to pay, not only for their own maintenance, but to support us here and give us our \$1,000 and travelling expenses each. All the civil servants, and the army of officials round Ottawa, do not produce a cent; and when you take out all the lawyers and doctors and politicians, all the lazy ones, all the professors and temperance lecturers, and all the spongers, you reduce the number of the wealth-producing class to a very small proportion. I do not mean to say these men are not

necessary, or that we can get on without them; but when we come here and vote away the public money, we have to look at the class which has to work and pay it. I am a workingman myself; I feel the taxes, and I know how others feel them. We have thousands and tens of thousands of people who have not a dollar of surplus at the end of the year, after working hard all through it. I know plenty of industrious families who have trouble to obtain their contributions to the clergymen, and often go without doctors when they need them—I do not pity those who employ lawyers in every occasion. Now, this class we ought to consider; and we consider them just about the time of elections, with hearts overflowing with kindness. We enjoy their hospitality, but we care more for their votes. We are going to be very economical and we talk about the extravagance of every one except ourselves. How soon we forget all this after we get into Parliament, when we want to vote money to the Pacific Railway Company, composed, as it is, of men possessing vast wealth.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GILLMOR. An hon. member says, hear, hear. I think he is the gentleman who thought a great deal of the National Policy because it would cause the hens to lay larger eggs. If he has to depend for his eggs on the success of the National Policy he should be very careful how he votes \$30,000,000. We are puffed up with the idea that we are bigger than we really are, and that our country has grown much faster than it really has. We think we have the best half of the continent; I think we have not. But because we think we have the best half, we enter into extravagant expenditure. I do not know much about the United States. I do know, however, that 100 years ago it had a population of 5,000,000, while to-day it has 55,000,000. We have been going on in the same way and have now a population of only 4,500,000. They must be terrible fools on the continent of Europe, and in England, Scotland and Ireland particularly, to go to the worst half of this continent and leave us in the cold. They have been going there, and continue to go there, and you tax the people of this country a great deal too much to bring emigrants here. Our efforts in regard to emigration are, to a great extent, objectionable. We have a great many people here who would have been better at home. Emigrants who, in this age, and with the information before them, who cannot get out of a bad country into a good one, had better stay at home. I would offer facilities to come here, but I would not tax the people of the country to bring the people here. I would give information, tell them the whole truth, and let them judge for themselves; if they cannot get here, let them stay at home. We are making an unnatural effort to create a nation before the proper time. We are taxing the people beyond their resources and pursuing a course which will prevent progress and growth. I heard some remarks made about an expression which slipped from the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Somebody said we had the best half of the continent, and that hon. member said we had the worst half, and this has been harped upon as though the hon. gentleman were unpatriotic, and did not seek to promote the best interests of this country. He simply told the truth. I do not believe in spreading our defects abroad, in giving information that will injure us; but when a man opens his mouth he should speak the truth. I say it is a humiliating position for any man to be placed in; that he has to lie when he speaks about this country, in comparison with any other—that a man has to lie to bolster up his country. Sir, we cannot afford to do it on this side of the House. No, we cannot afford to lie, and we cannot afford to exaggerate, and we cannot afford to do a great many things which hon. gentlemen opposite can afford to do. We have not got the majority to lean upon, as they have; and we have not got the public purse to lean upon, as

Mr. GILLMOR,

they have. They got the majority of the people to think with them, but we believe we are acting honestly, and in the people's interest, and we cannot afford to do anything but what is fair, square, honest and above-board. Yes, I have heard those references to our becoming a great nation, through Confederation, and this great trans-Atlantic railway—we have heard these high-sounding strains, for seventeen years. This country is to be the home of untold millions, this railway is to be built from ocean to ocean—not exactly from ocean to ocean in the Lower Provinces, but from the Pacific to somewhere on the Atlantic—anywhere between New York and Whitehaven. This is to be a great national highway from Montreal to Port Moody, but when it comes down through to the Lower Provinces, the great Chinese wall seems to be broken down, and we cannot tell where the deuce we are going to there. I think, myself, that the Company intend to go to Portland, and I think the Government should not let them. I think the Government should say to them, this is a great highway, and it is to be a highway from ocean to ocean, in Canadian territory. I think this work has cost enough, and is great enough to have that defined. The policy of the Government is imperfect, unless that is defined. I think the representatives from Nova Scotia should insist upon that point, and the representatives from New Brunswick as well. We should not be satisfied with these vague intimations that St. Andrews, and St. John, and Halifax, and Louisburg, have splendid harbours. The Company state that Portland is the better harbor, and I think the hon. members from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should be satisfied, before they vote, where the road is to terminate on the Atlantic coast. This reminds me of an anecdote which was told in our Local Parliament on one occasion when a rather serious vote was expected—an occasion which the hon. Finance Minister well remember. One or two members were a little doubtful—they did not know how they were going to vote. A witty son of Erin who was in the House, said the position reminded him of a circumstance which happened in London, when a man gave out that he was going to jump over St. Paul's Cathedral. The people were anxious, and they assembled by tens of thousands. The man stood there; he did not seem ready to make the jump. They asked him why he delayed, and his reply was: "Well, I would like to be satisfied that there is a little straw on the other side." He did not feel disposed to jump, unless there was something to break the fall. The discussion which is going on in this Parliament reminds me of the story. We have seen what has been going on among hon. gentlemen opposite; we cannot help looking at you, and knowing something about your troubles. There was a great leap to be taken, and I think last night a good many had concluded that there was some straw on the other side for Quebec Bleus. Now, I want to ask the members from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick if there is any straw on the other side for them. I would like to ask the Ontario members if there is any straw on the other side for them? I think Quebec, on the whole, has acted a wise part and I think their men are better and wiser men than those who are jumping without any straw. I think, Mr. Speaker, they are more honest men, because they see that this Dominion is going into an enormous debt—and Heaven knows, in Quebec the necessities are great, and they are not much better down in Nova Scotia. I tell you, I rather approve of their course. They were determined to know if the straw was there, and they know it is there. And we know it too from the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways to-day, that straw was not there three days ago. But the straw is there now; the Minister of Railways told us it was there. I do not think it was a very magnanimous or high-minded thing, but when they see that we are going to pay millions of money, for which their people are to be taxed, I do not blame them. When the devil wants

to catch Quebec Tories he baits the hook. But New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Ontario Tories will take the naked hook. But these hon. gentlemen are trembling in their shoes, they hope to blind the people, and they likely will; they have done it before. But there is an end. "The mills of the Gods grind slowly, but they grind exceeding fine." You have to pay for it; if not in this world, you will in the next. Mr. Speaker, what are we going to get for all the money? Where are the returns? We entered Confederation seventeen years ago with a debt of \$5,000,000 in our Province. It was expended on the Government railways, on that part of the Intercolonial which is the only paying part, which is a good asset for the money, and our entire public debt independent of our railway expenditure was not more than \$100,000. What is our debt now? It is \$15,000,000. That is our proportion of the national debt, and we are paying interest on that sum. We came into Confederation with a Tariff of 12½ per cent.—and 2½ per cent. of railway impost. Under that Tariff there was a large free list; nearly all the raw materials which enter into our manufactures and all our flour, corn, meal, coal and other things of that kind were free under that Tariff. We came into Confederation with an understanding implied, and expressed, that our Tariff was not going to be raised. What is the result now under Confederation? We have doubled our Tariff in seventeen years. It is now nearly 30 per cent., and I think, on the whole, if you take the free list in comparison with what they were before, it has more than doubled. What are we getting out of this whole affair? Of course we are getting treated like the rest; but we have been deceived, and the Confederation has not tended to make us love the Union. Our burdens have been increased, our taxes have been doubled and our commerce hampered and we get no return. I was pleased to hear the other night that the right hon. leader of the Government had opposed Confederation. I do not know that I ever had a warmer feeling towards any opponent than I had towards him when I heard that statement. It has changed my opinion of the hon. gentleman very much. It is one bright spot in his character, one oasis in the desert. And I wish that he had continued to hold that opinion; but he saw how things were going, I suppose—that there was more straw on that side than on the other. Now, Sir, with the best attention I could give to this whole discussion, I have come to the conclusion that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with all their wealth, have not put one single cent of their own into the road which they agreed to build under the contract; and if they get this \$30,000,000, and the road does not cost more than \$27,000,000, as they have estimated, I do not think they will put one cent of their own money into it. I think this country has given enough subsidy to build the whole of the road. With their other railway enterprises, I do not think we have anything to do. They and the Grand Trunk have got into a fight. I do not know any of the parties. I have heard of a man who was driving through a wood one day; he heard a fight going on behind his waggon; he stopped his horse and saw it was a coon and woodchucker; he said: "Curse you, fight away, for I never saw two animals before, that I had no choice in." Now, I have no choice of those two companies. Let them fight. After they get the people embarrassed and taxed as much as they can stand, they will conclude, like a man and wife, that it is best to make it up, but they will fleece you all. Therefore, I think, the less we have to do with those two companies the better. Although my sympathy has all along been with the Canadian Pacific, I must confess that I have now a little sympathy with the Grand Trunk, because when two parties are contending and a third person comes along and takes one of the men: a blow under the short ribs it is unfair. I do not know how it was possible for any

power to interfere with these gentlemen's credit abroad, if their resources and credit were what we were told they were when we entered into this contract. You give us too much credit for influence. We have not much influence at home, but it seems that we have a mighty influence abroad, according to your representations—an influence that keeps all the Scandinavians at home—and we do a great deal by our speeches here to affect the money markets of the world. I never thought my speeches had much effect in that way, and I do not think any of our speeches have any effect whatever, so far as affecting the credit of this company. Notwithstanding all that, I do not want to see this Company fail, and I would give them all the assistance that I felt we could. Notwithstanding that, I think it was a bad contract, that it was cruel to the people of this country to take from them so much money and land and give it to that Company, yet I have no bad feeling towards them—the feeling is all directed to those who gave it. Now, I listened to the speech of my hon. friend from King's, N.B., (Mr. Foster) the other night. He is a very fluent talker, there is no doubt about that. Talking is very good, but it is a sort of thing that people can learn the same as playing on a banjo, and he has learned it to perfection. I do not envy him his skill, but I did feel a little offended when he undertook to criticise the speech of our hon. leader in the way he did. He is a great reader, and he must like to read, when he would read over a three hours' speech three times. He says that although he read it over three times, he did not find anything in it but "maybe's" and predictions. I gave the hon. gentlemen credit for more discernment than that. When he said he read it over the first time and did not find anything in it but "maybe's" and predictions, I thought that was extravagant; when he said he read it over the second time and could not find anything in it but "maybe's" and predictions, I thought that was a stretch; but when he said he read it over the third time—that long speech—I just made up my mind that that was a whopper; and I just thought to myself, now, if the liars have their place in the lake—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think I am going to be in order—if I am not, stop me, and I will apologize—I thought then if the liars have their place in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, I would pity the liars. I know it is unnecessary for me to rise as an advocate for my hon. friend and leader, but we think we have a very respectable man as a leader, and we think that he does not speak for three hours and utter nothing but "maybe's" and predictions. We think he is very thorough. I think the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth) was nearer the truth when he said that he shot at everything, even at a feather; but he never fails of his mark. I think my hon. friend need not have resorted to that style of argument. We do not fawn upon our leaders, and lick their ears, as some member has said, the supporters of the present Government do; we do not put our arms around our leaders necks and embrace them. We have nothing of that kind to waste upon the male sex. But we respect and support our leaders, because of their intellectual and moral worth. When the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) was describing his study of our leader (Mr. Blake's) speech, I did not believe he was searching for truth, but like the scavenger he was hunting for garbage and offal. Like the bird of prey which floats aloft on the wings of the wind, surveying the landscape below, but not to see and admire its beauties. Hill and dale, green fields and flowery lawn have no attraction for the vulture, but if in some shady nook it discovers a carion, the remains of some putrified dead horse, it at once descends and sticks in its beak to the eye, and revels in putridity. Such was the object of the hon. member in reading our leader's speech. I have read speeches

of the leading gentlemen opposite and I can see a considerable amount of argument and a great deal of eloquence in them, and I do not get up here to depreciate the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have enough to do to take care of my own. We have able men on the front benches on both sides of the House, and I do not think it becomes the hon. member for King's, with his experience, to pretend to criticise the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition in the way he has criticised it. I have trespassed too long on your patience, although if I were to follow all the notes I have taken I should be here until this time to-morrow, so I will content myself with declaring my intention to vote for the motion before the House, because I think it is a reasonable one and against the Resolution to lend \$30,000,000 to the Company.

**Mr. HOMER.** After the many able speeches we have heard, there is little more to be said. With regard to the financial part of the question, the Government are receiving from the Canadian Pacific Railway a guarantee of \$5 for every dollar they are lending the Company to enable them to complete this gigantic enterprise in two years instead of extending its construction over a period of seven years. There is one point to which I wish particularly to refer and which I do not think any previous speaker brought out during this debate, that is, the immense benefits which must naturally accrue to the young and growing manufactures of this Dominion by their early introduction to the markets of Japan, China, India, Australia and the numerous islands of the Pacific Ocean as well as the entire western coast of America, extending from Behring Straits to Cape Horn, containing in all a population of upwards of 700,000,000 of souls. One would suppose this would be a special reason, independent of the many others given during this debate, why we should construct this Canadian Pacific Railway at as early a date as possible. The day on which the first Canadian Pacific through train will reach the Atlantic seaboard from the Pacific will be to the Dominion of Canada like the discovery of a new continent already far advanced in civilization and trade. Shall we then vote for these Resolutions and complete this great national undertaking in two years, or vote them down and leave their completion to an indefinite period? By voting for these Resolutions, we open up new markets for the productions of our country and will give employment to the people and general prosperity to the whole Dominion. By voting them down, we will bring, however, ruin and misery on the whole Dominion. By constructing this road within five years from the time it was commenced, we show to the world that we have completed an undertaking of greater magnitude than has ever been attempted by the most powerful and wealthy nation of the world; it will also give us a standing among foreign nations which it would otherwise take us a century to acquire; it will also stand as a monument through time of the vigour of this growing Dominion; lastly, by voting the sums asked for in these Resolutions, which will enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry out this great gigantic undertaking, the present Administration show their intention to fulfil the terms of the Union with British Columbia as far as possible.

**Mr. COOK.** I have no doubt but that hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to take the vote as it is now very late, and this discussion has been prolonged for a number of days, but I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without expressing my views for a few moments. A few nights ago, in discussing this question, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), diverging from the subject, looked across the floor of this House and singled out two gentlemen who had extensive interests in the North-West—the hon. member for Kingston, and the hon. member for South Perth. The hon. gentleman stated that he looked all through the *Gazette*

**Mr. GILLMOR.**

and he happened to discover that these gentlemen had interests in the North-West. I have been told by these gentlemen that they have an interest in the North-West to the extent of about \$1,000 each in the stock of a company formed by a Tory clique. They had a good deal more confidence in the formers of that corporation than I would have had myself. I could not be induced under any circumstances to have taken a dollar in any enterprise of that kind in that country—not because the country is not a good country to invest in, but I knew that the men who had the formation of that Company would have had the lion's share, and I would have come out at the small end of the horn. The hon. gentleman stated that he had been up through the country, that he had found this, and discovered that, but he forgot to tell the House that he found a timber limit, a valuable timber limit, and that he sold it for a large amount of money—that he got it from this Government for \$2 a square mile, and sold it for \$100,000 or \$200,000, which money should have been in the public Treasury, and have gone to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in constructing their road. A few years ago this Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or the Syndicate of that day, applied to Parliament to build this road. At that time another syndicate made an application on better terms—for less money and less lands. But, Sir, that syndicate was characterized by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, the Minister of Railways and the member for Cardwell—the gentleman for Cardwell, who would like to be a Minister, and who, I think, will never warm the Treasury benches—he is sitting for his constituency by the grace of the leader of the Government.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** Order.

**Mr. COOK.** That gentleman said this. I do not wish to trespass the Rules of this House. If I said anything that is wrong, I am willing to withdraw.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** Hon. members have been called to order in previous Sessions for saying that any member is sitting in this House by the grace of any other person.

**Mr. COOK.** A portion of the gentlemen who formed that Syndicate had been members of Parliament, and had been defeated. That hon. gentleman, the member for Cardwell, thought that was a crime; that hon. gentleman thought that a man who once sat in this House as a member representing a constituency should not be represented in any public works, if he had been defeated. He should not engage in any enterprise, I suppose, because he thought they were incapable of doing anything. Well, now, let us see, look back a few years, and examine the record of that hon. gentleman in reference to this very same matter. I find by the "Parliamentary Companion" of this House, that that hon. gentleman has been defeated on several occasions. That hon. gentleman was defeated for the Legislative Assembly in the Province of Ontario, in South Wentworth, in 1867. We find that that gentleman offered himself again for a constituency in Lower Canada, in the city of Montreal, where he lived, and we find they rejected him there. We find that that same gentleman ran again for the city of Montreal in 1876, and still they rejected the gentleman. We find that he then came to Ontario, thinking, perhaps, it was a little better place. He was not so well known, and he ran down in the county of Prescott and was defeated again. I wonder what the hon. gentleman thought when he was maligning the gentlemen who had at one time had a seat in this House, and had happened to be defeated at that time. I remember at the time that the *Mail* newspaper, that organ of the party, that always speaks so truthfully and so plainly, stated that I was defeated in North Simcoe, that my opponent, Mr. McCarthy, was elected by the small majority of fifty out of a constituency polling nearly 6,000

votes, and that I would never hang my hat upon the peg in the corridor that was once consigned to me. But the predictions of that paper were like the predictions of some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side. I am here again, and I am here to stay. Now, it was stated that these men were paupers. The Minister of Railways got up and stated that, after looking over the whole of Dun Wiman's, he could scarcely find that any one of them was worth a dollar. I believe he discovered by a microscope that one had something like \$600. That was the report given to the newspapers. I have not consulted the *Hansard*, and I do not suppose I should find it there if I did, for hon. gentlemen make utterances reported in *Hansard* that are afterwards corrected, so you would not know the speech. It is like a Bill that goes to a Committee, and, when it comes out of the Committee, it would not be known by the party who introduced it unless he followed it through all the stages. I want to mention the names of some of the gentlemen who formed that syndicate. I do not, Mr. Speaker, decry the other Syndicate. I do not object to them endeavouring to get that bargain, because it was a good bargain, and, if properly managed and looked after and conducted on the principles that any ordinary business should be conducted upon, they would not be back here to-day asking on the floor of Parliament for a loan of \$30,000,000. But I will revert to that again. But it was stated that the members of the first Syndicate were men of great wealth. It was stated by my hon. friend from North Norfolk, the other day, in his speech, but I know nothing about it; but, if his statements were correct, that one of the gentlemen forming that Syndicate acquired means of wealth in a questionable way, he had means of making money very rapidly. I know nothing about that. I would not say anything against Mr. Stephen's character. It may not be so. I do not know that it is so. But, if it is so, I think it is the duty of the Government to enquire into a matter of that sort, and not to entrust a man of that character at the head of any corporation with such a very large amount of money as they propose to give to him now. Well, Sir, who was in the second syndicate? In the first place, Sir, we had representatives from the city of London, the city of Hamilton, and we had Mr. Hendrie, and it was a Grit concern; the second syndicate was composed of men who had no ability, no commercial ability, no ability of any description, and no money, and why should they pick up paupers on the street, and put them in a position by which they could make large amounts of money? Well, Mr. William Hendrie, of the city of Hamilton, is known to be one of the greatest and most successful railway men in the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Hendrie is not a Conservative, but he is a blue-blooded Tory, the worst kind of a Tory, and he was one of the gentlemen. Then we have Mr. John Stuart, a man also of great ability and a man of very great wealth. We had Mr. Proctor and Mr. A. T. Wood, and I would like to hear the hon. gentlemen in this House get up and individually select either of these men to-day and say they were not men of ability, that they had not railway ability, that they had not means to carry on an operation not so stupendous as this, but as much probably as the gentlemen who did get the contract. Then we have Mr. Jas. Maclaren, of Buckingham. Perhaps he is not worth anything. No, only six to eight millions, but that does not amount to anything with gentlemen on the other side of the House; he must be a great millionaire, worth a great deal more money than that. Then we have Mr. Allan Gilmour, a man without any money, a man who has not been a successful man. No; he is a pauper. But we find he is, if not a millionaire, approaching it very closely. I could go to work and speak of the gentlemen who form that syndicate. They were scattered from the western part of the Province of Ontario to the seaboard. Who did we have at the seaboard? We had a gentleman who only a few days ago—and

I am sorry he had confidence enough in the National Policy to build the institution he did build—built a cotton factory that cost \$1,000,000, and he is sorry for it; that is Mr. Gibson, another of the paupers the Minister was talking about. Of course, they are not so wealthy as the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Railways is, because they have not had opportunities in such gigantic scales to make money as they have had. Then we had Mr. Ross, of Winnipeg, clean from Winnipeg; and Mr. Ross was applauded last night. The cheers that went up when he turned that somersault, when he denounced the very platform that he stood on when he was elected, when he denounced himself, as it were, then he was a great man, cheered by the Minister of Railways, and the Minister of Railways to-day applauded him for what he did. Well, Sir, why was he not as good a man then as he is to-day? I think he was a great deal better man than he is to-day, in more senses than one. Why, Sir, the gentlemen who formed that second syndicate, myself excepted, were men of wealth, men of ability, men of standing, and of railway as well as of commercial ability. I, Sir, venture to say that if this contract had been given to them they would not have come knocking at the doors of Parliament for aid. They would have done their work judiciously and economically, and they would not have got Yankees from the United States to work upon the road. No, Sir, I am not one of those who decry the Americans; I am not one of those who oppose Americans coming into this country. But at the time of the National Policy, the cry on the other side was: "Canada for the Canadians!" We heard that cry from the whole crowd of political hacks from one end of this Dominion to the other. "Canada for the Canadians, and drive out the Yankees. We want none of them here." Sir, we have a great depression just now. Our friends on the other side said: "The expenditure of this money is going to allay all that depression." But it has not done so, because the money is taken by the Chinese, and taken by the Mohicans and every other nationality in the country. We, in Canada, have not the benefit of it, and the result is we have a calamity, and why? Because of the injudicious actions of these gentlemen—not alone because of the National Policy by which they squeeze out of the poor working men the last cent they can get, but because they cannot give them work. Look at the city of Toronto to-day and what do we find there? Look at the soup kitchens all over the country. Why does not the hon. Premier establish soup kitchens now? When he was leader of the Opposition he had a soup kitchen, but he does not take so much interest in it now. As my hon. friend who has just taken his seat said: "Oh, how they do love these men at election times!" I could not help looking across the floor when he mentioned that to see the smiles on the faces of those hon. gentlemen who sit here, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, by the grace of the workingmen. We find these poor working men all over the country working for almost nothing, and to-day men can be hired to go into the woods for \$10 per month. Only a few days ago, coming up to the Parliamentary Buildings, I met a man who formerly worked for me. He said: "I have been begging and praying all winter to get a day's work. I have a wife and six children. I have not been able to get any work all winter, but finally I succeeded in getting a week's work here pitching snow from around the Parliament Buildings." I said: "Who gave you that?" "Well," says he, "it was done through the influence of hon. Mr. Skead." "Mr. Skead is a friend of mine." I said: "You could not have a better friend, I am sure he will assist you through the winter."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COOK. Gentlemen who cry hear hear, had better do it this Parliament, for they will not have a chance the next. This \$30,000,000, and the taxes that are grinding the poor

working men will keep you at home. Now, I was very much pleased with the eulogies which were showered upon the present Company—the eulogies of hon. gentlemen all the way from the Minister of Railways down to the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). They all spoke in the most eulogistic terms of the members of that Company. They were men of reputation, men of standing, men of ability, and, above all, men of good character—splendid fellows they were. Who of the hon. members who were in this House in 1878, does not remember when the hon. Donald A. Smith rose in his seat and denounced these gentlemen for the Pacific Scandal? What did they think of him then? What did the Premier of the day say to him within the corridors of this House? Sir, I am sure you would say it would be unparliamentary if I should use that language now, but he threatened to thrash that man and send him to a very hot place that would scorch him. But to day he is a splendid fellow, a man of undoubted ability, and of good moral character. I did not know the word “coward” sent from one hon. member to another, was parliamentary, but in looking over the *Hansard* of 1878, I saw where the hon. Minister of Railways, called Mr. Smith a “coward! coward! coward!” three times in succession—without breathing, I have no doubt. Now, Sir, Mr. Smith expressed his opinion of these gentlemen. He stated upon one occasion, that they were a pack of liars, and they stated he was a liar; lying went back and forth between these gentlemen, and I have no doubt—I have no reason to know, Mr. Speaker—but Mr. Smith has the same opinion of these gentlemen to-day that he had then. But, Sir, he has his revenge. Time always brings its revenge, and the fine speeches made by these gentlemen, and the donations that are given him, though he was the worst man in creation a few years ago, now prove that he is a splendid fellow, and they stuff his pockets full of the poor people's money. But I forget the second syndicate. The head of that syndicate was Sir W. P. Howland, of the city of Toronto, a gentleman who these men denounced with the rest as being unworthy of consideration, not to be considered at all, to be thrown into the waste paper basket. “What do we want of anything of that sort? Throw him into the waste basket.” How did he stand in the estimation of the Premier at one time? Why, Sir, he was the recipient of favours from that gentleman. He sat on the Treasury benches and occupied the position of Finance Minister. He was the Finance Minister in whom the leader of the Government had the utmost confidence, and after Confederation he was the recipient of the honour of being appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario, but the office of Lieutenant-Governor has now dwindled down into that of a political hack. Then what did the hon. gentleman from Cardwell (Mr. White) think of Mr. Smith? Will he refer to his paper? Will he refer to that sheet that sometimes tells the truth and sometimes don't? Sometimes it vilifies when it is right to do so, and sometimes when it has no right to do so. But on this occasion it vilified Mr. Smith, and when the hon. Mr. Smith went to his office, and met him face to face, he had not the manliness, nor the boldness, to say that he would stand by his article. The only excuse he made was: “The exigencies of party sometimes require a man to say what is not strictly correct.” Now, the hon. gentleman has a good deal of political expediency; there is no doubt of it; I am aware of it; would he like me to read the record? I would not like to take up the time of the House by reading so much trash, such trash as is every day to be found in that newspaper. After the rejection of the second syndicate, and the formation of the first Syndicate, and the establishment of the Company under an Act of Parliament, we find, within the short space of three years, these men coming back, these men possessed of all that wealth which was asserted, with

Mr. Cook.

all that ability and all that astonishing reputation which hon. gentlemen opposite gave them. And why? They ask for \$30,000,000 more. What does that mean? I have in my hand a newspaper published in the city of Montreal, a newspaper which almost entirely, I believe entirely, supports the Conservative party. It is a Roman Catholic paper published in the interests of the Roman Catholic people of that city, but it is a Conservative paper. In an article we find these words. Referring to the Syndicate it says: “The Dominion never should entrust those men with the public funds for the purpose of wrecking and squandering recklessly, and buying lands in which Ministers are interested.” What does that mean? That refers to the Cabinet—one or more members. If that is a falsehood and a slander on their characters they should take legal proceedings against the paper. If that article is not true they should vindicate themselves, they should take legal proceedings against the newspaper, as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did, when a paper in Lambton vilified him. He took legal proceedings against that paper and punished it. It is a serious charge, it matters not where it comes from, and there are many people besides the editor of the *Post* who have opinions of that kind. I am afraid a good many of the outside world have opinions of that sort. I should be sorry to think so myself, because I could not believe that men occupying such important and responsible positions as members occupying seats on the Treasury benches, would stoop to such acts. Whatever they might have attempted before Confederation, now that we have come together, they should rise above anything of that kind. We should have no scandals either among members on the Treasury benches or in the House. It will be different from that some day. The atmosphere will be purified; if we have to wait for three more years, then I have no doubt it will. Hon. gentlemen are rushing this thing through at a rate which is unwarranted and indecent. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have offered Resolutions. Nobody knew anything about those Resolutions until the House met. We had not an opportunity of discussing them in our constituencies. If we had known it a year ago, when we had an election, we might have discussed it and got a verdict from the people. What did hon. gentlemen say before they dissolved the House? They dissolved the House a year before their time. Why did they do it? Because Americans offered to bring in \$2,000,000 of capital, and they wanted to see the National Policy established for another five years. I have not seen the \$2,000,000, and hon. gentlemen opposite have not seen them; but millions on millions have gone out of this country, and out of the Treasury of this Government to the Syndicate and to the United States. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt hon. gentlemen would like to make it short, but I can tell hon. gentlemen that the members on this side of the House have no desire to make it short. They want to have an investigation. They want to know exactly what it is necessary to have the money expended on. They want to know how the money will be expended. Hon. gentlemen may sit in the front seats and may shut their eyes, and they think we will shut our eyes and go it blind. We never go it blind. No, Mr. Speaker, we have two statements by the President of the Company. The President appears to be a political writer. He is constantly writing letters and is always putting his foot in it. He wrote a statement last year. He said it would cost so much to build the road. He made another statement this year; there is a difference of a \$24,000,000 between the two. That does not amount to anything; oh, no. The people of the country are beginning to think, as my friend who preceded me said, there is a nigger in the fence. They begin to think there is something wrong. I ask any gentleman on the Treasury benches, and some of them know something about business, though not a great deal—I will ask some members behind,

who, I think, know a good deal more about business—I will ask them. I ask business men, if you have a man who takes a contract for any purpose, and when the contract is about half completed and he has done the easiest part of it, and he comes back and wants double the money he asked for it, would you quietly give him the other amount he asked for without investigating his books?

An hon. MEMBER. We would if the man gave security.

Mr. COOK. Security! I imagine the Minister of Railways thinks the people of the country are fools. They have drawn the wool over the eyes of the people on one or two occasions, but the people are getting alive to the actions of those hon. gentlemen. They are getting alive to the means which hon. gentlemen adopt to carry a constituency, and they cannot do it again. But what would you do? Any man, unless he were a fool, would investigate that man's books and look into the contractor's affairs thoroughly; would scan them, and if he did not carry on the contract as he thought he should, he would send him adrift. Now, in my humble opinion, the quicker these men are sent, the better for the country. They will get \$30,000,000, but they will not run the road as it has been intended to be run. What reasons have we to know they will do it? Everybody who has any sense at all, any knowledge of the road or the country it traverses, knows it will not pay for a number of years. It will tax the resources, not only of the Company, but probably of the Government, to pay the deficits which will constantly be made from year to year from the running of that railway. I do not believe, as some hon. gentlemen believe, that this railway is going to pay right from the word go. The Grand Trunk was built through a well-settled country, drawing trade from the towns and cities, from Quebec and Windsor and Sarnia and Point Edward, until now it goes to Chicago. But up to that time what money had they made for the shareholders? Not a cent; they never will. I am told my hon. friend who is interrupting me does not deal much in water or much in whiskey. Perhaps the reason is that hens never take to water. They are always in the barnyard. Now, Sir, I say this Company is an incapable Company. I say it with a knowledge of what I am saying, and I say it is extravagant. I say the management of it is something such as never was known in the country. It has been stated on many an occasion that they never knew what they wanted until they required it, and then it cost them double what it would cost if properly looked into. Now we have all these manufactures in the country to build everything required for the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have built a Chinese wall about Canada, so that we can live within ourselves. Now how much do these men bring from the United States? I was told by a good Conservative last night, within these walls, that at least two thirds—and he was almost sure three-fourths—of the engines and rolling stock of that road have been brought from the United States. My hon. friend from Grey, who spoke this evening, said, what would be the effect on the provisions of this country. Why, Sir, they bring almost all their supplies from the United States. The hon. gentleman has not a great deal to boast of, because his county could not furnish enough to supply themselves. They had a great deal of frost in his county, and not much wheat to spare.

Mr. SPROULE. I have only to tell the hon. gentleman that it is the highest county in Ontario to-day, for wheat, by the last Provincial exhibition.

Mr. COOK. Had they any frozen wheat there?

Mr. SPROULE. They had frozen wheat all over the country.

Mr. COOK. We had none in Simcoe, for we keep it hot there, and we never have anything of that sort. But, Sir, we were not to have any more frosts, or beetles, or potato

bugs, or midge—they were all to be exterminated by the National Policy. Still, the hon. gentleman confesses that he had frost in his county. Why does he not apply to the leader of the Government for exemptions from such evils. And when I travel through that country I shall endeavour to make these people know that he did not apply to the leader of the Government to stay the frost and preserve the wheat. This Company built a road to Algoma Mills. I know that country as well as I know these legislative halls. I know whereof I speak, and I can assure my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways, that if he will go up there and select the most unlikely place for a harbour on the north shore of Lake Huron, he would take Algoma Mills, as I have been told by a party who understands the question, that it will cost \$1,000,000. If they had stopped 20 miles east of that they would have found the finest harbour in the world, one which would take in all those large vessels. But they would not stop there, and why? God knows, for I do not. They went on up across the Spanish River, which is a wide river, and it would cost a good deal to build a bridge there. They went 8 miles beyond, and they stopped very suddenly, and why? Well I suppose it is within the recollection of the House that the Grand Trunk Railway diverted their line to go to Point Edward to suit a political friend of the Government. I say, that a political friend of the Government, and a member of this House, owned property at Algoma which that member has sold, I am told, for an enormous sum of money.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. COOK. You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours. I say if the scandals of this syndicate with the Government could be unearthed, I do believe, and the people believe, that it would be a greater scandal than the scandal in 1872, in which these gentlemen were driven from power so ignominiously. I say if what is in my mind could be unearthed, it would astound the people of this country, but the day is coming when it will come out, for iniquity is bound to be punished, and sometimes it is punished on this earth. I say this Company have spent half a million dollars more than they should have spent going to Algoma Mills, and people believe that it was done to reward a friend of the Government. What else do we find? Immediately after the defeat in 1873, when those men were driven from power, when they had not a corporal's guard behind them, when they squirmed before the people, they went back to the city of Toronto and they erected a building. It was not a Solomon's Temple, but a den of iniquity. It proved to be so, and in it some of the young men of the city of Toronto cultivated habits which made them ready for the penitentiary by frequenting that establishment. It was stated there, and I do not know but the utterances were made from the pulpits of Toronto, that even on the Sabbath day, gambling in all its iniquity was practised in that institution—the U. E. Club. I say they have no right to call it a U. E. Club, for it was not a U. E. Loyalist institution—it was just the contrary. It was a united pack of political bandits. Why, Sir, it is reported that that building was sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for offices in the city of Toronto. There are plenty of buildings to be got in the city of Toronto, and large establishments too, which would suit as well and probably better than that, for less money. But there has been a good deal to do with this U. E. Club. It has been in the courts; it was necessary that something should be done; and they got it off their hands. It is said that it has been sold to the Syndicate. I do not know; I will let the Syndicate answer that for themselves. I know that when I was in Toronto a short time ago, and was passing the building, I was told that they were cleaning it up, and it would soon be occupied by these gentlemen. Now, there was a great deal said about loaning money to the Grand Trunk. The people of Canada did loan money to the Grand

Trunk; it was said that it was to be a loan; but it stands to-day as an asset. Why should it stand as an asset? I know it from the lips of a Privy Councillor himself that it was discussed time and time again that this loan should be wiped out, but it was decided by the Government to keep it there. They knew that they could never recover it, and the Grand Trunk Company came here year after year and asked Parliament to place it back, so that they could put another loan ahead of it, and they have got it back so far in their books that it may be regarded as lost altogether. The Grand Trunk was looked on by this country as a very extravagantly built road, and the management as well. But what do we find? Taking the managers and the engineers and the whole staff together, the cost of management only amounted to about \$30,000 a year. What does the cost of management of this Syndicate amount to? About \$255,000 a year. The Grand Trunk was a road of 1,000 miles in length. This road is longer, but it is not all being built at once. We find that it has been admitted by the General Manager himself, or by his friends, that he received \$50,000 a year. Why, Sir, we find the President of that road in receipt of a salary. It is said that Mr. Stephen gets \$50,000 a year, Mr. Angus \$40,000 and Mr. McIntyre \$40,000 a year. I am not saying how true these statements are, but if they are not true they ought to be contradicted. Now, Sir, it has been said by hon. gentlemen that there is no exodus from this country. There was an exodus in Mr. Mackenzie's time—he was a great reprobate, driving the people out of the country—there was an exodus then. Well, I happen to know something of this matter from practical observation. I had an ocular demonstration of it. I was in Michigan last summer, and I found the whole country settled by Canadians, all of whom went there since the D. M. & M. railway was built. When I was there, I felt like putting myself up for election; and I know they would have voted for me, because they knew that these gentlemen had driven them out of the country. There were not only Reformers there, but Tories too, who would have voted for me if it had been possible to send me back to Canada as their representative. I do not wish to descend to the stories and the reports that are going in reference to these great railway kings—these men who have so much money that they could build the road without the aid of the Government, if necessary—these gentlemen who would and could complete the road—who said this would be the last time of asking, just as on a particular occasion, when the leader of the Government telegraphed to Toronto for another \$10,000—give us \$25,000,000 and 25,000,000 of land, and we will ask no more. Well, after the short space of three years, they are here again. Well, I suppose the Government thought that if they did not give it to them, they might be in the same position as the conductor was at Buffalo. The conductor was caught in the act of pilfering money, and the superintendent threatened to dismiss him. "Why," said the conductor, "if you dismiss me—do you see that house up there on the hill?—You will have to build such a house as that for my successor." Did the Government have in their minds that they would have to build another palace in the city of Montreal for another President? I do not want to descend to that, but such is the talk there. When I was in Montreal a few days ago, I had a conversation with a gentleman who was a Tory, and who said, "I thank the Lord they did not ask for \$50,000,000 because they would have got it just as quickly as \$30,000,000." And I believe they would, because I do not believe the Minister of Railways knows anything about the affairs of this road—how can he? He was away in England last year; but he sends his engineer down to inquire into them, and he has got the authority of his engineer. Of course the engineers report just as they are told. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would do such a thing as that—oh, no—he would not. ask

Mr. COOK.

his engineer to report unfavourably—oh, no. Now, I want to say a little about those steel vessels, we hear so much of; and really to the country it is a steal. Sir, these vessels, when completed, I suppose will cost the country \$600,000. They can float on Lake Superior, but there are very few harbours that they can go into; they draw too much water. There was a mistake made in their build. They are too long for the Welland Canal. Why these gentlemen are making blunders all the time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. COOK. Well, the gentleman who has got his hair parted in the middle and wears a black moustaché had better keep his mouth shut. It is sometimes said that the parting of a man's hair shows what is under the skull. Now, I was talking about these steamboats. They have got the steamboats and they have no use for them unless they go to other harbours, and they are now abandoning Algoma Harbour and are going over to Owen Sound; they are building elevators there; they had started to build wharves, docks, elevators, immigrant sheds, and even hotels at Algoma. But when they got part of their material there for the construction of all these buildings, they changed their minds and of course a very heavy loss occurred. It has been stated there was a very large number of men waiting for the work of construction and they had to wait for months under pay. This is a matter we have a right to deal with. These gentlemen are using the money of the people in a manner not at all calculated to advance the interests of the people, and it is our duty to denounce their conduct, and the man who does not is not worthy of a seat in this House. I believe there was a deputation from Owen Sound to the Government, and a large amount of money is to be given to deepen the harbour there for the Canadian Pacific Railway. No doubt it is right to change from Algoma to this other place, but they commenced the construction there, and should have finished the work. If they wanted these steamers, what did they want of a railway? Did they suppose the people were going to travel through that country in the winter, over that road? No man is a fool; he would endanger his life by it, and I guarantee that neither the First Minister nor the Minister of Railways will go over that road in the winter time. They may take a pleasure trip in the summer and do some shooting and catch some trout, but they will not go in the winter time. A man would be safer on snowshoes if he knew how to wear them, because he does not know where he would stick, and the road will run through a country not fit for settlement; and when I say that I am not decrying the North-West lands, for those lands belong to Ontario, and the members for that Province know that what I say is true, and I know something about that country. I say it is impossible for it to be settled. They will have a railway running in the summer and not in the winter. In the winter there is nothing to carry, and in the summer the steamboats will be running as well. Is not that a steal all around? Certainly it is. We have the opinion of eminent men on that subject. If I mistake not, we have the opinion of Mr. Sandford Fleming, a gentleman to whom the Minister of Railways referred as one whose word and opinion were unequalled. I agree with the hon. Minister of Railways. I think as much of Sandford Fleming's reports as of any other man's in the Dominion. He made a report of which we all know. The thing is absurd that they should build a great railway through that country. The starting of this road in 1873 was a sad affair in the history of this country. It was a sad affair to the Tory party. But could it be possible that Mr. Stephen, in going home and launching his Canadian Pacific Railway on the money market—could it be possible that the people in that country who had money to invest, and large quantities of it, referred back in their mind to the iniquity perpetrated which this

brought to their recollection—the iniquity perpetrated by the leader of this Government in 1872, recalled to them by the very name of the railway project and that of the Pacific Railway Scandal. If the Government will not dissolve Parliament, and go back and ask their masters for the privilege of expending \$3,000,000 more of their money, they could, at least, give their supporters in the House an opportunity of investigating this matter. But, when an amendment was offered, asking for a Committee of investigation, to be formed of members of this House, who are capable of investigating matters of this kind, we are told: You are impudent, you are insolent; how dare you? What do you mean? Why, you would think these gentlemen were the potentates of this country; you would think the First Minister was king of this country. The old family compact was nothing to this. It was an improvement on the present management of this Government. They have not improved upon it. They have retrograding; they have gone back; they will allow no inquiries. Of course we understand that is the Tory principle. We know they do things only when they are forced, and that they will do anything to retain the reins of government. They do not care for the interests of the country; what they want is power. Let me have a pliant Finance Minister that I can handle on the one hand, and a Railway Minister that I can handle on the other hand, and I can run this country. I do not care where—I can run it to the dogs. Let us have a chance of running this country with a railway king on the one side, and a finance king on the other side—he, the great potentate, greater than any Eastern potentate is running it, and the expenses of the management of this Government have more than doubled since Confederation, for it was only \$13,000,000 then, and to day it is \$29,000,000 or \$30,000,000. But what does this Government care about a few millions? They are going into higher figures; they have transcendent ideas. I will not detain the House longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. COOK. I will go on half an hour or an hour longer if you like. It makes no difference to me. I do not imagine that hon. gentlemen will think I have given them any new light. I do not think I have advanced many new ideas. There have been so many ideas given before, and I had not the opportunity of speaking earlier in the debate and giving figures. I have not gone into figures, but I have them here, and if hon. gentlemen want them I will give them. All the figures I have given is the difference in calculation made by the President of the Company of \$24,000,000. After that there should be an investigation. If gentlemen outside or inside this House have an idea that I, for a moment, entertain feelings of hostility to this Company, they are very much mistaken. I, Sir, do not feel hostile to this Company, because they have what they would term, in common parlance, a Yankee manager—I should call him a gentleman from the United States. I have no hostility because the manager of that road comes from the United States. I have no hostility to that Company, because their superintendent comes from the United States. I have no hostility to the Company, because the whole retinue of the officials under these gentlemen, almost the whole of them, come from the United States. Why, a letter which was read here from Winnipeg the other night stated that two-thirds of the employees on the road were from the United States, and I have no hostility to them on that account, or any other account. I say, if the second syndicate had got that contract, probably they would have got the best labour and the best management they could have got, even if they had to go to England for it, and I am sure these gentlemen would not object to that, because we know every time in the Local Legislature there is an appointment made in the

educational institutions in the Province of Ontario, the Tories [are always crying: "Why do you not take people from our own country?"] It makes all the difference in the world with these gentlemen whether they are in power or out of power. It is all right. I have a the *Hansard* report of the last day of the Legislature, the dying day of the Legislature, of 1878, on the 10th day, I think it was, of April—the discussion that took place that day. If the gentlemen are anxious to hear it, I will read it, but I have gone over it. The leader of the Government was not in his place at that time. If he had been, I would have read the statements that were made by the gentleman at that time, the beautiful and flourishing and rosy language made use of by that hon. gentleman on that occasion. I would have read the words he gave utterance to, and the gentleman sitting alongside of him gave utterance to, in reference to our friend, Mr. Donald A. Smith—their friend now, my friend then and now, my friend always, but their enemy then, and they are stuffing his pockets to-day. And they laugh. He says: "What a good thing I have got; I have got them by the throat now; they had me in a tight place once, but the time has come when I have got my revenge, and I have them in such a way that I can hold them by the throat with the right hand and stuff my pockets with the left, and when I get my left pocket full, I will get them by the throat with the left and stuff my pockets with the right." It is unfortunate, because it has to come out of the people of the country, and, as has been said by my hon. friend who just took his seat, that lawyers and doctors did not contribute to the revenue of the country, they were barnacles, I go further, and say that the Government are not contributing to the revenue; the Government of the day are barnacles; they are sapping the foundations of the people, and they are robbing the country in such a way that our children and our children's children will curse the name, when they look back on the history of this age and see how they mismanaged the affairs of this country, and trampled on the rights of its citizens.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Having the misfortune, Mr. Speaker—and it is a very great misfortune—to be one of the constituents of the gentleman who has last spoken, I desire to make only two remarks. The first is that the hon. gentleman said one true word when he said that time brings about its revenges. It has brought about this conclusion, at all events, that the gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches were justified, and more than justified, in refusing to give their confidence to a syndicate of which the hon. gentleman who made that speech was the champion and principal representative. The other remark I desire to make is, that another thing is quite evident that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is not in his place to-night, or that hon. gentleman would not have ventured to make a speech which the very reporters at the table must have blushed to place upon the pages of *Hansard*.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Allison (Lennox),	Fisher,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Paterson (Erant),
Auger,	Forbes,	Platt,
Béchar,	Geoffrion,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Gunn,	Robertson (Sheburne),
Bourassa,	Harley,	Scriver,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Scmerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	King,	Thompson,
Casey,	Kirk,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Vail,

Catudal,  
Charlton,  
Cockburn,  
Cook,  
Davies,  
De St. Georges,

Laurier,  
Lister,  
Livingstone,  
McCraney,  
McIntyre,  
McIsaac,

Watson,  
Weldon,  
Wheler,  
Wilson,  
Yeo.—62.

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Allison (Hants),  
Amyot,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Missisquoi),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Beaty,  
Bell,  
Belleau,  
Benoit,  
Benson,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Billy,  
Blondeau,  
Bolduc,  
Bossé,  
Bourbeau,  
Bowell,  
Brecken,  
Burnham,  
Burns,  
Cameron (Inverness),  
Cameron (Victoria),  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Chapleau,  
Cimon,  
Cochrane,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Coursol,  
Curran,  
Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers,  
Desjardins,  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,  
Dugas,  
Dundas,  
Dupont,  
Farrow,

Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),  
Ferguson (Welland),  
Fortin,  
Foster,  
Fréchette,  
Gagné,  
Gault,  
Gigault,  
Girouard,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guilbault,  
Guillet,  
Hackett,  
Haggart,  
Hall,  
Hawkins,  
Hay,  
Hesson,  
Hickey,  
Hilliard,  
Homer,  
Houde,  
Hurteau,  
Ives,  
Jamieson,  
Kaulbach,  
Kilvert,  
Kinney,  
Kranz,  
Labrosse,  
Landry (Kent),  
Landry (Montmagny),  
Langevin,  
Lesage,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
McDonald (Cape Breton),  
Mackintosh,  
Macmaster,  
Macmillan (Middlesex),  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McDougald,  
McGreevy,  
McLelan,

McNeill,  
Massue,  
Méthot,  
Mitchell,  
Moffat,  
Montplaisir,  
O'Brien,  
Orton,  
Quimet,  
Paint,  
Patterson (Essex),  
Pinsonneault,  
Pope,  
Reid,  
Riipel,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Robertson (Hastings),  
Ross,  
Royal,  
Rykert,  
Scott,  
Shakespeare,  
Small,  
Smyth,  
Sproule,  
Stairs,  
Sutherland (Selkirk),  
Tassé,  
Taylor,  
Temple,  
Tilley,  
Tupper (Pictou),  
Tyrwhitt,  
Valin,  
Vanasse,  
Wallace (Albert),  
Wallace (York),  
White (Cardwell),  
White (Hastings),  
Wigle,  
Williams,  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westmoreland),  
Woodworth,  
Wright.—137.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) has not voted.

Mr. ABBOTT. I should prefer not to vote on any question connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. With the permission of the House I desire to abstain.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the remark of the hon. member for Argenteuil, I desire to observe that if that hon. member has such an interest in this matter that he is not entitled to vote upon it, according to the Rule of Parliament, of course, he does not require our excuse. If not, our Rule is that any member who is in his seat, votes.

Mr. ABBOTT. I have not referred to the Rules of Parliament, and I do not know what interest I should possess in order to disqualify me from voting. I have not the Rule before me.

Mr. SPEAKER. Rule 16 reads as follows: "No member is entitled to vote upon any question upon which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and a vote of any member so interested will be disallowed."

Mr. ABBOTT. I beg to state, then, that I have no direct pecuniary interest in this question. But at the same time, I do not feel that I am in a position to vote impartially upon it, and I ask to be excused from voting.

Amendment (Mr. Vail) negatived on the following division:—

Mr. Cook.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,  
Allison (Lennox),  
Armstrong,  
Auger,  
Béchar, Geoffrion,  
Bernier,  
Blake,  
Bourassa,  
Burpee (Sunbury),  
Cameron (Huron),  
Cameron (Middlesex),  
Campbell (Renfrew),  
Cartwright,  
Casey,  
Cesgrain,  
Catudal,  
Charlton,  
Cockburn,  
Cook,  
Davies,  
De St. Georges.

Fairbank,  
Fisher,  
Fleming,  
Forbes,  
Geoffrion,  
Gillmor,  
Gunn,  
Harley,  
Holton,  
Houde,  
Innes,  
Irvine,  
Jackson,  
King,  
Kirk,  
Landerkin,  
Laurier,  
Lister,  
Livingstone,  
McCraney,  
McIntyre,

McIsaac,  
McMullen,  
Mulock,  
Paterson (Brant),  
Platt,  
Ray,  
Rinfret,  
Robertson (Shelburne),  
Scriver,  
Somerville (Brant),  
Somerville (Bruce),  
Springer,  
Sutherland (Oxford),  
Thompson,  
Trow,  
Vail,  
Watson,  
Weldon,  
Wheler,  
Wilson,  
Yeo.—63.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),  
Amyot,  
Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Missisquoi),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Beaty,  
Bell,  
Belleau,  
Benoit,  
Benson,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Billy,  
Blondeau,  
Bolduc,  
Bossé,  
Bourbeau,  
Bowell,  
Brecken,  
Burnham,  
Burns,  
Cameron (Inverness),  
Cameron (Victoria),  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Chapleau,  
Cimon,  
Cochrane,  
Colby,  
Costigan,  
Coughlin,  
Coursol,  
Curran,  
Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers,  
Desjardins,  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,  
Dugas,  
Dundas,  
Dupont,  
Farrow,

Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),  
Ferguson (Welland),  
Fortin,  
Foster,  
Fréchette,  
Gagné,  
Gault,  
Gigault,  
Girouard,  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Guilbault,  
Guillet,  
Hackett,  
Haggart,  
Hall,  
Hawkins,  
Hay,  
Hesson,  
Hickey,  
Hilliard,  
Homer,  
Hurteau,  
Ives,  
Jamieson,  
Kaulbach,  
Kilvert,  
Kinney,  
Kranz,  
Labrosse,  
Landry (Kent),  
Landry (Montmagny),  
Langevin,  
Lesage,  
Macdonald (King's),  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
McDonald (Cape Breton),  
Mackintosh,  
Macmaster,  
Macmillan (Middlesex),  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCallum,  
McDougald,  
McGreevy,  
McLelan,

McNeil,  
Massue,  
Méthot,  
Mitchell,  
Moffat,  
Montplaisir,  
O'Brien,  
Orton,  
Quimet,  
Paint,  
Patterson (Essex),  
Pinsonneault,  
Pope,  
Reid,  
Riipel,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Robertson (Hastings),  
Ross,  
Royal,  
Rykert,  
Scott,  
Shakespeare,  
Small,  
Smyth,  
Sproule,  
Stairs,  
Sutherland (Selkirk),  
Tassé,  
Taylor,  
Temple,  
Tilley,  
Tupper (Pictou),  
Tyrwhitt,  
Valin,  
Vanasse,  
Wallace (Albert),  
Wallace (York),  
White (Cardwell),  
White (Hastings),  
Wigle,  
Williams,  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westmoreland),  
Woodworth,  
Wright.—136.

Main motion agreed to on same division reversed; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On Resolution 2.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not possible, in the absence of information for which returns have been accorded by the House, to get an idea of the estimated cost of the various sections and of the various divisions with reference to the heavy and the light work. I merely state the fact that the materials for an intelligent discussion have not been provided by the Government.

On Resolution 4.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to know what information the Government has as to the amount of the floating debt of the Company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman. The amount is as stated here.

Mr. BLAKE. It says, "to such an amount not exceeding \$7,500,000."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as I can ascertain, that is the amount stated by the Company. My hon. friend will see that we do not provide for paying any specific sum.

Mr. BLAKE. The information of the Government is that the floating debt is about \$7,500,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I made an observation in the former discussion, with the best ascertainment we could have of the figures, that the floating debt would include the amount of the borrowing of the \$10,000,000 of stock. I could not place that asset, the \$4,950,000 which was obtained by the temporary borrowing of \$10,000,000 of stock, unless it was placed amongst the floating debt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the floating debt is outside the loan of \$4,950,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. member speak positively on that subject?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I can.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the debt of the Company is \$12,500,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not exactly, because the \$10,000,000 of stock, of course, is pledged for the amount of that loan.

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite aware there is a security for that, and there may be security for the \$7,500,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is very much the same as the sale for that amount.

Mr. BLAKE. But if it is, as stated, a debt of \$12,500,000, although the \$7,500,000 is floated, the \$4,950,000 is secured by a temporary pledge of the stock?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, that is as I understand it.

On Resolution 5.

Mr. BLAKE. I would desire to learn from the hon. Minister of Railways whether the language that is used in this Resolution is intended to embrace the interest of the Company in its leased lines.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is not intended to charge the interest of the Company in the leased lines with the security?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman considered the peculiar position that the Government would occupy in the event, which he seems to contemplate with some complacency, of the Government becoming proprietors of the Canadian Pacific Railway under these circumstances?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I look on that as a remote contingency.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman give us any information as to what the obligations of the Company are in reference to their leased lines?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend will see that in the event of the lines becoming, under these Resolu-

tions, the property of the Government, we will not be at all responsible for any engagements they have made in respect of leased lines. It is the property described that becomes ours, not the obligations.

Mr. BLAKE. That would depend entirely on the terms of the agreements and papers in the hands of the hon. gentleman, and which have not been submitted to the House. We have before us a private Bill for the ratification of certain agreements connected with the leasing of the lines, and for all I know those agreements may make us responsible for the rentals of the lines. I do not know what relation the obligations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have to other property in that remote contingency occurring.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will take a note of that point, and at a later stage I will give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. BLAKE. There is another point. Is it intended to take security upon, or in any way to appropriate in respect of this line, the \$10,000,000 of stock to which reference has been made as being temporarily pledged for \$4,950,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. That is intended to be left at the sole control of the Company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I understood the Minister rightly to-day, he stated in his speech that it was contemplated that certain bonds should be issued for the purpose of constructing branch lines. Now, if I understand the terms of the Resolutions rightly, all these branch lines would become part of the security pledged to the Government. In that case, we should not provide to allow bonds to be issued, I imagine, on those branch lines, or at all events the Company should not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I said was this: That if they were allowed to issue bonds on the portions of the branches constructed for the specific purpose of extending those branches, it would not in any way interfere, because in case of the trunk line and branches becoming the property of the Government, we should have the property created by the bonds issued on the existing branches. We should have the extensions that would be created by the money raised from the bonds issued upon the existing road, as the hon. gentleman will see.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the Company would not issue under this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But I said that would require to be provided by legislation.

Mr. BLAKE. It is proposed to authorize the Company to create a charge upon the branches already constructed, upon the Algoma Mills branch for instance, and other branches in the North-West which now exist and will be built with this money.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I meant to speak in general terms as to the mode by which it would be practicable to provide for the extension of those branch lines, the effect of which, if sanctioned by Parliament, would be to put the money raised on branch lines for extensions, and this would accomplish the object of providing the means for extending the branch lines, and at the same time, in case of the property reverting to the Government, they would have all the property of the private Company.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman stated, with great distinctness, that if the bonds were issued upon existing branch lines for the purpose of extending the branch lines, and if we had to take the line, we would have the property. I want to know whether that is an accurate statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is proposed to authorize the Company to bond lines which cost \$10,700 a mile for \$12,000 per mile?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. That is what the private Bill is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are not responsible for the private Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman speaks pretty much as if he were responsible.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It requires to go through the Railway Committee, and the Government will have an opportunity of reviewing it there.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the present proposal. I say once again, what residuum of value there will be on the North-West branches when, after costing \$10,700 per mile, they may be charged with \$12,000 per mile, I leave the hon. gentleman to decide. But it seems a rather serious statement with respect to the security and the statement which the hon. gentleman made in the former part of this discussion, as to what security the Government was going to obtain, that the existing branches should be subject to be charged at the will of the Company with so large a sum of money. It is quite clear they are to be charged with the amount for which they would practically be saleable; and the observations which the hon. gentleman has made as to the character of the security, the Algoma Mills branch and the North-West branches, amounting to between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000, is most materially altered by his present statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not in the slightest degree. I will assume that there is a branch of 100 miles, and that money is raised from bonds on that branch, every dollar of which is to go into an extension line. You have the same valuable property remaining then, as now, with this difference: you have the railway facilities given by the extension of the branch, you have the country opened up, the traffic brought to the main line of the road, and that without the slightest deterioration in the value of the existing property as a security.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has any provision been made to guard against issuing bonds at a depreciated value; against issuing bonds at very much more than their face value, and encumbering the road with a debt that will swamp both the original branch and the amount created by the issuing of the bonds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All that will be provided for. I have said that legislation will be required and that legislation will secure that every dollar paid upon existing branches is expended in actual value on the construction of whatever amount of work can be constructed for the money raised.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is hardly an answer to my question, which is whether there will be a provision to guard against the issuing of bonds at depreciated value?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly.

On Resolution 9.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a very general statement giving power to the Government to permit the application of the \$35,000,000 of stock either to the improvement or extension of the railway or to its equipment, or to the repayment of the indebtedness of the Company to the Government. Would the hon. gentleman give some little better definition as to the character of either the extension or improvement to which it is intended to apply this money? Is it the im-

Mr. BLAKE.

provements to the main line or to extensions authorized by charter, or what is to be the nature of the control which the Government will exercise over those funds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, it is pretty distinctly covered by the statement which is contained in the Resolution. It says it shall be for the improvement or extension of the railway, its equipment or the redemption of the indebtedness of the Company.

On Resolution 10.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman made allusion, in the course of the prior debates, to some point, as I understood him, which rather escaped him formerly, with reference to some greater power to be given the Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will be embraced in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. What will it be?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The power of issuing land grant bonds, under certain restrictions, for the payment of the debts of the Company.

Mr. BLAKE. Further land grant bonds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To extinguish them and put on new land grant bonds, the amount going towards extinguishing the debt.

Mr. BLAKE. To what amount?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That necessarily cannot be stated. It will be to an amount which is approved by the Government, and will be the extent of so much per acre.

Mr. BLAKE. How much per acre?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know that that is positively settled.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought these things were all arranged.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

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

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. OUIMET. Before the House adjourns, Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention, and the attention of this hon. House, to an article which appears in the *Toronto Mail* of this morning, and which I consider an insult to myself, and other representatives of the Province of Quebec, who generally act with me. The article is entitled, "A base but unsuccessful conspiracy." I will read a few lines which will give an idea of the article:

"One of the basest attempts at wholesale bribery in the annals of Parliamentary Government has just been unsuccessfully practised at Ottawa by hon. Edward Blake, which appears to have been no less than the purchase of the whole of the Conservative following from the Province of Quebec. It is no secret that the Government of that Province is in financial straits, and that representatives of that Government have been for several days at the Dominion Capital for the purpose of endeavouring to secure 'better terms' from the Dominion Government. The demands of these gentlemen were not recognized by Sir John Macdonald, and this fact becoming known to Mr. Blake, that gentleman, prompted by some diabolical agency, made corrupt overtures to the supporters of the Dominion Government from that Province, with a view to securing their opposition to the scheme for assisting the Pacific Railway Company, and the consequent defeat of Sir John's Government. The Quebec members met and considered the overtures, but notwithstanding the fact that the Premier did not interfere with their consultations, to their credit be it said, they spurned the bribe, and remained true to their allegiances. One member of the Government, it appears, succumbed in a moment of weakness, and believing, no doubt, that the Government would fall, sent in his resignation. This was hon. John Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue. His place will be easily filled by a more worthy man."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair to myself and those members from the Province of Quebec, who have acted with me from the beginning of this Session, and who, I hope,

will act with me in the support of this Conservative Government, to say that it is entirely false that we ever had any opportunity of meeting to consider an overture of the hon. Mr. Blake. I suppose the paper means the hon. leader of the Opposition; and I suppose that the hon. leader of the Opposition—if, as I supposed, that is the hon. member specified—must have more respect for us than to think he would be justified in offering us a bribe of any kind. And it is fair to add, even if we had any overture of that kind, that the representatives of the Province of Quebec would consider it their duty not to meet or consider any bribe of that kind. In acting as we have, I may add—for some of our actions have looked strange to some members of the House—that we have acted in a constitutional way, making to the Government what we considered fair representations, as loyal supporters of, I would say, a just Government. We made our representations thinking they were good, and we insisted on them, and we shall ever insist on them as long as we think they are good. And we will never receive, nor shall we consider any attempts of that kind as a bribe for our support, or for changing our allegiance to our party or to the duty we owe to our country and to our Province. I think it is also fair to the hon. leader of the Opposition to say, that never any offer of that kind was made. I never expected to be treated either by the Government, or by the Opposition, as if we could be tempted by such a base bribe. I will say, Mr. Speaker, before I resume my seat, that I consider any attempt of that kind from the press, of what ever party—I consider any attempt of that kind, of intimidating members of this House, or of either side of this House, as an attempt to blackmail, and nothing else. I regret sincerely that the name of an hon. Minister whom I respect as one of my best personal friends I have in this House, and one of the best friends the representatives of the Province of Quebec have in this House, and have had since 1867—I regret that his name should have been mixed up in this matter. And I must say that the hon. Minister has never, to my knowledge, or to the knowledge of any of my friends, come near us either to seek to know what we were doing or what we were attempting to do. And I must say, that this last part of the article deserves an equal reprobation from the members on both sides of the House.

Mr. SCRIVER. I must regret that while the hon. gentleman was calling the attention of the House to the article of the *Mail*, he did not at the same time call its attention to the same statement which was made in the correspondence of the *Montreal Gazette*, and extend to the statement in that paper an equally emphatic contradiction to that which he has given to the statement in the *Toronto paper*.

Mr. BLAKE. As the House knows very well, it is not my custom to notice newspaper attacks; and on this occasion I would not have made an exception of that custom; but as my hon. friend has spoken on this subject as became him, I think I may in one word thank him for the language he has used. He and those with whom he acts have been opponents of mine for a great many years. We have not learned to agree with one another in opinion, but I trust that we have learned mutually to respect one another, and I should regard it as entirely beneath the sense of honour which ought to belong to any member of this House to suppose for one moment that he would be open to such overtures or suggestions as the article which my hon. friend has just read, speaks of having been made; and if I had thought that the hon. member and his compatriots had fallen so low as to be capable of being so approached, I should have had too much regard for my own honour to meddle in such a way with such persons. So, on both sides, it is entirely impossible that this could have happened. It is true, as the organ has said, there has been a base but unsuccessful conspiracy

—and, as the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) says, it has now extended to the *Montreal Gazette*—to confound in a common dishonour the humble individual who now addresses you and the Conservative members from the Province of Quebec.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall only say, in addition to what has been already said in this matter, that I can, of course, vouch, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that there has been no unconstitutional or improper pressure brought upon the Government by those gentlemen who have been alluded to from the Province of Quebec. Some of them, in the exercise of their privileges, and I have no doubt, to other members of the Government, and their duties, have stated to me, certain matters which they thought, as representatives from Quebec, they ought to press upon the Government; but that there was anything like a bargain or improper suggestion, anything like force, moral or immoral, is directly untrue and erroneous. I will also say, in reference to my colleague, who was alluded to in that article, that his conduct is unexceptional in every possible way. He is now my colleague, Sir, and I hope will long remain so. And I would say, Sir, as his offer of his resignation has been alluded to in the press, it has been from personal motives altogether, not in the most remote degree connected with the Resolutions before the House. I regretted very much that he did so, and almost refused to present his proffer of his resignation to the Governor-General; and after explanations between him and myself, he has withdrawn his resignation and he stands a member of the Government as he has done ever since he has joined it.

Motion agreed to; and (at 3:15 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 21st February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 96) to amend the Law of Evidence in Criminal cases.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 97) to amend the Criminal Law, and to declare it a misdemeanor to leave unguarded and exposed holes, openings, &c., cut in the ice on any navigable or frequented water.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 98) to amend the law with reference to procedure in criminal cases and the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions in relation to persons charged with indictable offences.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 99) to consolidate and amend the Acts for the more speedy trial of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanors in the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

### MR. SMITH'S SERVICES IN THE MILITIA DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) enquired, Whether H. Smith, of Cobourg, was in the employment of the Militia Department at any time between the 1st of July, 1883, and the 1st of January, 1884; if so, in what capacity; if in more than one capacity, the nature of his employment in each capacity, and the length of time, and his salary or emoluments in each?

Mr. CARON. The services of Major H. Smith, are as follows:— He was appointed Lieutenant of the Cobourg Rifle Company, on the 16th March, 1866; Adjutant of the 40th Battalion on the 5th of October, 1866; Brigade-Major in District No. 3, from the 12th January, 1872, to the 1st of May, 1876, at a salary of \$800, with \$8 efficient company allowance. He was reappointed Adjutant of the 40th Battalion on the 11th August, 1882; with pay of \$3 per day and allowances of rations and lodging. He was attached to a regular regiment at Halifax for three months prior to his appointment as Captain in the Infantry School Corps. He is stationed at Toronto.

#### ASSUMPTION OF WHARVES AND PIERS BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. DAVIES, in the absence of Mr. KING, enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to take over all or any of the wharves and piers of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and to refund to the Local Governments of these Provinces the moneys laid out by them on these wharves or piers since Confederation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has come to no decision in this matter.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, What is the Government Engineer's estimate of the cost of construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops? What is the estimated distance? What is the estimated cost of equipment?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Chief Engineer's estimate of the cost of construction from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, is \$12,000,000; rolling stock \$800,000, making altogether \$12,800,000, which provides also for rolling stock sufficient for the line from the crest of the Rocky Mountains to Port Moody.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, What is the Government Engineer's estimate of the cost of construction of the remainder of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the Lake Superior and Nipissing divisions? What is the estimated cost of constructing the heavy section of from 95 to 100 miles? What is the estimated cost of equipment?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Chief Engineer's estimate of the cost of construction on the Canadian Pacific Railway on the Lake Superior and Nipissing divisions, 450 miles, including all the work done hitherto, is \$16,300,000, rolling stock, \$900,000, making together \$17,200,000. The Chief Engineer's estimate of the cost of constructing the heavy section of the road, from 5 to 100 miles, is \$7,400,000.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will notice that I asked specially for the cost of the remainder of the Lake Superior and Nipissing divisions, exclusive of that already constructed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will allow the question to stand, I will supplement my answer by that information to-morrow.

Mr. BLAKE. The question need not stand, but the hon. gentleman can let me have the present information and give the other to-morrow.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Is it the intention to run the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers next season from Owen Sound? If so, are they to touch regularly at Algoma Mills?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would say, that it is not yet quite determined from what point these steamers will run during the present season.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

#### LIQUOR LICENSE ACT OF 1883.

Mr. KIRK enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to provide for the salaries of Commissioners and other expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of the Liquor License Act of 1883, in districts where the License Fund will be insufficient to meet the same?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That matter is under the consideration of the Government, and a measure will be brought down on the subject.

#### CARRYING DANGEROUS WEAPONS.

Mr. McMULLEN enquired, Whether a Justice of the Peace is authorized to empound a pistol, carried on the person, in the event of committal under chapter 30, of 40th Victoria?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a question of law which I do not think the Government should be called upon to answer.

#### PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before calling the Orders of the Day, I wish to state that since the last sitting of the House, I have looked into the practice relative to members in the Chamber being called upon to vote, and I do not find any recorded instance of that kind since Confederation. Prior to that date, the practice seems to be well established, that a member who is in the Chamber can be called on to vote, and must vote unless he has a direct pecuniary interest in the question upon which the vote is taken, or unless he is excused from voting by the House, in which case a resolution should be proposed and recorded on the Minutes. I think in future, perhaps, it would be well that that rule should be adhered to.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it was well, Mr. Speaker, that you have made this announcement, and I have no doubt it is in accordance with parliamentary law. Of course there is one difficulty which arises from a strict observance of this rule, and one upon which we should have a clear understanding, and that is with reference to the question of pairs. In England, from which we obtain our parliamentary practice, any member who is in the Chamber at the time of voting cannot excuse himself by declaring that he has paired; consequently, the only mode in which a pair can be made available is by a member absenting himself from the Chamber. If we are to adopt the modification which practice has created on this subject, of course that is a question for the House to consider, and there is no doubt that it is only by our practice, and by objection not being taken, that the validity of an excuse for not voting by pairing has remained up to this time. I merely take this opportunity of saying that perhaps it would be as well to come to a clear understanding on the subject, else there might be some confusion when a member is called upon to vote, as it might be held that it would be no excuse for him to refrain from voting, that he had paired.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt the hon. gentleman has spoken correctly with regard to the practice in England, because pairing is recognized in England as well as here, but here a member is bound to absent himself if he has paired. I am not at all sure whether their practice is the better one. In the English Parliament the pairing goes on and the pairs are announced, as arranged by the whips, the next morning—that Mr. so and so, has paired with Mr. so and so. It occurs to me that if an hon. gentleman has paired, it is infinitely more satisfactory, if he be called upon to vote, that he should up and say that he had paired. I think it is a great deal better if a man has paired that he should state so from his place, so that his constituents may

know that though his vote does not appear in the division, he has not neglected his duty, because he has paired with a gentleman who has a different view on a particular question.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That has been our practice.

Mr. BLAKE. There is one respect in which the English practice is more satisfactory than ours, and that is, that when a member pairs there, the statement that he has paired includes also the fact as to what question, and what side of a question, he has paired for or against. You find that those particulars are stated, and you know therefore the mode in which the hon. gentleman would have voted. I remember an occasion on which the hon. gentleman paired with a late colleague of his, Sir George Cartier, and no one could find out which way he would have voted; and until the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) moved his Bill the other day, there always existed some doubt as to what were the sentiments of the hon. gentleman and those of his colleague, Sir George Cartier, on that question. Therefore, I would suggest this amendment—that when any hon. gentleman is called upon to vote and excuses himself on the ground that he has paired with an hon. gentleman, he should state the way in which he would have voted had he not paired.

Mr. SPEAKER. There might be some rule established from this time in this way—that when an hon. member declares that he has paired with another member, it shall be recorded in the Minutes that he has paired with some hon. member for or against the motion.

#### RETURNS.

Mr. PLATT. Before the Orders of the Day are taken up, I wish to enquire of the whereabouts of a certain return ordered in the early part of last Session, in reference to the carrying of mails in Prince Edward County. The Secretary of State's Report mentions this return as having been presented to the House under the heading, "Synopsis of returns presented to the House of Commons in 1883," and I have been unable to ascertain where it is. It is stated to have been presented to the House on May 22nd, before the close of last Session.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand from the Clerk that while that return is mentioned in the report of the Secretary of State, as having been presented, we have no record of its having been presented here.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand that the report is in error, and I will look into the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call attention to the returns that were laid on the Table in response to an Address of the House about four weeks ago with reference to the office of High Commissioner. I mentioned once or twice that it was my intention to invite the attention of the House to the position of the hon. Minister of Railways and of the High Commissioner, and I desired this information for the purpose of acquainting the House with the facts that were material to a discussion of the question; and I called the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that it was extremely inconvenient that there should be any delay in presenting the information demanded. The Address was moved and granted on the 25th of January. It took just four weeks to bring down the return, which consists of a portion of one page of paper, containing a copy of an Order in Council recommending the appointment of Sir Charles Tupper as the successor to Sir Alexander Galt, and that is all that is brought down. The Address, however, required copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, commissions, and instructions, touching the appointment of the present High Commissioner, touching the discharge of the

duties of the Minister of Railways during his absence in England as High Commissioner, and touching the discharge of the duties of the High Commissioner during his absence in Canada as Minister of Railways. The Order in Council orders that a commission shall issue, but no commission is brought down; there is no answer to that part of the Address at all. The only communication brought down is that in compliance with the request contained in an Address to the House of Commons, a copy of the Order in Council is transmitted. If there was nothing else to be brought down, I understand it to be the usual course and the only respectful course, that there should be a statement from the proper officer that there are no papers answering the demand of the Address. If there have been no commissions, no correspondence, no instructions, we ought to know it; we do not know it because there is no statement one way or the other; and this paper is manifestly an improper return. On the same day an Order of the House of Commons was passed, "for copies of all correspondence relating to any payments, claims or allowances on any account whatever in respect of the office of High Commissioner, not already brought down, and separate statements, in detail, with dates and sums of all payments made on any such accounts in respect of the office, during its tenure by Sir A. T. Galt, and by the present incumbent respectively, and an estimate, in detail, of all sums payable on any such accounts, up to this date, and yet unpaid; also for copies of correspondence as to the letting of a residence for the High Commissioner, and statement of the terms and of the sums payable for rent, taxes and other charges in respect of such residence and the date of the letting." The only answer to that return is a letter from the Auditor-General, enclosing two papers, one of which gives in some detail, though not with the dates that are material, some of the payments made during the tenure of the office by Sir A. T. Galt. The other paper gives a statement of the payments made during the tenure of the office by Sir Charles Tupper. It is this: "1883-84—removed expenses of Sir Charles Tupper, per account of the 21st September, 1883, \$636," without any date of the payment at all; "Bank of Montreal, London—credit cheque of High Commissioner, \$3,893 33," without any date of the payment, without the letter of credit, or any details of the payments which were made in respect of that cheque. There is no statement here at all, that I can find, of payments that I am informed were made during the tenure of office by Sir A. T. Galt by the Department of Agriculture and Immigration to that gentleman. I think that some of the reports indicated, and my information is that such payments were made. This Address asks for statements in detail, with dates of all payments, claims or allowances, on any account whatever, and there is no statement of this, although, unless I am grievously misinformed, such payments were made in respect to the Department of Immigration, and I presume from the general account we have received, as to the discharge of the duties by the present Minister, some such payments have been made during his incumbency of office as High Commissioner. There is nothing stated to show that there are any sums accruing, due, and yet unpaid, and if there are any, we want an account of them. The Address called also for copies of correspondence, and there is no answer to that. Perhaps there is no correspondence, but we want to know if there is. Inasmuch as the Order in Council appointing Sir Charles Tupper High Commissioner, declares that his travelling expenses will be paid in the same manner as those of Sir Alexander Galt, and inasmuch as it appears by the paper before me that during Sir Alexander Galt's incumbency, the gross sum for house rent, fuel, and other contingencies, was ordered to be paid by Order in Council, the payment of Sir Charles Tupper's expenses was, no doubt, ordered in the same way, and I think that paper should be brought down, as it will indicate the mode and principle on

which such payments were made. I trust we shall have full information at the earliest possible moment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The usual practice, when a return is moved for, is to send to the Department where the permanent officers prepare it, and it is then looked over by the Minister presenting it, to see that it satisfies the requirements of the House. In this case it is obvious the returns are altogether imperfect, and we will see that the full return is supplied.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the practice is to send all returns to the Secretary of State in the first place, and he is to see that they are all supplied.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The practice is certainly that all returns are sent by the officer of this House to the Secretary of State, who looks over them and sends them to the proper Department. Sometimes, as in this case, a return may require to go to more than one Department, and it is likely the hon. Secretary of State, or his officers, sent this to the Minister of Finance, and was not aware that the Department of Agriculture was in any way connected with it. Therefore, there was no demand made on that Department.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have just received a note saying that an hon. member of this House has called the attention of the Auditor-General to the fact that the returns of the details of expenditure were not complete, and the Auditor-General said he would have, as soon as possible, supplementary returns furnished and sent to the Department of the Secretary of State.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A return was asked for last year in the matter of timber licenses which appears not to have been brought down. Will the hon. First Minister take a note of this?

Mr. BLAKE. I find that a great portion of the delay which takes place in printing returns arises from the fact that they have been delayed after they were ready for presentation. I do not charge the Secretary of State with the delay because he may have delivered the return to the proper Minister, but a very considerable portion of the delay is caused after the returns are ready for presentation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At the opening of this Session the Department of the Secretary of State sent a circular to each of the public Departments, stating what reports had not been answered, and the returns, as received, were sent forthwith, with the exception of two or three papers that have been lying on my table from the beginning of this Pacific Railway question. None of those reports have been left standing in the Departments any one day.

Mr. DAVIES. I would ask when I may expect to get a return of the reports of the steamboat inspectors.

Mr. McLELAN. I will see that they are prepared and brought down.

#### FRAUD IN SALE OF PATENT RIGHTS.

Mr. MULOCK moved the third reading of Bill (No. 26) for the better prevention of fraud in connection with the sale of patent rights.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not object to the third reading of the Bill, although I agree to it with a good deal of hesitation. It has been strongly impressed upon me that the sale of these fraudulent patent has become a crying nuisance and is a case for special legislation. I regret very much that these frauds have been so extensive as to require special legislation.

Bill read the third time.

Mr. BLAKE.

#### RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. MULOCK, in moving the second reading of the Bill (No. 52) further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, said: the first clause of the Bill is as follows:—

"In any case where a railway is constructed across or along any public highway, on the level, it shall not be lawful for any railway company wilfully to permit any, or any portion of any engine, tender or car belonging to or then used by such company, to stand on any part of such highway for a longer period than two minutes at one time."

As I understand the position of railway companies at the present time, in respect to this mode of working their railways, they are entitled to construct and to maintain their lines upon the public highways, across and along them; along the highways, of course, with the sanction of the municipalities. They are entitled by their general powers to cross with their trains, and, so far as may be deemed necessary to obstruct the highways by allowing their trains to stop upon the crossings. It appears to me that railway companies have abused this power, and have, to a large extent, come to a conclusion that they can utilize the public highways as long as they may deem it necessary to have their trains standing on such crossings. I do not think the evil is local, but, that throughout the whole country, railways now obstruct highways just so long as it suits them. Moreover, whilst they are apparently endeavouring to consult the convenience of the public, I think they consult it, but to a partial extent. It is usual in some parts of the country for railways to open their freight trains, where they are standing for a length of time near crossings, but they do not open them sufficiently wide to enable vehicles to pass through with absolute safety. They merely make a narrow opening between their box cars, and the public run the risk of danger both from the cars closing upon them when they are passing through, and from horses taking fright by being compelled to pass too close to these frightening objects. Accordingly, it appeared to me proper that, where trains are cut in two in this way, they should stand entirely off the highway, and the public should have the full use of their own highway—in fact, that the public should not be compelled to provide yard room for the railways. The object of the second section of the Bill is to give a wider definition to the word "village," as used in Sections 76 and 77 of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879. Sections 76 and 77 of the Consolidated Act of 1879 provide that "no locomotive or railway engine shall pass in or through any thickly peopled city, town or village at a speed greater than six miles per hour, unless the track is properly fenced." It has been held by the courts that this restriction on speed does not apply where the line is through a village that is not incorporated. Of course, I presume that what the Legislature aimed at was that, where there was a thickly peopled portion of the country, whether incorporated or unincorporated, certain safeguards should be adopted, namely: either fencing the line or the reduction of speed, but it has been held that this term "village" is used in its technical sense of an incorporated village. It appears to me that it is proper to give it the wider signification, and that the true reason for limiting the speed should be the character of the neighbourhood, not the circumstance whether it is incorporated or unincorporated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no objection to the second reading of the Bill if the hon. gentleman proposes to send it to the Committee on Railways. The period of two minutes seems to be very short, and I think the railway company should be heard in the Railway Committee as to the first clause; and, as to the second clause, it is very hard to define where an unincorporated village begins and where it ends. Some villages are very straggling. For instance, in the Province of Quebec, you see a long line of houses for miles, built so close together that they may be called a village. The heart of it, where there

are two or three houses together, is generally called the village, and there must be some means of ascertaining where the village ends and the country begins. That, of course, can be considered in the Railway Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, Sir, but it might be as well that there should be a little expression of opinion on the point to which my hon. friend has alluded. Most of us know, by unpleasant personal experience, that the Railway Company do habitually interfere with the convenience, and often with the safety of the public, by their habit of keeping their trains for very long periods of time standing across a frequented highway. I can state, from my own personal knowledge, that I have again and again and again, seen railway trains standing for twenty minutes and more across a street which, I suppose, would be traversed, in the ordinary course of things, by at least 100 vehicles in that time. Therefore, my hon. friend has done good service in calling attention to the habitual infraction of the ordinary rights of passengers on ordinary highways by the railways. As to the time he has fixed, whether it should be two minutes or not, that is a proper subject for consideration by the Railway Committee, but there is no doubt that the companies do abuse the power granted to them in crossing public highways in cities to a very great extent. I think the members of the House who were on the Railway Committee can testify, as I can, to this fact.

Mr. FARROW. I can testify as well as the hon. gentleman from South Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) that under the present law the public suffer great inconvenience. About one mile west of a little town in my county there is what they call a "Y". There is a public road crossing the railway, and the freight trains stop there across that road sometimes from ten minutes to three-quarters of an hour. When people make representations to men in charge of the trains, they can get no satisfaction. The train men are above all law and all authority. I shall go heart and soul for the support of that Bill.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If there is one fault to be found with this Bill it is that it does not go far enough. Speaking on behalf of the farmers of the country, I say that the way they are treated by railway corporations is most disgraceful. There is not a single country pretending to have civilized governments where the public submit to such exactions and conduct from railway companies, as they do in Canada. Why, in England they would not permit a railway to cross the smallest road where there is the least possible amount of traffic, unless they constructed a bridge or sub-way. Now, it seems to me that in this country the public put up with a degree of ill-treatment from corporations of all descriptions that is simply astounding. Where I live there is a railway crossing in the village of Allandale on the Northern Railway. There is not a day in the year when life and property are not in danger from that crossing, and it is a matter for wonder that there are not more accidents. There is another crossing in my county where there is a considerable amount of traffic, and nobody can pass on that crossing without incurring a certain amount of danger. Accidents have occurred and accidents will occur, but the public seem to care nothing about it. It is nobody's business to take up the matter, and so they continue to suffer. It seems to me the proper way to deal with this question is to reverse the policy of the Railway Consolidation Act; and, instead of railways being required to make bridges only when they are asked to do so, or when they are called upon to do so by the Railway Committee, the Act ought to compel them to make bridges, or sub-ways over all roads, unless they are specially exempted from doing so. That is the proper course for the country to pursue. In my own neighborhood there is not a day when life and property are not in danger from the actions of the railway company. Considering the extent

to which this country is subsidising railway companies, the least thing the farmers of this country, who are the most interested, and the general travelling public who drive along the roads, have a right to ask, is that the Government insist upon these companies taking measures which will make it safe for people to cross their railways. I hope the hon. Minister of Railways will take the matter into consideration. He cannot do less, under existing circumstances, in view of the great increase of travel, the great increase in the number of trains, and the great privileges and assistance that railway companies are getting from this country. The least the Government can do is to alter, to reverse, our present policy, and, instead of making it incumbent on them to put bridges only where they are required to do so, they should be compelled to put bridges in all cases unless they are specially exempted.

Bill read the second time.

#### MARITIME COURT OF ONTARIO.

Mr. ALLEN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 70) to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.

Mr. DAVIES. There is a provision in this Bill that I think ought not to be adopted; I refer to the clause which prescribes that a ship shall be liable to attachment for cost of repairs, or supplies furnished to the ship, when the owner resides in the same Province. This to introduce a new principle altogether, that whether the owner resides in the Province or not, proceedings may be taken *in rem* against the ship for supplies furnished. I do not think it is in the power of this Parliament to apply the principle to other Provinces. You cannot supersede the jurisdiction of Vice Admiralty Courts, which derive their jurisdiction from Imperial legislation, and add the principle of this Bill *quoad* the Ontario Courts. You have one law in Ontario, and one law in Quebec. Besides, the principle is not sound. I do not see why a ship chandler, or other person who supplies goods to a ship, should not rely upon the credit of the owner, if the owner is in the Province; why he should have a right to attach the ship by proceedings *in rem* against it. Such a principle has never been introduced into Imperial legislation. I think it is calculated to operate unjustly against the owners of ships if it is applied here, and the hon. gentlemen promoting the Bill has given no reasons for it.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House comes from the Maritime Provinces. He objects to this Bill because it is not in accordance with the English law. Now, Sir, I simply wish to state to the House that the Maritime Act now in force in Ontario, is based on the Maritime law of England. That law provides that where the owner of any vessel has made repairs, or has purchased supplies for his vessel, and he lives within the country, there is no maritime lien. I have not heard the hon. gentleman give any good reason why a vessel belonging to this country, and the owner of which resides in this country, should escape the responsibility of a lien. Why should there be a lien against a foreign vessel for its supplies and repairs and no lien against a home vessel? This matter has been before the United States Congress, and a special committee made a very voluminous report. That report states that there is no reason at all why a home vessel should be treated differently from a foreign vessel. These vessels are often in ports where the owners are not known, where the responsibility of the owners is not known. They require repairs, they require goods to be furnished, in order to complete their voyage; they require repairs on account of disasters in the lakes, probably, and it is as much in the interests of the vessel owners themselves as it is in the interests of the people who furnish the supplies, that this law should be enforced.

I do not understand why the Maritime law should not give complete protection to people who do repairs, and supplying necessaries, the owner of the vessel obtains the value of the repairs and necessaries. Why is it that in our own country, and in regard to vessels belonging to our own people, persons furnishing supplies have to look to the owners for payment, whereas, in the case of vessels belonging to a foreign country or owned outside of this Province, those furnishing supplies have a lien on the vessel? There is no reason for that distinction. Our law provides, that seamen's wages, charges for towage and certain other charges shall form a lien against the vessel, no matter whether it belongs to this country, or a foreign country. Why the law should stop there, has always been a mystery to me. It is in the interest of the vessel owner, and certainly it is in the interest of those furnishing supplies, that the vessel should be responsible for what she gets. Taking this view of the case, I trust the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Allen) will receive the consideration of the House, and that at this early stage it will not be rejected, because after full discussion it will appear that the reasons why this Bill should become law are so substantial and good the House will ultimately pass it. It is not necessary at this early stage of the Bill that I should enter at length into the reasons why it should be placed on the Statute Book, suffice it to say that there are persons who supply vessels from one end of the country to the other who know to their cost the defect in the present law, and who hold that if a vessel receives supplies or has repairs done, it is only just that the vessel should be held responsible. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) urges the old reason against this measure, that because it is not the law in England it should not be the law here. That is no valid reason, however, why the Bill should not be passed. The United States has a Maritime law, and every country which has a marine should have a Maritime law, because it is the only way of adjusting claims between claimants and owners. In the United States they have changed the law, making it different from the law of England and providing that vessels themselves shall be responsible for the repairs or supplies furnished them. I cannot understand why there should be any distinction between supplies and repairs, and any other lien so far as the responsibility of the vessel itself is concerned. I trust the Bill will receive a second reading and that when it comes up again the House will have an opportunity of discussing its merits.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I hope the Bill of the hon. member for North Grey will receive a second reading and meet with the approbation of the House. I quite agree with the views expressed by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). I have had a little personal experience in carrying out the Maritime Act of Ontario, and it is a great inconvenience that vessels coming from a long distance should be allowed to obtain supplies and repairs, that workmen should be employed, and these men be deprived of their pay. It is not always an easy matter, for reasons which will suggest themselves to the minds of hon. members, to obtain payment from the owners. On a search being made at the port where the vessel is registered, it is perhaps found that the vessel belongs to some persons whom no one expected owned her, or that a mortgage exists. I am satisfied that great hardship occurs on account of the lack of a law of this kind. There is a certain law on the American side of the great lakes and rivers, and a different law on the Canadian side, and difficulty arises in consequence. If we had a similar law it would be a great improvement. I was surprised that the hon. member for Queen's, who is a distinguished law reformer, should object to the Bill mainly because it is not the law in England. I think he should have taken very much higher ground.

Mr. LISTER.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstood my remarks. I said that the law in England governed in the case of the Maritime Provinces, and you have no power to sue in the Vice-Admiralty Court under the provisions of the proposed Act. You will thus have one law in one Province and a different law in an adjoining Province, and I think that is not right.

Mr. PATTERSON. I accept the hon. member's explanation. A Session or two ago the Minister of Justice announced that he would bring this question under the notice of the Imperial Government with a view to having a uniform Act for the whole Dominion. It would be interesting to know what has been the result of the correspondence. I admit the hon. member for Queen's is correct in regard to the law in the Maritime Provinces; but in Ontario we are under the Ontario Act, and my experience, and the experience of the hon. member for Lambton, are identical in this matter, and I shall be very happy to do anything in my power to further the Bill of the hon. member for North Grey.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Two hon. members have stated that they approve of the principle of the Bill, and hope it will go to a second reading, and be afterwards discussed on its merits. That is an unparliamentary practice; the discussion should take place on the second reading. I have not had an opportunity of discussing this Bill with the Minister of Justice. Now that the attention of hon. members has been called to it, I think the second reading had better stand over, as we ought not to give it a second reading and affirm the principle unless the House is fully satisfied as to the merits of the Bill. I repeat that the attention of the House having been called to the Bill, its merits having been spoken to very shortly, and perhaps, not quite satisfactorily, it is desirable that the second reading should stand over. I therefore move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

#### CUSTOMS OFFICIALS IN INVERNESS COUNTY, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness), in moving for copies of all petitions and correspondence relative to the necessity of increasing the number of Customs officials at Cheticamp, Mabou, Port Hood, Whycocomah, West Bay, and Hawkesbury, Inverness, Nova Scotia, said: In moving this motion I desire to say a few words in order to show the reason why I intend to ask for the papers and correspondence referred to. At the outset I may assure this House that I, as a representative of the Island of Cape Breton, occupy a very peculiar and uncomfortable position in this House. I find that, to a large extent, I receive no particular sympathy from the representatives of Nova Scotia proper. But I might as well at this stage, state once for all, the peculiar position that not only I, but all the representatives from the Island of Cape Breton, occupy in this House. Years ago, Sir, just after Confederation, the subject of better terms for Nova Scotia occupied a very prominent position in the minds of the people of that Province, and among them, myself. At that time I had the pleasure of writing a letter to the Hon. Sir John Rose, on that subject. I now propose to read it, as it will place before the people of this Dominion the exact position which I occupied on that question at that time. It was as follows:—

“SIR JOHN ROSE:

“MABOU, 21st January, 1869.

“DEAR SIR,—I observe that Hon. Joseph Howe and Mr. McLellan have left this Province to meet you at Portland, in order to settle, if possible, the Nova Scotia difficulty. I, therefore, beg leave to call your attention to the necessity of considering the claims of the Island of Cape Breton, in any modifications which may be made in the Union scheme. Nova Scotia has its railroads and other advantages, for which this Island had, since its annexation to Nova Scotia, been heavily

taxed. This Island is larger than Prince Edward's, had its own Government in its day, and is as populous and of more importance to the Dominion than Prince Edward's Island. Nova Scotia Governments had always, previous to Confederation, neglected this Island, St Peter's Canal being the only offset to all the Nova Scotia public works, which cost over nine millions of money. If Prince Edward's Island comes into the Union, it must be under much more favourable terms than Cape Breton, which is much more important in its natural resources. The local requirements of this Island will be neglected by all Local Governments, for the want of that influence which numerical strength in representation always commands.

"Justice would give this Island the same terms in the Confederacy which Prince Edward Island shall obtain, with its fixed number of Senators, and consideration as a separate Colony, even without a Local Government, which ensures several advantages to that Colony, if, or when confederated. Unless something of that kind be done for Cape Breton, modification to satisfy Nova Scotia proper, may not better our condition in the slightest degree. Hoping that those few earnest hints will attract your influential attention, to the requirements of over eighty thousand people, dragged into the Union against their will, of whom many are daily emigrating to the neighbouring republic.

"I have the honour to be, dear Sir,  
"Your obedient servant,  
"H. CAMERON, M.P."

To that letter I received the following reply:—

"OTTAWA, 30th January, 1869.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of your note of the 20th inst. The observations contained in it I have read with much interest. I assure you I am not insensible to the isolated position of Cape Breton, and I hope that the arrangements which we have now concluded with Mr. Howe and Mr. McLellan will place at the disposal of the Local Government ample means for assisting the services to which you refer. These arrangements are substantially that Nova Scotia comes in with a debt of \$1,100,000 more under the Union, and receives about \$90,000 a year for ten years, besides other collateral advantages.

"Mr. Howe and Mr. McLellan are entirely satisfied with the conclusion at which we have arrived, and it will place Nova Scotia in a position of financial ease that will enable her to meet all local requirements both as respects steamboat service and roads and bridges.

"I have spoken to Mr. Howe on the subject of your letter—he goes down immediately to Nova Scotia—and the statement which he will be able to make ought, I think, to be satisfactory to even the most exacting.

"You will readily see, that however much truth there may be in the statement you make of the claims of Cape Breton as a part from Nova Scotia proper, that we have no power to alter the constitutional arrangements under the Union Act, or to consider the Island other than an integral part of the Province. But I shall be glad to discuss all these matters with you when you come up for the session, which will probably be about the end of March.

"Believe me to be,  
"Very faithfully yours,  
"JOHN ROSE."

"H. CAMERON, Esq.,  
"Mabou, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia."

Over fifteen years have elapsed since that time, and I regret to say that my anticipations have been fully realized, and notwithstanding the fact that a large amount of money has since that time been placed at the disposal of the Local Governments, not even one dollar of that large amount has been expended on the Island of Cape Breton. It may be said, that we have no right to complain here, that it is cowardly to attack the Local Governments who are not here to defend themselves. But, Sir, as I occupy the position of a representative of the Island of Cape Breton, I shall not hesitate to complain of the conduct of the Local Governments in Nova Scotia whenever I feel that they have failed to discharge every part of their duty, in aiding and assisting Cape Breton when necessary. Now, Sir, at that time I only advocated that Cape Breton should have a fair consideration in the Confederacy—such a consideration as Prince Edward Island had to obtain before she would accept the Union. Although we do not yet, in Cape Breton, ask for the same consideration that Prince Edward Island has received, I may as well now, once for all, tell this House that the day is fast coming when the people of Cape Breton, unless their services are attended to more satisfactorily than heretofore, particularly by the Local Government, will ask for Home Rule. Over \$3,000,000 have been expended in Nova Scotia proper since Confederation upon railways, and notwithstanding that we make claims here for subsidies from the Dominion, we complain the Local Government in Nova Scotia failed to give us any aid whatever for railway purposes. I may be informed

by members from Nova Scotia that all possible aid has been given for railway extension in Cape Breton. Leading people who do not know the facts have been led to believe that they really did expend some money on railways in Cape Breton. Unfortunately, while the agitation existed in Nova Scotia for the extension of railways east and west, Cape Breton was put off with mere promises. But this matter I shall discuss on a future day. My object to-day is only to make a statement to this House relative to the position which we in Cape Breton occupy, in order that this House will at least excuse us, when we undertake to press the claims of that island for more consideration than it has yet received. We complain that sufficient attention has not yet been given to other services as well as the railway service on that island, not the least of which is the protection of the revenue, particularly in the county of Inverness. For several years representations have been made to me from all sections of the county with reference to the necessity of protecting the revenue in various localities in that county, and years ago as well as lately I have visited the Department of Customs and pressed my views upon the Department to the best of my power. While I am ready to acknowledge that I received on all occasions the most courteous treatment, I must admit that I always failed to convince the Department that there was any necessity for further protecting the revenue on that side of the island of Cape Breton. We do not complain so much of the amount of smuggling which is carried on on the coast of that county as we complain that most of the smuggling is done in ardent spirits. The county of Inverness is, I believe, one of the most temperate counties in the Dominion of Canada. I believe also that the temperance advocates in that county are those who generally complain of the necessity of protecting the revenue, particularly with the view of preventing this kind of smuggling. The answer I invariably received in the Department was that the amount of revenue collected in the county of Inverness did not justify any increase in the expenditure. At first sight the objection was reasonable; but my impression is that the smallness of the revenue is the strongest evidence on the face of it why the protection to the revenue should be increased. Notwithstanding all that, I failed to convince the Department that there was much necessity for an increase. I hold that the amount of the imports and exports in an outlying constituency of the Dominion is not a correct indication of the quantity of goods consumed in that constituency. The exports from Nova Scotia in 1883 amounted to \$9,820,332, and the imports to \$9,042,017, showing a balance in favor of Nova Scotia of \$778,315. The exports from the whole Island of Cape Breton, as shown by the trade returns, only amounted to \$531,005, and the imports into the whole Island amounted to only \$246,358, showing a balance in favor of the Island of \$334,697. Now, Sir, every reasonable person on the Island of Cape Breton who knows anything about the trade of that Island, must admit that the imports and the exports are much larger than they are shown to be by the trade returns. I contend, and I contend with reason, that the exports from that Island amount to more than one-fifth of the total exports from the Province of Nova Scotia. It is true, the exports from the Island are not all made from the ports of the Island, for Halifax, which is the principle outport for the productions of the whole Province of Nova Scotia, exports a part of the productions of the Island of Cape Breton. While the trade returns represent that the exports from Inverness County amount to only \$117,005, I think I can conclusively prove that the actual exports from that county amount to \$380,000, or nearly eight times the amount represented by the trade returns. In order to explain the position more clearly to the House, I beg to call attention to the imports and exports at the various ports of the Island, which were as follows:—

	Imports.	Exports.
Arichat .....	\$ 24,883	\$ 33,623
Beddeck .....	16,392	97,926
Hawksbury.....	17,176	113,445
Port Hood.....	903	3,560
Sydney.....	42,262	204,360
North Sydney.....	144,752	128,141
	\$246,358	\$581,055

Now, Sir, the imports into a county depend upon the purchasing power of the people of that county. With the exception of Prince Edward Island, which is the best agricultural section of this whole Dominion; in that respect the island of Cape Breton presents as good a face as any other portion of the Maritime Provinces, and as good a face as more than one-half of the constituencies of the greater Provinces. I shall not discuss the productions of the whole Province but shall briefly refer to those of Cape Breton. In 1881 Cape Breton produced, as shown by census returns, 49,468 bushels of wheat; 529,259 bushels of oats; 1,226,842 bushels of potatoes, and 105,825 tons of hay—and this statement which I have before me gives the production of all the counties of the Province. Inverness alone produces 21,854 bushels of wheat, 256,483 bushels of oats, 435,533 bushels of potatoes, 47,816 tons of hay; and from the said statement, I conclude that the island of Cape Breton has comparatively a better agricultural section than the Province of Nova Scotia, and also that the county of Inverness is the best agricultural county on the whole Island—I may even go further and say it is the best in the whole Province of Nova Scotia. In proportion to its area and population, Inverness is the most productive county in Nova Scotia, and if we had the same railway facilities and harbours from which to distribute the productions of that island, it would give encouragement for greater production; and I have no hesitation to say that the production of that county would be doubled. But the difficulties in the way of distributing the products of that county are such that the people are discouraged from producing much more than is required for home consumption. By comparing the statistics of the various counties, I have arrived at the following conclusion with respect to Inverness. Inverness produces only a few tons of hay less than the counties of Richmond, Queen's, Shelburne, and Yarmouth, and hay is a great index of the productiveness of the soil in any constituency. Inverness produces 43,471 bushels of potatoes more than the counties of Richmond, Guysborough and Queen's; as much wheat as Yarmouth, Guysborough, Shelburne and Queen's; and more oats than Richmond, Guysborough, Queen's, Shelburne, Yarmouth, Lunenburg, Annapolis, Digby and Halifax. Yet, strange to say, nearly all these counties have a railway and Inverness has not, and the fact that we are without a railway only proves what we could produce if we had such facilities. The exports of Nova Scotia consist largely of fish and I find by the trade returns that the export from Inverness is more than the average from the whole Province. I have reason to know that the export of fish from Inverness last year amounted to over \$500,000 and yet the trade returns only allow us \$117,000 for all our exports; but the exports of fish from Inverness do not show on the trade returns as coming from the Port of Inverness, but as coming from the port of Halifax which is the point of distribution. The exports of cattle from Inverness amounted to not less than \$150,000; butter, \$100,000; canned beef and mutton \$50,000; sheep \$10,000; horses \$10,000; in all \$320,000, yet the trade returns only show \$117,000, thus misrepresenting the productiveness of Inverness to the amount of nearly \$700,000. Besides the productiveness as shown by the statistics already quoted I may refer to other indications of productiveness in that county. In 1880, as shown by the census returns, Inverness had 5,532 horses a greater number than then existed in any county of the Province 458 working oxen,

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

29,843 cattle, 45,453 sheep,—or more cattle and sheep than in any other county—5,573 swine, being more swine than in any other county; 117,081 pounds of wool, or more wool than in any other county; 649,276 lbs. of butter; 153,083 lbs. of cheese; 9,549 lbs. of flax; 147,211 yards of home made cloth and flannel,—more than was produced in any other county in the Province; 5,792 yards linens; 3,730 bushel apples, which is small as compared to the Annapolis Valley I admit; other fruits 913 bushels; maple sugar 5,668 lbs. I have given these statistics to show that the exports and imports of Inverness must be very much larger than shown by the trade returns; and the same remark applies to every county on the Island. This was an old argument used against the Island when we pressed our claims for public improvements, but it is an argument that is very fallacious. It may be asked, is there any smuggling? I am sorry to say there is, particularly in ardent spirits, to a very great extent. In order to show that is the case I beg to refer to a report in the local paper in our shire town which is as follows:

"Schooner *Harriet Tory*, of Souris, P. E. I., 59 tons, was seized in this harbour on Sunday last, the 16th instant, for violation of the Customs laws, in having on board a cargo of smuggled goods, consisting chiefly of liquors. The vessel and cargo are now in the hands of the collector. It seems our temperance Finance Minister, has not been more successful in producing a home supply of brandy, rum, whiskey and gin, than he has been in that of 'cotton, sugar and glass-ware,' by his National Policy for the foregoing article is still being imported."

My object in reading this is to show that, in that locality, there is considerable smuggling, and, when I assure this House that that is only one small village of a number of villages in the county, they must conclude with me that, if a large quantity of goods has been taken there, a large quantity is also unfortunately carried to our shores for the purpose of sale in the other villages. There are not less than six or seven villages in the county as large as that of Port Hood, and the want of harbours on the north-west coast of Cape Breton only encourages the smuggling trade. The trade is not always, in fact it is very seldom, carried on by our own people, from the simple fact that our people unfortunately do not own many vessels, and they do not own many vessels because they have no harbours on the north side of the island into which vessels, except of very small tonnage, can enter. Therefore it is not our own people, as a rule, that engage in this traffic, but people who find it a profitable business engage in it, and deluge the country with liquor, nearly altogether smuggled liquor. When I call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that only \$98, or thereabouts, was collected for revenue in the whole County of Inverness, from the Strait of Canso to Cape North, he must conclude with me that nearly all, if not all, the liquors used in that county are smuggled, and I regret to say that that is our experience. Now, in order to be relieved from such illicit trade, I intend to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the number of officers that, in my humble judgment, is required in order to protect the revenue in that county and also the number that is required in order to facilitate shipping from the various sections in which considerable trade exists. I may inform him at first that in Cheticamp, where there is a large business done, particularly in the fish trade, the traders in that locality complain that they have not a sub-collector of Customs in order that they may from that port get a clearance for their vessels and also enter them when necessary, without being put to the trouble and inconvenience of travelling eighteen or twenty miles for the purpose of doing so. At Broad Cove Marsh, where considerable business is done on Margaree Island and by traders on the shore, a preventive officer is necessary to prevent smuggling on the shore in that locality, according to representations repeatedly made to me by temperance men. At Mabou also, a place where I believe

the largest business is done of any place in the county, there is not a preventive officer or a sub-collector. Certainly, a sub-collector is absolutely necessary in that district, in order to protect the revenue, and in order also to facilitate the shipping from that section, which, I am happy to say, is largely on the increase, on account of the improvements lately made by the Public Works Department. In former years, and until lately, there was hardly a vessel owned in Mabou. I am happy to say they own a few vessels there now, and have commenced to build more, so that the necessity of having a sub-collector in that district, is great. At Port Hood, where I myself have seen two or three hundred sail from different parts of the Province, and from the United States as well, anchored, it is necessary to have more help, to enable the Collector of Customs in that district, to discharge his duty efficiently and well. It is not only liquor, Sir, but tobacco and kerosene and other articles upon which a high tariff is paid, that are smuggled into the county, and Americans who frequent our shores not unfrequently, trade in kerosene and boots and shoes along our shores. In Judique, half distant between the Strait of Canso and Port Hood, where there are also a number of business men, it is almost absolutely necessary, in order to prevent smuggling, to have a preventive officer. It is also necessary to have a sub-collector of Customs at Whyccomagh, a large village, perhaps the largest in the county; and it is necessary to have a sub-collectorship at West Bay, which is also one of the growing villages in the county. Port Hawkesbury also requires a preventive officer, being the terminus of the railway and several steamers. Now, what would all these officers entail? It would not amount to much more than \$1,200. The existing expense of collection and protection in that large county only amounts to a little over \$1,000, and, putting both together, the expenditure in the county of Inverness would amount to less than the expenditure in any county of the Province of Nova Scotia, and not more than one-tenth the expenditure on the island of Prince Edward. The collection on the island of Cape Breton does not cost nearly as much as the collection on Prince Edward, and I think my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island will agree with me that the amount expended on collection on that island is not more than is necessary for the efficiency of the service on that island. When we ask to protect the revenue in the interests of our temperance people particularly on that island, we also urge it in the interests of the revenue. I admit that the collections in the county of Inverness will not be much, if any, larger than at present, but I hold that the collections in Halifax and in Montreal and other cities from which we import dutiable goods will be considerably larger than they are at present. And, in this connection, I may inform you of the mode of traffic, and it is this. Some enterprising trader will go into the city of Halifax, will buy \$2,000 or \$3,000 worth of liquors in bond, and will transfer such liquors to the Island of St. Pierre or Miquelon, and vessels coasting and fishing, having cleared from Newfoundland or from any other port, will call at St. Pierre and Miquelon for these goods, and will distribute them along the shore of the Island of Cape Breton, and in this way the duty collected in the cities from which such liquors are originally exported must show a falling off. My object then, Sir, is to call the attention of the Minister of Customs, and of the Government as well, to the necessity of increasing the protective staff on the north-west coast of Inverness and on the lakes as well. But when I assure them that the coast of Inverness county is equally as large as the sea coast of the whole of Prince Edward Island, they must agree with me that the number of officers in that county is not as large as it should be; and the number asked for only amounts to three officers more than the County of Richmond already possesses. In this connection I

may say that, once for all, I feel that I have discharged my duty in connection with advocating further protection. I have advocated it now for fifteen years with little or no success. An increase was made, I believe, in 1871, or 1872, in Mabou, but in 1874, owing to the fact, I presume, that few collections were made in that locality, the officer was discontinued. But the fact that no collections are made in that locality does not argue at all in favour of the discontinuance; on the contrary it argues in the favour of further protection in the locality. Therefore, I beg to move for copies of all petitions and correspondence relative to the necessity of increasing the number of Customs officials at Cheticamp, Mabou, Port Hood, Whyccomagh, West Bay, and Hawkesbury, Inverness, Nova Scotia.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that we have in the Port of Gananoque, perhaps, as efficient a Customs officer as there is in Ontario. That officer has been in charge of that Port for the past twenty or twenty-five years. Correspondence has been sent, I believe, to the Government asking for an assistant for that officer; why an assistant has been refused, I cannot say. Some years ago an assistant was sent there but for some reason or other he has been removed. I find that if the figures representing the receipts and expenditure of that Port are to be taken into account, we have a good claim for an assistant at that Port. I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns, the following figures, based on the receipts and expenditures made for the past ten years:—

Year.	Colls.	Cost
1873.....	\$ 2,837	\$1,127
1874.....	3,178	1,158
1875.....	5,314	1,498
1876.....	4,258	1,994
1877.....	3,507	1,983
1878.....	3,116	1,983
1879.....	4,103	1,926
1880.....	6,836	1,713
1881.....	8,616	1,586
1882.....	14,068	1,584
1883.....	14,248	1,668

Now, Sir, I see no reason why, when the cost of collecting \$3,116 in 1878, was \$1,983, only the sum of \$1,668 should be paid in 1883 for collecting the large sum of \$14,248. During the years 1876-77-78, and part of 1879, an assistant was appointed at that port; but for some reason unknown to me, the officer who was in charge of that port in 1878, is now doing all the work there alone. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that he is over-worked and not sufficiently paid. In 1873 his salary was \$700; an assistant was sent there during the years I mentioned, at a salary of \$730—\$30 more than the officer in charge of the port. I may say that since 1878, the expenditure at that port has decreased \$315, while the receipts have increased \$11,132—an increase of 356 per cent. in the revenue, and a decrease in the cost of collection of 18 per cent. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that if there is any port in Ontario, or in the Dominion, that makes a better showing than the port of Gananoque, with one officer in charge, then he should have an assistant. There should be an assistant in Gananoque now, owing to the fact, that it is a railway terminus, and in connection with that terminus we have a ferry plying to the opposite shore in New York, three times a day. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move an amendment to the motion that after the words "Nova Scotia" the following words be added, "and Gananoque, Ont."

Mr. PAINT. I desire to add a few words in connection with this matter. I may say that I have on several occasions pressed upon the hon. Minister of Customs, the necessity for more preventive officers in the County of Richmond, and I trust that my application will soon be granted. I am much obliged to my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr.

Cameron) for having brought this matter to the attention of the Minister. He has referred to the matter of railway extension into the Island of Cape Breton. This, Sir, is a matter of the utmost importance to that island, and it is one upon which the members from that island feel deeply. That island has long felt the disadvantage of not having railway facilities, and I may, on a future occasion, make some further remarks in connection with this matter. I trust that his request may be granted, and I hope that the county of Richmond may also receive attention in this respect. I am glad to hear from the hon. member for Inverness, that the county is so very productive, but at the same time it does not possess the shipping facilities as other counties in the Provinces.

Mr. GAULT. I think the present a very favourable time to say something in regard to the Customs of Montreal. It is not that I want an increase of men, but that the salaries paid to officers of the Customs are insufficient, and are not even up to living rates. To-day the chief appraiser in Montreal receives \$1,800 a year, which is not equal to what is received by clerks. I know some employes who receive \$3,000 and \$4,000 a year, and yet these Government officials are every day placed in positions where they could make their salaries five times over. I hope therefore the Minister will consider the question of salaries paid to these officers and place them at amounts to which they are entitled.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have a similar cause of complaint with respect to my county; and as I think this is the first time I have uttered a note of complaint to the Minister of Customs, the hon. gentleman should feel grateful. I have been hoping for a long time to obtain the appointment of an appraiser for the town of Newcastle. We have only one appraiser in the county, and he lives in Chatham District; and that is the reason why I desire to obtain an appraiser for Newcastle. But it is like drawing an eye-tooth to get anything from the Minister of Customs. Whether we must put it down to a desire to economise, or to his idea that we may be trying to get a little job done, I do not know; but it will be very gratifying if he will do what I have long pressed on him, that is, to appoint an officer at a good salary, to perform the duties of appraiser at the town in which I was born. I feel it to be due to myself and the constituency I represent, that when these grievances from remote country districts in Cape Breton, the Gut of Canso, and the commercial Capital of the Dominion, are being presented, that he should consider the representation which I have made in regard to my county.

Mr. BRECKEN. On behalf of Prince Edward Island which has been very kindly referred to by the hon. member for Inverness, and of which he spoke so very highly, and yet without exaggeration, I have a few words to say. I desire to press on the hon. Minister of Customs the necessity of giving the Province an inspector of Customs. I am not going to make the admission with respect to the island which the hon. member for Inverness made with respect to Cape Breton, namely that the people are great smugglers. I do not know that we are; but it has been urged upon me by my constituents, that an inspector of Customs is urgently needed, and that an active and efficient officer would probably save to the revenue of the Dominion four or five times his salary. We had a sort of detective on the island, an officer who resided at Souris, King's County, and who had a travelling commission to visit various ports and repress smuggling; but the Minister of Customs, I regret to say—though perhaps he may have some good reason for having done so—thought proper to do away with that officer. If we had an inspector of Customs and one or two persons employed as detectives to visit the various harbours and inlets—for whatever may be the feelings of the people,

Mr. PAINT.

the natural facilities afforded on the island for smuggling are very great—no doubt the Minister of Customs would find the revenue of the island considerably augmented.

Mr. DALY. I had intended to reserve my observations in connection with this subject for a future occasion, when the Estimates would be before the House, but as the subject with respect to the salaries of Customs officers has been brought up, I desire to direct the Minister's attention to the salaries of the staff at Halifax. Representations have been made to him at various times in this regard, and I am glad to see by the Estimates this year, that some increases have been granted in the salaries of those officials. Nevertheless, there are cases which have not been provided for, and which should be provided for. Clerks are now serving in the Long Room at Halifax, of 10 and 12 years, experience, who are receiving salaries of \$600 a year, which is not sufficient to support them in a proper manner. I think those cases ought to be considered, and the scale of salaries increased, according to the length of time the officers have served. I have much pleasure in pressing the claims that have been urged by the hon. member for Inverness. I believe the outside Preventive Service in Nova Scotia, is not sufficient in numbers or adequately paid, and the more the Minister does in the direction which the hon. gentleman has pointed out, the more he will find his revenue increased, and the small salaries paid will be returned to the Treasury a hundred fold.

Mr. TEMPLE. With respect to Nova Scotia Customs officers, one is required in the noble county of York, N. B., which I have the honour to represent. There is a section of my county in which there is no Custom House officer; and an officer is much needed to prevent the smuggling which is going on between the State of Maine and my constituency. It is not fair to our traders that smuggling should be allowed to proceed right under their eyes. It involves a great loss to those traders, and I hope the Minister will endeavour to appoint an officer for that section.

Mr. IRVINE. As the hon. gentleman's constituency borders on mine, perhaps I can do something to help him out of his difficulty. I may say that there are three or four of the officers in our county who we could very well spare for the benefit of the hon. gentleman. Our people are so remarkably honest that they consider it to be their duty not to consume anything but what is manufactured in Canada, so as to give the National Policy a little start. There is no smuggling in our county, and I am sorry to hear that there is in the hon. gentleman's constituency. It was said that the manufacturing establishments would receive such an impetus on account of the National Policy that our people are so patriotic, in the true sense of the word, that they will consume nothing but Canadian goods. I think, therefore, that instead of appointing additional officers in the place of the one who was dismissed, and who, I presume, was a Liberal, for that is the programme this Government usually carries out, they might transfer some of our officers to his county. We do not want to reach our hands any deeper into the Treasury for the sake of these hungry cormorants who drain the Treasury, but we would rather assist in replenishing the Treasury. At all events we do not want any more of these officers.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sure the House will thank the hon. member for Inverness for the very interesting statistics which he has given proving that at least that portion of the Dominion is not only very productive but increasing very rapidly in wealth. Whether smuggling exists to the extent to which my hon. friend refers, I do not know, but one case to which he adverted was a seizure in Prince Edward Island of a vessel which was carrying some liquor—

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; it was in my county.

Mr. BOWELL. If that be the case, the fact that the vessel was caught while smuggling liquor, proved that there were officers there, attending to their duties, hence there was no necessity, so far as that particular part of Cape Breton is concerned, to increase the expenditure, by appointing other officers. The House will understand that upon a coast line like that of Nova Scotia, as well as in other parts of the Dominion, it would be utterly impossible to have officers stationed at every nook and corner, at which small vessels could land in order to smuggle in goods. The localities to which the hon. member for Inverness has referred, have many offices, one, two or three officers. The Port of Mabou which has been alluded to, had an officer for a long time, and another has been appointed to take the place of the gentleman who either resigned or died, though it is only a preventive station; but I have yet to learn that it is to those particular places, where officers are to be found, that smugglers are in the habit of resorting. On the contrary, smuggling usually takes place at other places than these, and if the revenue is to be protected in the manner suggested, it would be necessary to appoint travelling Preventive Officers, to travel from one place to another, as it would be utterly impossible to have an officer in each locality in which smugglers might visit. When we recollect how difficult it is in all countries that have a tariff, to prevent smuggling; in England where they had mounted preventive officers who travelled along the coast of that country, yet they had smuggling there, notwithstanding this means of protection against it. I fancy we must expect smuggling so long as there is a duty, whether it be small or great, people will be found ready to evade the law. I was surprised to find, however, that in the county which my hon. friend says is a most temperate county, a county in which perhaps temperance prevails to a greater extent than in any other county, either in Cape Breton or Nova Scotia proper, so much liquor should be smuggled. If the people are as temperate as they are represented they would only want the liquor for the purpose of exporting it to neighbouring and less temperate counties. If the hon. gentleman will look at the return which was brought down early this Session in answer to a motion by the leader of the Opposition, he will find that a number of vessels have been seized in the act of smuggling from the port of St. Pierre. It is a pity that there is a free port so near the coast of this Dominion, and it is with difficulty that smuggling can be prevented in that part of the country. If the hon. member will look at the statistics, he will find that they show that there is ex-warehoused in bond for St. Pierre, almost enough tobacco, liquors, and other goods, to supply a continent; and I can assure the hon. gentleman that this is not confined to Halifax and other ports of the Dominion, but that the statistics of Boston and other American ports show precisely the same thing—hundreds of thousands of dollars worth, are every year ex-warehoused and exported to the Island of St. Pierre. What becomes of those goods afterwards it is difficult to say, but we know that an irregular trade is carried on and as many officers as the revenue will justify are on the alert, in different sections of the country, to prevent this illicit trade as much as possible. In every case in which my attention has been called to the necessity of establishing either further ports or sub-ports, or appointing other officers, I have at once referred the matter to the Inspectors, who have in many cases reported that it would be in the interests of the revenue that such officers should be appointed. In other cases, where it has been represented very strongly by the representatives of the county and others, the Inspectors have reported that it would not be necessary to appoint further officers, and it

is necessary that we should pay some little attention to the reports of these officers, who are entrusted with the performance of very important duties. Hon. gentlemen will readily admit that the officers in the head office in Ottawa cannot be personally acquainted with all the localities in the different sections of the country, but I can assure the hon. gentleman and his constituency, that their interests are well looked after by him in this particular. The general complaint made by members of this House, that the salaries of the officials are not sufficiently large, is a question which is not a new one. I have no doubt that if my predecessor in the Department were present, he would corroborate what I am about to state, and that is, that the representatives of different sections of the country are never backward in asking that the salaries of various officials should be increased. We find, however—and it is just as well that we should remember it—that it is a very favourite topic when we go to the electorate, to say that the heads of the Departments, those presiding particularly over the Customs and some other Departments, where there is a large expenditure of money, have been extravagant, and have not carried out their promises with regard to keeping down the expenditure during the past year. As far as the appropriation voted by Parliament would enable me, I have been trying to level up and equalize the salaries paid to the officers at the different ports; hon. gentlemen must bear in mind—that though a particular officer or clerk at one port may not receive as large a salary as a similar officer or clerk at another port, it will be found upon investigation that there is probably not half the responsibility or one tenth of the labour in the one case, that there is in the other. I never have the slightest difficulty in finding men to fill the places as soon as they become vacant, even at the salaries now paid. In the case of those \$600 or \$700 positions, to which my hon. friend from Montreal has referred, I do not think that he has ever found any difficulty in obtaining gentlemen who were willing to take the positions at those salaries. With regard to Gananoque, my hon. friend made a slight mistake. He said the expenditure there had decreased some 18 per cent. for the collection of revenue from 1878 to the present time. That is quite true, but instead of the increase of revenue being 35 per cent. at that port, it is nearer 335 per cent. I found that at that port there was a collector—and as my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says, he was one of the best collectors in the country—receiving a smaller salary than a temporary man, a very old gentleman, who was placed there at a certain per diem allowance, which was greater than the salary of the collector. As I found that the collector could perform all the work, I removed that officer to another place, where I thought his services could be better utilized, and reduced the pay he was receiving. Mr. Ormiston is a good officer, and instead of appointing another man, I increased his salary by one or two hundred dollars per annum, and I find that he is quite willing to perform all the duties imposed on him. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Northumberland, N. B. (Mr. Mitchell) that there is any necessity for an appraiser at Newcastle. It is true, that port had formerly an appraiser, because a few years ago it was an important point on the Miramichi; but if the hon. gentleman looks at the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find that the revenue collected at that port was only \$10,400; and as Chatham is only five miles distant, upon the death of the appraiser at Newcastle, I thought that the services of the appraiser at Chatham could be utilized to perform the duty there, and he is allowed extra pay for performing that work. If Newcastle were importing largely, and particularly of the stock of my hon. friend, I do not know but that it would be necessary to appoint an appraiser at that port. I think I may say generally that the object of the Department

has been to increase wherever they could the salaries of efficient officers; and while this is done, it must be borne in mind that if all the appointments which are demanded all over the country were made, the head of the Department would have to come to this House and ask for an increased appropriation of some \$50,000 or \$60,000 per annum. The increases in the city of Montreal during the past year have been somewhat numerous. My hon. friend will find, when he comes to look at the expenditure, that it has increased much more rapidly than perhaps many would think justifiable; and when I tell him that the expenditure at that port is some \$14,000 more than it was last year, and that I shall have to ask, in the Supplementary Estimates, for a sum to cover the extra expenditure, I question whether this House would sanction the increases which are constantly demanded in different parts of the Dominion from this and other Departments. The Montreal collections have increased from under \$4,000,000 in 1878 to nearly \$8,000,000 last year, and I found it necessary to add two or three appraisers to the list there; and I can safely say that those appraisers—particularly the one understanding chemistry, who is capable of analyzing patent medicines—have many times more than paid their own salaries in what they have saved to the country. One great difficulty I have had to contend with has been the fact that, during the reign of my predecessor in the last Administration, officers were appointed at different ports, and particularly at important points, at salaries of \$1,000 or \$1,200, to perform precisely the same work as equally efficient men, who had been there for half a score or nearly a score years, and were receiving only \$500 or \$700 per annum. This created numerous complaints, almost a little rebellion, because it was claimed that if anybody deserved promotion, it was those who had been in the Department for many years. It is one of the curses of the system not to make, in every case where you possibly can, promotion in the service, though I readily admit my experience has taught me that in nineteen cases out of ever twenty, as far as Collectors are concerned, a man who has been in business and who is, if I may use the term, up to the times, who understands the genius of trade at the present time, will make a better collector than the man who has been drudging in an official capacity in the Custom House for ten or fifteen years. I can only account for that by this reason, that the clerk goes on in his regular routine business, paying little attention to the outside world, without studying the changes, rapid as we all know they are, of trade, and the different modes of transacting business in all parts of the country. If you take a man from business who has had years of experience, who has been dealing in all the different articles which are imported into the country, he is, as a rule, better adapted to look after the interests of both merchant and revenue than many of those who have spent year of service in the Department. That at least has been my experience and I can account for it in no other way than that to which I have referred. I am glad to know that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) is prepared to dispense with some of the officials in his locality. I understood him to say, though I did not catch what he said very readily, that a Reformer had been turned out of office there by the Government. I have no knowledge of any such case.

Mr. IRVINE. What I said was, that I understood from the returns that a Preventive Officer has been turned out last year in the county of York.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is labouring under a misapprehension. There has been no officer turned out of York County; but one was suspended for reasons I do not desire to give in the House. But if the hon. gentleman desires, I will give the reasons. If the rev-

Mr. BOWELL.

venue requires an additional officer in York County, I will be very glad to appoint one. I have a distinct recollection of my hon. friend making a speech here a year or two ago in which he intimated to us that all the goods consumed in Carleton were smuggled goods. I am glad to know, however, that the placing of officers there has made my hon. friend's constituents honest, in this particular, at least.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### UNLAWFUL ASSOCIATIONS AND OATHS.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) in introducing Bill (No. 100) further to amend [the chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths, said: The character of the Bill is a very simple one. It is similar to that of the Bill passed in 1865 by the old Parliament of Canada. In the old ordinance relating to seditious and unlawful associations and oaths, there was a clause exempting Freemasons hailing from the Grand Lodges of Great Britain, and Ireland from the effects of the Bill. Subsequently the Freemasons of the Province of Canada established a Grand Lodge in this country which they called the Grand Lodge of Canada, and in 1865 an Act was passed simply to add the words Grand Lodge of Canada after the word "Ireland" in the original Act. After Confederation, the Province of Quebec becoming a political entity, the Freemasons in that Province established what they called the Grand Lodge of Quebec under the ordinary principle that prevails among them of making Masonic and territorial jurisdiction co-terminus. The object of this Bill therefore, is simply to add the words "Grand Lodge of Quebec" after "Canada." The same thing was done in 1865, and was done then without the formality of recording the votes of Parliament.

Bill read the first time on a division.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that whenever the Resolutions moved by Sir Charles Tupper, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway are reported, and concurrence in them, as reported, is moved, such motion for concurrence shall have precedence every day next after routine proceedings.

Mr. BLAKE. As the further discussion of this question is impossible, without the presentation of those papers which have not yet been laid on the Table, I do not apprehend any protracted further discussion of it. We are not able to discuss it, as I have frequently pointed out, intelligibly without this information. Many of the propositions advanced on the other side; many of the statements and calculations made as to the condition of the work are dependent for their intelligent investigation upon the presentation of information which ought to have been submitted to the House in view of the proposals of the Government—which has been asked for repeatedly and is not yet brought down. Under these circumstances, I do not suppose that there will be any protracted discussion, and in this view, although I

object to the motion, I do not propose to trouble the House with a division upon it, but ask that it be passed as agreed to on division.

Motion agreed to on a division.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I beg to call the attention of the House to the following facts: I find, in a daily newspaper published in Montreal and called the *L'Etendard*, a correspondence dated from the Capital, and which contains inaccuracies which I desire to point out. I should have taken no notice of it had not my name been mentioned in the said correspondence, and that in connection with a statement which is false altogether. I do not wonder at this correspondent not saying the truth, as I do not think that in the caucuses held lately by the members from the Province of Quebec, there has been one man who acted the part of an informer or told the editor of that paper what took place in these caucuses. In consequence, I readily forgive him the inaccuracies which are contained in his letter. In the caucuses which were held, I understood that the hon. members had acted loyally, honourably and constitutionally, from what was said by the hon. Premier of the Dominion himself. Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears that some people are trying to impress the public with the idea that there have been persons outside of this House who brought a pressure to bear on the French Canadian members, in order to make them hold these caucuses, and to induce them to make to the Government those remonstrances which they deemed it their duty to make in the interest of their Province and of the country at large. My name being mentioned in that correspondence, I deny, for my part, all that has been said in it, and I also deny it on behalf of my colleagues from the Province of Quebec. There has been no such thing. The hon. members from the Province of Quebec met together, but they had no connection whatever with anybody outside of this House. They made up their minds to remonstrate, and, as was said by the right hon. First Minister, they did it constitutionally. I make these remarks in order to show that there are among the newspaper editors of the Province of Quebec, and especially at *L'Etendard*, persons who, urged by unavowable motives, which are unknown to me, write in their papers statements which are utterly inaccurate.

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAKE. Last night, when the hon. First Minister was not in his place, I called the attention of his colleagues to the propriety of stating a day for the second reading of the Franchise Bill some time in advance of the period which is to be fixed for the second reading, for reasons which I then stated, and which seems to receive the assent of the hon. gentleman's colleagues. I ask now if he can name the day when he proposes to read that Bill, because the earlier the day is named, the longer period will hon. members have to prepare themselves for its consideration. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance, who disappointed us to-day by not introducing the Factory Bill, whether he proposes that that shall be introduced without any serious delay, because we are already at a somewhat advanced period of the Session. Then, with reference to the addresses, I had hoped that we would to-day have had supplied the defects in the returns already made as to the position of the High Commissioner and the Minister of Railways, but I call attention to the fact that the addresses or orders for the papers on this subject, especially those which should come from the Department of Agriculture, have not yet been complied with.

Mr. POPE. They are being made up now.

Mr. BLAKE. But they ought to have been made up a month ago.

Mr. POPE. We could not have made them up a month ago.

Mr. BLAKE. They ought to have been made up a month ago—a lunar month, which suits the hon. member better than a calendar month.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not catch the reason the hon. gentleman gave last night for asking for a day to be fixed for the second reading of the Franchise Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Because the measure is a very long one and a very important one, our attention has been directed to other subjects, and it seemed to me important that we should have four or five days' notice of the day which the hon. gentleman would propose to fix. I desired very early to make that statement because I did not wish, when the hon. gentleman proposed to read the Bill a second time, to interpose any delay. As I think it important to deliberate upon it as early as possible, I thought he should intimate to us as early as possible when he proposes that we should deliberate upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite recognize the unreasonableness of the hon. gentleman's suggestion, which is not in the lunar month sense. My hon. friend says he desires to have the Bill fully considered. The Bill was before the House last Session, and stood over for the purpose of consideration for a year, but, however, my hon. friend, with all his quickness of perception, with all his readiness in making up his judgment, has not yet made up his judgment. Therefore, it is quite reasonable that we should have a day fixed. I have not the slightest objection that Tuesday week should be fixed as the day, that is to say, if we get rid of the question now before the House in reference to the railway by that time, and unless some accident should prevent the hon. Minister of Finance from making his financial statement before that time. We desire that he should make that statement as early as possible and as soon as this Pacific Railway matter is disposed of, but, if by chance he cannot address the House before Tuesday week, then his measure will take precedence of mine, which will follow immediately after that.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the Resolutions respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, reported from Committee of the Whole (page 456), be read the second time.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to move. As a representative of the North-West, I suppose I ought to explain to the House and to the people my reasons for voting on these Resolutions as I have in the past. I am, I believe, the only representative from the North-West in the House who has voted against these Resolutions. I have several reasons for doing so, and one of the first is that I do not think it is in the interests of the country to have this money granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway without having something in return from the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have certain grievances in that country which, I think, this is the proper time to have remedied. I refer principally to the monopoly of railways in the North-West. My friend the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) the other night took occasion to make what I consider a very brilliant speech on the capabilities of the North-West, and I can heartily agree with all that he said so far as the natural advantages of that country are concerned. If it was possible to say more as to the natural advantages of that

country, I should do so, but I think he exhausted the subject. At the same time, I think he probably made a few mistakes when he closed up by endorsing the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by accepting the position that country is in under the high protective tariff, and also the land regulations. I think that possibly he and I might differ somewhat considerably on that. I believe the people of that country are just as much interested in having this road completed as those of any other Province, but it is the only Province, I believe, in which the veto power has been exercised in disallowing competing railways. I am greatly interested in that country and wish to see it prosper, and the only thing that will make it prosper is to have the country well settled, and to have the country well settled we must have good land regulations and reasonable rates on railways, and the only way to have reasonable rates on railways is to have competition. The rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway are, I think, a little high, inasmuch as it was said by the Minister of Railways, when this contract was let and this monopoly was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that they would have to run that road at a loss for the first ten years. If the Company get a monopoly of the carrying trade for twenty years they will be able to make up in the last ten years whatever they may fail to make in the first ten. We find by returns brought down to this House, and by a statement made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that during the ten months previous to that statement that Company had cleared net earnings of over \$900,000. Now, if the railway is paying at that rate, and the Government have a right to interfere in the regulation of freight rates, I think it is certainly the duty of the Government to interfere. If they have made these enormous profits in ten months at so early a period of their monopoly, when there is so small an amount of cultivation, and so sparse a population, it is evident that as the country becomes more thickly populated, the profits of the road will be something enormous. I must say that I have my doubts as to that statement made by the Company being correct. I believe that it was probably made for the purpose of improving the condition of the stock so that they might get the money to pay interest on their bonds. If that is the case, and they have made that amount of money, they have made it out of the operation of about 300 miles of road. I am one, Sir, who believes that it would have been in the interests of the Company if that road had not been constructed so rapidly in the west as it has been. It is well known by people of that country that settlement is very much scattered, and the scattered nature of the settlement makes it very inconvenient for farmers. I see by the papers within the last few days that it is not going to pay them to run trains to the western end of the line more than once a week, and Brandon to Moose Jaw more than twice a week. That clearly shows that they are constructing a road that will not pay. Now, there are a great many portions of that country in which it would pay the Company to operate a railway, particularly those portions which have been settled by people with the expectation of having a railway convenient to their settlements. But people who have gone there with these expectations have been disappointed. Instead of the Company building branch lines to accommodate existing settlers they have devoted their energies to pushing the main line westward. Of course hon. members may differ in opinion as to the wisdom of that policy, but for my part I think it is not wise, and I am certain that every mile that has been built west of the Province of Manitoba has been of no benefit. I must differ a little from some hon. gentlemen as to the character of the land west of Moose Jaw. From all I have learned I believe those lands are of very little consequence for the purpose of cultivation. I have not been over that section myself west of Moose Jaw, but from all I can learn—and I think I have quite as good sources of information

Mr. WATSON.

as any other hon. gentleman—that country is almost a barren wilderness. A surveyor who had been in that country last year informed me that in certain districts there is no rain for three months and a-half. I do not think any country can prosper, as a grain growing country, which is without rain for more than one-fourth of the year. Besides that, it is very difficult to get water. I know in some places the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has dug down as deep as 480 feet, and has been unable to find water. If the country were a paradise in all other respects, this want of water is a fatal objection. In some places it would cost a man more to get water, if he could get it at all, than it would cost him to buy a farm in Manitoba. I think, also, that the Government ought to have required the syndicate to build the road on the line laid out for it by the Government. I think the line ought to have followed the route laid out by the Mackenzie Government—I may say by both Governments. Many people have endured great hardships in that country on account of the change of route. People who went into that country six or seven years ago, settled on the line that was surveyed for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they are living there yet. They have broken up a certain portion of land and have cultivated a certain portion, but they cannot dispose of their grain, because it is too far to haul it to market. The result is they have had to put up with great hardships on account of the railway not having been built on the line laid down by the Government. I think that the construction of the line west of Brandon to the Rocky Mountains has been the cause of a great deal of speculation in that country. In fact, I think, the Railway Company have run the road south for the purpose of acquiring lands at the least possible cost, for the construction of the road. There were no settlers in that section of the country, and the lands on the north line, that laid down by the Government, were taken up. All the places for town sites had also been taken up; consequently, the railway syndicate could not benefit by the sale of town sites on the northern line, as they have on the southern line. I am sorry to hear any hon. gentleman in this House make use of such language as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) used the other night. People in the North-West are not spoiled. On different occasions they have had the spoon held out to them, but it has passed into some other people's mouths before it got to theirs. I can assure that hon. gentleman that I know something of the hardships suffered by the people of Ontario, but I can assure him also that there are many people in the North-West who have undergone just as great hardships as the early settlers of Ontario—and I believe even greater. The North-West is a country with a very rigorous climate. A person living in that country has to be both well fed and well clothed to stand the winter. In Ontario the winters are also cold, but there the people have many conveniences which are wanting to the people of the North-West. I think the hon. gentleman would know more about it if he would go out to these plains, and see what some of the people have to undergo. If he saw people without specially warm clothing, and probably without quite sufficient food in the house, where the farmer has to take his ox team, and go ten or twenty miles for wood, with the thermometer thirty degrees below zero, he would know something of the hardships they have to undergo.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a fine description you are giving of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let us have the truth for once.

Mr. WATSON. What I am stating is a fact. That is not the case in all portions of the country, but I am speaking of the portion of country west of the Province of Manitoba, which is very sparsely provided with wood.

An hon. MEMBER. What part?

Mr. WATSON. We will take Regina for instance.

Mr. BOWELL. What about it?

Mr. WATSON. You have to go ten or twenty miles for wood across the Regina plains. I did not obtain all my information from the press, but from traders and old residents, who have been in the country thirty or forty years, and I had information long before the Canadian Pacific Railway was built in that western country, and that information was, that from about twelve miles west of Moose Jaw, for many miles west, it was a barren country. I hope this may prove to be incorrect, and the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) the correct one. I do not circulate untruths for the sake of building up the country. As to Manitoba, too much cannot be said about the natural resources of that Province, and I believe if that country has a fair show and is well governed, it will be one of the brightest spots in this Dominion. But I must say, at the same time, that the land regulations have not been such as they might have been to have made the people well satisfied. The Government, I think, will admit that a few years ago these regulations were very often changed, and the same regulations could not be counted upon as existing for more than two or three months at a time. I am glad to say the regulations are better to-day. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite read the speeches delivered by hon. members, and they will remember that the hon. member for Lisgar eulogized the land regulations, the other night, and stated that a settler in Manitoba could receive 160 acres of homestead, and 160 acres of pre-emption. I am glad this is the case. Last year that hon. gentleman said that the worst speculators in the North-West were the settlers who obtained homesteads and pre-emptions. I did not agree with him then, nor do I now. I only hope the land regulations of the Dominion Government will continue to be as liberal as they are to-day. Then there is the question of branch lines. I think while the Government is granting this money to the syndicate every Province should see that some benefit is derived out of this grant. I observe by this arrangement the syndicate have to place every dollar they receive from the Dominion Government in the construction of the main line. They are to give all the road already constructed and the plant as security; consequently they will have nothing from which to realize in order to construct branch lines. I should like to see the Government make provision either for building, or assisting to build, branch lines through Manitoba. The settlements of which I spoke in the North-West, where the people went in and settled along the proposed line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, after waiting a number of years for the building of that railway, are now asked to give heavy bonuses to private companies for the building of a line along the same route as was proposed for the Pacific Railway Company—I refer to the road which the Manitoba and North-Western is building. That company is subsidized by the Government, and has obtained very heavy bonuses along the line. This, I think, should not be. I think the Dominion Government should endeavour to build, or have built, in the interests of the original pioneers of that country, such railways; and these, I think, would pay the Government and syndicate, and be greatly in the interests of the people. It would pay better to build fifty or one hundred miles of branch lines, and be able to run trains regularly over that distance, instead of rushing the road out west, where they do not feel disposed to run more than one train a week. There is another reason why I am opposed to the Resolutions. I believe that if the wheat of the North-West is to be shipped by an all-rail route to Montreal, after the cost of carriage has been

deducted, the prices received by the farmers will be very low. I think we will have to get to the seaboard by some quicker means than that. We have the road constructed to Port Arthur, which, I think, will be the outlet for the wheat of the North-West. Of course it will not be operated in winter, and I believe that the freight rate will be so high on the monopoly road along Lake Superior that, unless we have competition in Manitoba, it will not pay farmers to farm to any great extent. Two things are required in the North-West. First, we require cheap implements; and second, cheap freight rates for the exports of the country. We have to remember that in opening up the North-West doubt exists as to whether there is going to be a market found for all the North-West wheat; but with cheap freight rates we would be able to supply an enormous quantity of wheat, because I consider we can grow wheat of better quality and at less cost in Manitoba than in any other Province of the Dominion. I was a little surprised the other day to hear the hon. member for West Wellington (Mr. Orton), make use of such words as, that the only cause for dissatisfaction in the North-West at present was due to the frost there last fall and a few farmers and political agitators.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings). Hear, hear.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for East Hastings says "hear, hear." The hon. gentleman has been out into that country, and he should know. I do not think that some reports which the hon. gentleman has made have given altogether a true description of what he saw in that country. I know for a fact that the farmers have certain grievances. I do not think there is anything wrong or anything disloyal in the people asking the Government to remedy their grievances. A deputation of North-West farmers presented their case recently to the hon. First Minister and obtained a very good reception, but I think the reception will be about all they will get. They have returned without being very much encouraged; nevertheless, I hope the Government will remedy at least some of the grievances placed before them. We have also had the Premier of Manitoba here asking for certain concessions. I hope his request will receive favourable consideration; at present I believe the prospect of any remedy being applied is very discouraging. I will trouble the House by reading an extract from the *Winnipeg Times* headed "Manitoba's Position," that journal being, as hon. gentleman opposite well know, a supporter of the Government. Before doing so I may state that there are all classes of politicians in the Farmer's Union. So far as I am personally concerned I am not a member of the Union, I have never attended any meeting for the purpose of appointing delegates, and have taken no part in its arrangements lest it might be called a political organization, because I believe any class of men who find fault with the powers that be are declared to be acting for political purposes, or something of that kind. The *Winnipeg Times* of February 13th contains the following:—

"It is impossible just now to say to what extent Mr. Norquay has succeeded in his efforts to secure better terms for Manitoba. It appears to be certain, however, that he has failed to induce the Government to hand over the public lands to the Province; that the Government has not determined to extend our boundaries to Hudson's Bay; and that the question of giving the North-West a representative in the Cabinet is still undecided. Some concession will probably be made to us in the shape of an increase of subsidy; but it must be confessed that the east is not disposed to deal generously by us.

"Mr. White, the very able member for Cardwell, doubtless voiced public opinion there when he declared that the people of the North-West wanted too much. The Eastern Provinces, notably those on the seaboard, have made up their minds that the Canadian Pacific Railway is being built solely in North-West interests. They ignore their own admission that construction is being paid for out of the sale of our lands; and that the road is in all respects as much a necessity of Confederation as the Intercolonial or Welland Canal, neither of which benefit us,

although we are paying considerably more than a fair share of the interest on the borrowed money that built them. These are patent facts, but with singular unreasonableness the east declines to admit their existence; and the Ministry is, of course, swayed by Eastern opinion. It may as well be admitted to-day as to-morrow that the door has been shut in the face of Manitoba, and that we are in the uncomfortable position of a young member of a family for whose future no adequate provision has been made.

"What is to be done about it? It is useless to blame Mr. Norquay. He has evidently done his best, and so have the Manitoba members and other prominent Manitobans now at the Capital. To advocate secession is entirely out of the question unless we are prepared for the inevitable result—annexation to the States. The only prudent course for us to pursue is to specifically formulate our demands, neither exaggerating them nor asking too little, and submit them direct to Parliament through the agency of our representatives."

That is the voice of the *Manitoba Times*, the exponent of the opinions and principles of hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Norquay has been here for some time, asking that the boundaries of the Province be extended, and that is a question upon which the people are more agitated, perhaps, than any other. They wish, also, to acquire their own public lands, if possible, so that they would be in a position to help themselves. At present they are exactly in the position described in this article from the *Times*, that is, of a young member of a family for whose future no adequate provision has been made. They have no resources of their own, nothing with which to subsidize a railway, and I think all the demands which have been made by our Premier, Mr. Norquay, should be acceded to. He asks also, for a readjustment of the financial position. We pay into the Dominion Treasury a larger proportion than any other Province, and I believe we receive less. The people of that Province are all agitated at present over the prospect of having the Hudson Bay Railway opened, one cause being, I believe, that they realize that the products of that country cannot be shipped by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the sea-board, and consequently they wish for a shorter and better route. If our boundaries were extended to the Hudson Bay, and our public lands acquired by our Province, the people would be in a position to assist in building this road if they saw fit. I think Mr. Norquay has laid his case very plainly and fairly before the Government, and that his demands are just and fair, and I trust, therefore, that the Government will give them a favourable consideration. Mr. Norquay did not, perhaps, ask for as much as the people of the North-West wanted him to ask for, but he came down with the intention of putting the people of Manitoba in a position to help themselves. I can assure hon. gentlemen that the agitation spoken of by the hon. member for Wellington has been underestimated. The delegates appointed at the first convention may not have been as representative as they might be—I will say nothing about that—but those gentlemen who have formed themselves into the Manitoba Farmers' Union, who have drafted a constitution and formulated certain resolutions which were presented by them, represent about 20,000 of the people of Manitoba, who belong to the Union, who have endorsed the actions of the first meeting, and of the delegates who came down here. I may read a telegram from Winnipeg on that subject. It is dated February 18th:

"The council of the Manitoba and North-West Farmers' Union has issued an address to the people of the Province, inviting the co-operation of all classes in considering the course to be taken to obtain relief from Dominion oppression. This is done in consequence of the report of the Ottawa delegates, who have returned. The address says: 'We believe that the time has arrived when the Province and the North-West by united action are compelled to force redress by determined and constitutional means.' A general convention is called to meet at Winnipeg on March 5th. At a meeting held to receive the delegates, very strong talk was indulged in by both Conservatives and Liberals. Secession was freely advocated, and grave difficulty may be confidently anticipated if the demands of the Province are not conceded."

This may seem rather a trifling matter here in the east, because our Province is young and struggling; but hon.

Mr. WATSON.

gentlemen must remember that the people who settled there are mostly composed of young men who went there to better their condition, and who will take a firm stand in trying to get their Province into the same position as the other Provinces under Confederation. With regard to freights in the North-West upon the Canadian Pacific Railway last fall as compared with other lines, I may state, that the freight rates of that road from Portage la Prairie to St. Vincent, a distance of 126 miles, were 19½ cents per 100 lbs, and that on the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba, for a distance of 392 miles between St. Vincent and St. Paul the freight rates charged for the same quantity of wheat was 21 cents. I think this shows that the freight rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway are excessive. The rates on the American road may be due to a certain extent to the effort to divert trade from the Canadian Pacific Railway line to Port Arthur, a competition which, however, I would not care to see stopped. I do not think it is right to give a monopoly to any road, nor do I think it will be right to grant this money unless certain concessions are given to the Dominion and the North-West; because I believe the biggest card the Dominion Government could play to get people into that country would be to advertise that they had the best lands in the world, and no monopoly in railways. What we want is competition, and for that reason I have drafted the amendment which I propose to submit, and which I hope will receive consideration. I suppose this amendment will be attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite, who claim that there is no monopoly in Manitoba. At the same time, we have the fact before us that the Government have disallowed charters granted by the Local Legislature, which we considered should not have been disallowed. They were disallowed, not because it was particularly specified in the contract that they should be disallowed, but the Minister of Justice, I believe, claimed that their disallowance was required by the spirit of the contract. Now, there is no certainty that this will not occur again. The hon. Minister of Railways has stated that he may see fit, at the end of two years, to do away with the monopoly clause. If it is right to do that in two years, I think it would be much better to do it at present. I think now is the time to strike, when the Company are asking aid from the Government; and if we give that aid, we should get some *quid pro quo*. The syndicate claim, I believe, that after they complete the road north of Lake Superior, they will defy competition. I doubt that. I think the cheapest route from the North-West to the Eastern Provinces is by way of Port Arthur, and I hope the Government will see to it that the freight rates are not excessive on that part of the line of railway; because when we get to Port Arthur, we have the competition of the lake steamboats. I must repeat again that I believe the hon. member for Lisgar did not represent the feelings of the people of the North-West, and I do not think this Government believe so, when he endorsed the National Policy. If any part of the country has suffered from the high tariff, it has been Manitoba and the North-West, because we have no manufacturers there, and everything which we require comes from the Eastern Provinces or the United States. I am one of those who believe that the consumer pays the duty, and that being the case, Manitoba has to pay a large and excessive portion of the duty which is contributed to the Dominion exchequer. I hope that this amendment will carry, and that the Government will take this opportunity of requiring from the syndicate something in return for the large amount of money they are to receive. I might also state, as the hon. member for Lisgar was eulogised as an independent Liberal who was going to vote for the Government, that he was not always a Liberal. In fact, I do not know what he has been, for I suppose we may take for granted

that if an assertion is made with reference to an hon. gentleman, and he does not contradict it, we may accept it as true. Perhaps the House will remember that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), last Session, when describing the members from Manitoba, stated that he himself and the hon. member for Winnipeg supported the Government, that the hon. member for Selkirk was elected on the railway question, and I believe he gave me credit for being elected on a straight party issue; but he said that the hon. member for Lisgar represented himself—that Ross was elected for Ross. Probably the interests of that constituency have changed, for that hon. gentleman did not always speak of the monopoly in the same terms that he did the other night. I may read to the House a motion which that hon. gentleman made in the Legislature of Manitoba on 24th December, 1880:

"Mr. Ross moved for an address to the Governor in Council, praying that the terms proposed with the syndicate may not be entered into, inasmuch as the said terms will be found unacceptable to the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territory, more particularly part of clause 11 and clauses 14, 15 and 16."

Clause 11 gives the Company power to select their lands; clause 14 relates to the construction of branches; clause 15 is the restriction as to competing lines, better known as the monopoly clause; and clause 16 relates to exemption from taxation. The hon. gentleman went on after that to deliver a very vigorous speech against the action of the Government in agreeing to give the syndicate such a monopoly in that country, and amongst other things he said:

"People are willing to pay taxes to build roads to have them run for the benefit of the Canadian people, but not to swell the gains of incorporators across the lines."

If the speech was not so long, I do not know that I could make a better argument against this monopoly than to read it; and I am sorry to see him endorsing the action of the Government in this matter, after moving in the direction that he did at that time. But, as I said before, the interests of the constituency of Ross may have changed since then. I move, seconded by Mr. Holton, that all the words after the word "that" in the said motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:

"That said Resolutions be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with power to provide, that as a condition of granting the proposed aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it should be stipulated that the Company shall no longer claim, that no lines of railway should be permitted to be constructed within Manitoba South of the Canadian Pacific Railway, except such lines as shall run South-West, or to the Westward or South-West, and that no lines of railway should be permitted to be constructed within fifteen miles of latitude 49."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I just ask this hon. House to give me ten or fifteen minutes in which to say a few words with regard to the North-West Territory from personal experience. I will promise that I will read no motions or speeches, and as I have no notes, I shall not occupy much of the time of the House. I believe that the British Columbia Resolutions were carried through the House of Commons in the year 1871. From that time to the present I have heard very many eloquent speeches for and against the Canadian Pacific Railway, for and against British Columbia, for and against the North-West Territory. I must say that up to the time I had the privilege of visiting that country, I knew very little about it. On leaving Winnipeg, I had only to look in every direction from the window of the car as I went along, and every place that I visited showed nothing but beautiful lands, and at every station, until we reached Brandon, I saw people coming to meet their friends from the older Provinces. We went at the rate of from twenty to twenty-five miles an hour, and all along the route there was no end of fine land. Although I had often heard that along the line of the railway the land was not good, I was satisfied that these reports were unfounded, as mile after mile of the finest land met my view,

and Mr. Holt, the engineer of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, said to me, you can go to bed and get up in the morning, and day after day you will find the same fine country. You may make the run from Winnipeg to Calgary, 860 miles, and I am satisfied that along the line there are not fifty miles where you will not see, as far as the eye can carry, first class land fit for settlement. The hon. gentlemen from Marquette says the railway is constructed too fast. Was it constructed too fast to Portage La Prairie for the hon. gentleman, who, I am proud to say, has made his fortune there, and I hope he will live long to enjoy it? It is not built too fast to reach Regina and Moose Jaw, because along the line until you reach that point there are quite a number of settlers. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman is it built too fast to reach the coal mines at Medicine Hat which have reduced the price of coal from by \$4 or \$5 a ton, if not in the city of Winnipeg, at least throughout the great North-West Territory? I can say now that had it not been for the opening up of the Medicine Hat coal mines the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territory would be paying to-day \$16 per ton for coal when it can be purchased in Winnipeg for \$10. Will the hon. gentleman say that the railway is constructed too fast, when its construction brings about the supplying of that fuel? I would ask the hon. gentleman if the herdsmen think the road is being constructed too fast? Had Mr. Cochrane's rancho been well managed, and I regret it was not, they would have been able to ship from Calgary a large number of cattle this year, as they would have had more than could be consumed in that country. Do the ranchmen believe that the road is being constructed too fast? Then when I had the pleasure of getting to the summit of the Rocky Mountains and passed through that beautiful valley of the Bow River, I had a talk with the miners who had been there, some a year, some six months, some three months, and they said to me: "White, use your influence that we may have a liberal mining Bill, because this country is rich in ore, because it has large quantities of precious metals that will enrich the Dominion of Canada." I ask if the miners of the Rocky Mountains think the road is being constructed too fast. The full extent of the railway strike was reached when I arrived at Moose Jaw, and I was astonished to meet the number of men I did from around London and the county of Middlesex<sup>1</sup> and to hear how well they spoke of my hon. friend the Postmaster-General; but the next day, after the strike occurred on the railway, they said: "Well, we sometimes find fault with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but what under the sun would we do without it? It is the only hope, the only prospect we have of getting in everything we want and sending out everything we raise; we cannot do without the road and we hope the strike will soon be over." When we reached Medicine Hat we saw not one train load of coal from that mine, but six train loads brought on a siding to send to different parts of Manitoba and the great North-West Territory. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, when he speaks of the interests of the people of that great country, whether there is anything they require more than heat, whether there is anything they require more than coal? They have the land, and when they get the coal it will help them very much. Had not the road been constructed the people would have suffered in that direction at all events. I believe that the hon. gentleman did say, or at least if he did not, others did, that the road was not well constructed.

Mr. WATSON. What I stated was that I consider the Canadian Pacific Railway have a good road and I think it is well operated. All that I have travelled over I have no fault to find with, as regards construction.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has stated this because his political friend will believe my state-

ment when it is endorsed by the hon. gentleman. The road as constructed is, I say, creditable to the Company. They not only have the track well constructed with easy grades, but at every nine or ten miles along the whole 860 miles, they have two sidings, one on each side of the track, and the road is raised about three feet from the prairie and every precaution is taken against its being affected by the snow drifts. They have built snow fences or banks of earth in order to keep the drifts from coming in at certain parts of the line, and there are not better stations, or sidings, or round-houses, or places for the men to reside in, on any other road on this continent than on the Canadian Pacific Railway, until you reach the summit of the Rocky Mountains, less the station that is to be constructed at Calgary. They are only working in the interests of the people and I believe their rates of freight will compare favourably with those of any other road going through a similar country. I believe the officials are doing everything they can to meet the requirements of the country. I believe the Company deserve a great deal of credit, and it is not right, proper, just or honest for any hon. gentleman to stand up in this House and try and injure the character of the road or the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman said that so far as climate was concerned, it was not a good climate. I never before, as long as I have lived in this country, slept under canvas. On the first of January at four o'clock in the afternoon, I left Calgary, and with two others drove forty miles across the plains. After dark we cooked something to eat and then slept in a shanty on the ground as we had no boards. On the next day we drove fifty miles, and the following day 120 miles across the country to the Rocky Mountains, sleeping under canvas ten nights, and during that time we saw no houses, shanties, or wigwams, or inhabitants, but an excellent country and a great deal of timber destroyed by fire. I believe that for 220 miles from Calgary, on the north of the Saskatchewan, to the Rocky Mountain House, there is not over thirty miles of poor land, or of land that will not compare favourably with the very best in Ontario, Quebec, or the other Provinces.

Mr. WATSON. I said nothing about the climate. I said, I think, that we had a rigorous climate. It is sometimes cold in winter there.

Mr. BOWELL. You said the land was no good.

Mr. WATSON. As far as the climate is concerned, I believe we have the best in Canada.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it was forty below zero. If so, I think I should have met with it between the 1st and the 13th or 14th of January, when I only had the pleasure of sleeping one or two nights under a roof, and the rest of the time under canvas; and, Mr. Speaker, I am back here, and I feel as sound as any man in this House, I feel as happy as you please. The climate—there is none on the continent to beat it. The Chinook winds, coming through from British Columbia along the base of the Rocky Mountains, make a man feel good, better than adulterated medicine or adulterated whiskey. As far as the climate is concerned, I say we have everything that we can desire. It may possibly at times be cold in and around Winnipeg, and in some portions of Manitoba, but the hon. gentleman will agree with me that the bright, clear sun from the time it rises in the morning until it sets at night, the bright, clear atmosphere makes it a really healthy and invigorating climate to reside in, and he will agree with me that, as far as that country is concerned, it has a grand—yes, a grand future before it. The hon. gentleman said, too, in his remarks, that so far as that country is concerned, they should have more side lines and less Canadian Pacific Railway constructed into the Rocky Mountains. I would, I think, not

Mr. WHITE (Hastings.)

be out of place now, to make a few remarks concerning other and older Provinces. If you take the county I have the honour to reside in, the city of Belleville gave \$150,000 to one road, the county \$80,000, three townships about \$45,000, and we constructed a railway believing we would have a road independent of the Grand Trunk Railway, but, after it was run for a short time, we were anxious that the Grand Trunk Railway should take it over, because it would be better accommodated, better run, better controlled, and better managed than by those who belonged to the company that had constructed it. I believe the hon. gentleman lived for some time in the Province of Ontario, and he should know that there are a great number of people residing in very thickly settled parts of the country who paid their portion of the money that went to the Grand Trunk Railway, paid their portion of the money that was required to buy the North-West from the Hudson Bay Company, and will pay their portion of what is going into the Canadian Pacific Railway for its construction, and their portion of what the Local Government has paid to railways. They are taxed for the next fifteen or twenty years for the money given to railways to construct them, and they cannot get over paying that. Does he forget that there are in that Province of Ontario, many people living fifty or sixty miles from railways? Does he forget that, in some of the best settled parts of the country, many farmers live twelve, fifteen and twenty miles from railways? And yet he is finding fault because the Canadian Pacific Railway did not stop at Portage la Prairie, or Regina, or Moose Jaw, and take the balance of the road and construct it to every man's door, so that every man having a bushel of wheat to take away would have nothing to do but to put it on his back and throw it into a railway car. It is impossible for this House or for this country to do that. After the railway is constructed, and after the assistance which the Government are giving and are anxious to give has been expended, the people there must do what they have done in the older Provinces—put their hands in their own pockets, and construct their short lines of railway wherever they wish. The hon. Minister said that, as far as the monopoly clause in Manitoba was concerned, it would be removed in two years, when the road was constructed north of Lake Superior. I have no doubt that, if that monopoly clause was not removed, the Government would make an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to carry freight at the same rate as it is carried *via* Chicago to the sea-board, and at the same local rate given by the Grand Trunk to the localities it goes through; that would be satisfactory to the people of the North-West; and it is all they should ask, all they should expect, and all they should look for. It has been said that there has been a great deal of agitation in the North-West Territory, and it has been said by some parties that the people there were disloyal and were anxious to connect with the United States of America. I have been through that country, and I think I am safe in saying that I have as many friends in that country as any hon. member of this House, and I have talked with people in different localities and different sections of the country, and I make the assertion to-day that ninety-nine out of every hundred are loyal to the Canadian Government, loyal to Canada, and anxious to remain a part and parcel of Canada. Ninety-nine—yes, I am safe in saying nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand are loyal to this country and are anxious to belong to this country. I go further, and say that nineteen-twentieths of the people are satisfied with the land laws of the North-West Territories, and the land laws of Manitoba are better and more in their interest than the laws of the United States of America. Let me go further. A remark was made by the hon. member for Grey asking where was the Minister of the Interior—was he writing pamphlets? When that

hon. gentleman thought it necessary in the interests of this country to write pamphlets, he wrote them successfully, and he circulated them successfully, and he educated the people successfully, and, as he, with power and determination, circulated pamphlets to educate the people to the believe in the necessity of a change of Government. I am confident he will administer the affairs of the country and the great Interior Department of this country to the entire satisfaction of every man of a reasonable mind. Every man who has a reasonable demand to make will be met reasonably and honestly and conscientiously, but we do not expect or hope to give satisfaction to the agitators, the office-seekers, the men who go round talking as they have in the North-West. It is impossible to provide these men with places, and the people of this House and of this country must set their face against it, and when there is an agitation brought up by an office-seeker, or a man who has been put out of office because he did not do his duty, or a man who wants to be a member of this House or a member of the Local House, or a man who has an axe to grind, we must say: "We will do to you as we do to the rest of the people of this country, we will do what is fair and just and honest, but nothing more." If the House and the country are going to pay the attention they have in the past to the agitators in the North-West Territories, it will be utterly impossible to satisfy them. If every dollar that could be collected and every dollar that could be earned were sent into that country to build railways, it would not satisfy them, but they must be educated to believe that they are used as well as any other part of this great Dominion of Canada. I would say, too, for the information of the hon. member for Grey, that I am satisfied that any information he requires from the Interior Department, or the first Minister, that they will be anxious to give it him or any other hon. member, and that they will not suffer because the Minister of the Interior is not a member of this hon. House. So far as these Resolutions are concerned, I do not believe, looking at the bargain, or the contract or the agreement or the money loaned, if the Government discharge their duty, and I believe they will, that we are going to suffer anything by the operation or by the agreement. Why should we? We have got from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the control of \$35,000,000 of stock. The Government, I am informed by the public press of the country during last fall, have the right to enter into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that they should take a certain amount of money, enough to pay 3 per cent. on the \$100,000,000 of bonds for ten years, and give them a certain interest on the money up to the time they paid them out to the parties holding the bonds. If such is the case, why should we as a people suffer by this loan? The Finance Minister goes to the Old Country with 35,000,000 of bonds on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he says to the money lenders: "We will take 70 cents for those bonds." Can he not bring back to this country the \$22,500,000, and will he not have, making a rough calculation, about \$6,000,000 left? I am satisfied the Finance Minister will make that arrangement, and if he does, what right have we to be alarmed? But suppose he does not. The hon. member for West Durham, in that eloquent language we all admire, said that the lands, if I mistake not, were worth \$3.10 per acre, on an average. I suppose he calculated that the 10 cents were for survey. Well, suppose it is worth \$3.10; cannot this Government get back from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000, even if the land is only worth \$2 per acre? Are we then going to lose our money? I would like to ask the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) who owns, or who has owned, 30,000 acres in the very garden of Manitoba—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where?

Mr. WHITE. Well, in Southern Manitoba. Did you never own any there?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is a little too stretching in his calculations.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman will not say that the land is not worth \$2 per acre over a great portion of that country. He is satisfied it is. I am confident that if he sold the lands he now has in Southern Manitoba at \$2 an acre, and invest in the Nor'-West, he would be satisfied that he would have just as good a property as any Napanee landlord owns in the town of Napanee. We have heard a great deal said about better terms for Prince Edward Island, better terms for Nova Scotia, better terms for New Brunswick, better terms for Quebec, better terms for Ontario, better terms for Manitoba and the North-West—I believe British Columbia has not asked for better terms. We have heard it said that this company and that company, this Province and that Province, ought to be looked after; that this society and that society, this countryman and that countryman, ought to be looked after. I believe, so far as we are concerned, in discussing this great question, we ought not to know any Province, any locality, or any people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that road will yet help Prince Edward Island; I believe it will help Nova Scotia, and all the other Provinces—that we will all be benefited by it. Why not go to work like men and say: We will do what is right with this Company; we will do what is right with each other, and let the Government step in and assist each Province the best they can. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe there are many people asking for assistance; I am confident the Government will meet every demand as far as they reasonably can. Now, the hon. gentleman said in his remarks that the Hon. Mr. Norquay, Premier of Manitoba, was down here demanding better terms. He said that the farmers of the North-West formed themselves into a union and sent three delegates down to this Government to demand better terms—so-called. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the course the Government ought to pursue is to consult those gentlemen who are selected by the people, and let the Local Government stay at home and attend to their duties. I was very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that he kept away from their meetings, and he discounted any delegates coming to Ottawa. He himself knows that in anything he has got to bring before the House or the Government, he would be listened to and treated with that courtesy, that respect, that his position and that of his constituents deserve. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said that the Province of Manitoba was suffering from the National Policy. Well, that is a matter I think we can very easily compare notes on. Is it not a benefit to the people of Manitoba to have a protection of fifteen cents a bushel on their wheat. So far as the people of Manitoba are concerned they can manufacture goods as cheaply as they can be manufactured in Ontario. Will the hon. gentleman contradict that statement? He can buy a reaper in Manitoba for \$270; he can buy the same reaper manufactured in the city of London for \$270; he can buy the same machine in the city of Ottawa for \$270; he can buy it throughout Ontario for that price; and therefore are the people of Manitoba going to suffer? The hon. gentleman knows that these machines could be purchased in Manitoba last summer as cheap—yes \$10 cheaper—than the year before. I have the authority, and I have the public statement, of an agent of a party that sells machines for United States and Canadian manufacturers, who assured me that they were sold \$10 cheaper last year than the year before. And he assured me that the increase of duty did not affect the machines last year, nor would it affect the machines this year, because they already had enough on hand to supply the demand. The deputation that came

down here went home satisfied, and they had to admit that in the matter of agricultural implements they were not wrongly dealt with, and did not have much to complain of. I think the hon. gentleman says that they have no manufactures there. Why, have they not cheap coal? Will he deny that fact? He may say they cannot manufacture because they have not the raw material. If you can take a car load of raw material sufficient to build twenty-five or thirty machines. The people of Winnipeg and the North-West will soon commence to manufacture their own machines, and then they will be very highly pleased with the National Policy, and see that Protection benefits them. The hon. gentleman says that the people of the North-West have to pay a high rate of freight. He knows well that in Ontario a farmer has got to plough a field three times, and summer fallow it in order to get one crop in two years, sometimes, and seed it twice because it gets winter-killed. But in the North-West the case is far different. The hon. gentleman will agree with me that they can raise wheat and make more money at 60 cents a bushel than the farmers in Ontario can at \$1 a bushel. He will not deny that fact. And why? They plough the land in the fall, they sow the grain in the spring, and they reap it quicker and easier than they do in Ontario, because the land is not so rough. They get it and thresh it all by steam, and the land produces such great crops that the people have greater profits. Then the hon. gentleman will agree with me that agricultural implements will last a great deal longer in that country than in Ontario. He won't deny that statement. Then the land is not so rough, machines are not so liable to get out of repair. Now, I do think that that hon. gentleman, and every other hon. member from his Province, should give their support to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let them bear in mind that it is their salvation and their prosperity, and will be the advancement of that great country. Now, the hon. gentleman says that they want the Hudson Bay Railway built. The people of that country think they ought to have the road; but if it will not pay to send grain by way of Montreal, I should like to know how it will pay to send it by Hudson's Bay when the Straits are only navigable for about three or four months. The hon. gentleman, if I mistake not, is engaged in milling, or has something to do with the milling business. If he goes to the bank and wishes to obtain a large sum of money with which to buy wheat, the first question asked is, how are you going to ship it? The answer is, by the Canadian Pacific Railway direct to Liverpool. If wheat were shipped to Hudson's Bay, it would lie over till next summer, and would not reach Liverpool until next year. I know well such a scheme could not be profitable. At the same time the Government should render all the assistance possible, because the people in the North-West believe they should have a Hudson's Bay railway built. The hon. gentleman further stated that he thought the Government should aid branch lines; that the people were not satisfied with the way in which they were treated by the Dominion Government, and that they paid more duty per head than any other Province of the Dominion. I hope and trust the Government of Manitoba will not be placed in a position in which they could plunge the Province into debt, because we have the experience of other Provinces possessing as great resources and men as fully as well qualified to govern as Manitoba. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House and country the reasons for much of the agitation, and why the agitators obtained the ear of the farmers. He forgot that owing to the unfortunate frost last summer—I do not say he did it or that it was done at the mills at Portage la Prairie, but it was done at the remaining mills—millers paid only 25 cents, 40, 45 and up to 60 cents per bushel for

Mr. WHITE (Hastings).

wheat. The hon. gentleman will not deny that statement; that the average was about 45 cents per bushel.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). On an average the wheat, I believe, brought 45 cents. I think the millers—I do not say he did so because I think he is too honest—paid on an average about 50 cents.

Mr. WATSON. Fifty cents for frozen wheat.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Frozen wheat was bought at from 30 to 35 cents and as high as 40 cents. But I tell the hon. gentleman that the millers of that country said that four-fifths of the wheat was frozen. Some of the best wheat ever grown was brought in, and the millers said they would not have it, because it was frozen. They, however, bought it at 45 cents per bushels, and sold the flour at \$2.75 per 100 weight. They made \$1.25 per hundred for grinding flour and had the bran and shorts. If the hon. gentleman has been guilty of anything of that kind, it would be well for him to ask himself honestly if he has done his duty to those people. \$1.25 is really too much. He might throw in the bran and shorts. There, indeed, is a grinding monopoly; and when he places the belt on the machinery turning the stones, he grinds—what? He grinds from the unfortunate farmer the money which should pay for agricultural implements, the money which should go to buy tea and sugar, and clothes, and boots and shoes to enable the little ones to go to school. I am satisfied that the millers of Manitoba have had more to do with the adversity of that Province than any other class of the community, and I ask the hon. gentleman if such is not the fact—I do not say he is guilty, not at all.

Mr. WATSON. I have not been in the milling business for two years.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I knew I was safe in saying the hon. gentleman did not do it; but he knows it has been done. I am very glad he has sold out his business; but I really wish I were the owner. I would grind every cent out of the unfortunate farmers of the North-West, and then come down here and hurl a piece of the stone which ground the wheat, at the heads of the Government, and say they were the guilty parties, while at the same time I would put the dollars quietly in my pocket. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, I am glad to say, admitted that the Government were not responsible for the wheat being frozen. They well know that twelve months from now they will have no chance of getting up an agitation in the North-West. Who was the head centre of that movement, the great man who got up the Resolutions, and who advertised and took great interest in the meetings? It was that good and honest man, the late Judge Ryan. Bad as the hon. First Minister may be, I would rather take him as my guide than Judge Ryan, a man who has discharged his duties neither in the interest of the Government nor of the country. I hope the Resolutions will be carried by the same majority as was given on the votes already recorded, and I am satisfied the hon. Finance Minister twelve months hence will have no reason to find fault with the action of Parliament. I trust the Minister of Railways will make an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they should give the same through rates to the people of the North-West and Manitoba as American farmers, millers and merchants get to Chicago, and the same local freights as the Grand Trunk, with all its faults, gives to shippers along its line. One word as to the Grand Trunk. There is no member of the House more anxious for the prosperity of the Grand Trunk than I am. The company deserve every consideration at the hands of members on both sides of the House. They have had a great deal to

contend with; they have fought the battle and fought it well. But have not the Conservative party stood true to them on all occasions? That party stood up for the company when their enemies were making the most of little accidents and wrong-doings for which the company were not perhaps responsible, and stood by the company until they got a good road bed, good rolling stock and a satisfactory financial position—the company has forgotten that party, and gone over to hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us hope and trust that the members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company belonging to the Reform party will not forget those who stood true to them when in need of assistance, but perhaps they will pursue a like course, when it is to their interests and do everything they can to decry and put down the interests and prosperity of that country. I repeat, that there are many on the other side, who do not do this, but they are outside of those who want to be ministers or expect to be ministers. Let us hope and trust that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will construct this work within the two years; let us hold the Government responsible for getting the agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government which was announced to this House, carried out. It is our duty to help the Government to carry out this agreement, and let us unite as honest men, not as Englishmen, or Irishmen, or Scotchmen, or Frenchmen, but as Canadians—not as representatives of Manitoba, or Ontario, or Quebec, or any other Province, but as Canadians who represent the whole of this Dominion—let us unite to do good to the country as a whole. I am satisfied that the contract which has been entered into, and the present Resolutions, will be sustained by the people of the country, and I have great pleasure in supporting the Resolutions introduced by the hon. Minister of Railways.

Mr. GASEY. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. White) seems to be greatly exercised for fear any doubt should be cast on the goodness of the climate of Manitoba; and he instances his own experiences of that climate, as a proof that it is a good one. I am sure, Sir, that the climate of that country must have agreed with the hon. gentleman, for not only has it retained him in good health, and enabled him to come here full of energy, but it appears also, to have added eloquence to his tongue, unless that eloquence and fluency with which he has addressed us to-day, were acquired in pow-wow with Pie-a-pot and other native orators in the North-West, for he appears to have spoken with more freedom and enthusiasm than usual. I agree with him in this, that a visit to the North-West is sufficient to excite anybody's enthusiasm about that country, and that it is impossible for anybody who has been there to speak otherwise of the country than in terms which may appear somewhat enthusiastic and overstrained to those who have not seen it. I believe the climate of the North-West needs no defence either from the hon. member for East Hastings or myself. The sentence in the remarks of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) which gave rise to this discussion, was a very simple and innocent one. He wished to point out that every new country had its hardships and disadvantages, though people seemed to suppose that Manitoba had none of these and that, therefore, they did not so much need the railway facilities which the people of Ontario might require. He pointed out that men at a distance from the railway might find it awkward to drive thirty or forty miles in one of the cold days which occurred in that country, though they were not much colder than some weather we have had here in the capital, but even on those days it would be inconvenient to drive that distance with a yoke of oxen for a load of wood. I think it was only a fair and proper deduction from that statement, that the settlers should have a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway to bring them some of the coal about which my hon. friend

from Hastings said so much. The inference was, I think, a legitimate one, but the Minister of Railways must interject his interruption and give the cue to his followers, as to the way they were to treat this illustration. Why, Sir, if everybody who mentions any of the evils incident to Manitoba, or any other part of Canada, is disparaging the country, we have an account to settle with some gentlemen on the other side. We have an account to settle with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who allowed an advertisement of Kansas, or Texas, or some wild-cat colonization scheme in the United States, to be printed within the covers of one of his immigration pamphlets.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CASEY. Well, I should know; I saw it myself.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says he permitted it, but he knows that it was put there without his knowledge, and that as soon as the Minister ascertained it, it was suppressed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. After it was published under the impress of the Department.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly; we know that.

Mr. CASEY. It advised the people to stop wrestling with stumps and stones in Ontario, and to go where they would not have these disadvantages—that is in the Western States. That was disparaging the country, and the Minister of Customs says the advertisement was put there without the knowledge of the Minister of Agriculture. If that be the case the Department of Agriculture must be in a strange condition, and we will have to remove the hon. Minister who now fills that office, and put in his place the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White), or the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), or some other gentleman, who, no doubt, from the interest taken in this question, will see that advertisements speaking favourably of foreign countries and disparagingly of our own are not put in documents issued from the Department. I think the explanation made by the Minister of Customs is about as damaging an attack on the Minister of Agriculture as could possibly be made—that they could get in without his knowledge and consent. As to the question of climate, I think my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Ross) who spoke on this question distinctly admitted that some of the north-western States had a better climate than Manitoba. I am inclined to doubt his information, because I have information from others who have had experience of both countries, that the climate of Manitoba is better; but at any rate if we discuss the admission and statements made by members on both sides, it is only proper to quote the language of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), in comparison with that of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). Coming back, however, to my hon. friend from Hastings, I find that he wound up with a pious ejaculation. He said: "Let us hope and trust that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will finish the railway in two years, and do what they propose to do; and let us hope and trust that the Government will see that the terms of the contract are carried out." Well, Sir, that is the proper frame of mind for a supporter of the Government in regard to this question. He should be in a trustful, hopeful, frame of mind, for we have no guarantee that these terms will be carried out; it must be a matter of trust and faith, and those who support the Resolutions must do so simply by trusting in the good faith of the Railway Company, and in the controlling power of the Government. I have no doubt that past experience of the controlling influence of the Government, of the sharp oversight they have exercised over this railway Company, of the manner in which they have compelled them to do things for the interests of Canada, instead of in the interests of the Company, of the manner in

which they compelled them to abandon routes chosen in their own interests, which were not in the interests of the country—these past experiences have, no doubt, convinced my hon. friend from Hastings that we were safe in trusting to the Government and railway Company to do right. As the late lamented Artemus Ward said, "I speak somewhat ironically on this occasion," and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman sees it. The question has been raised as to whether the land adjoining the road of the Canadian Pacific Railway, west of Moose Jaw, is as good as that in old Manitoba—whether, indeed, it is fit for settlement at all. Now, I am prepared to believe that it is fit for settlement—or a great part of it—from reports I have heard, though equally trustworthy reports have given it a bad character. But I am prepared to believe on the testimony of my hon. friend, who has seen the country, that it is fit for settlement; but to say that it is as good as old Manitoba would be too absurd. In fact, the present route of the railway was not selected with the object of touching the best lands, or opening up the best part of that country for settlement. I contend that, in deciding upon the route of that railway, which is looked on as a great Government work, the Government should have insisted on the railway following such a route as would open up the greatest extent of good land for settlement. I think that is reasonable. I think also that the route selected by the present hon. Minister of Railways when he first took office was probably as good a route as could have been chosen. I am not going into the question of the change he made in the route laid out by his predecessors, in the eastern part of the prairie, but I refer more particularly to the western portion of the route. The railway, if built on the route first adopted by the hon. Minister of Railways, would have followed pretty much the line now laid out by the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. It would have struck out into the Birtle country, in the neighbourhood of Fort Ellice, and would have struck the Saskatchewan Valley, probably in the neighbourhood of Prince Albert, and followed that great and fertile valley towards the Rocky Mountains. No one acquainted with the North-West will deny that this would have opened up a vastly greater area of fertile country than the present route. We know that as far west as Moose Jaw, perhaps a little farther, the present route does pass through a very excellent country; but from that point westward, we all know that it passes through a country not nearly so good as that traversed by the hon. gentleman's original route. Of course, I take it for granted that the Government, in dealing with the railway Company, must have exercised some oversight in regard to the route—that they must have had something to say—that they did not abdicate their functions altogether, and leave the Company to select any route they pleased. It follows, then, that the hon. Minister of Railways must have been over-persuaded by the more powerful minds and stronger wills of the gentlemen who control the Canadian Pacific Railway to abandon his own route. This may appear strange to us for we have always entertained the idea that the hon. gentleman's brains and eloquence and force of will were as strong as they were ordinarily made. Yet we must either believe that he was over-persuaded to adopt an inferior route, or that he knowingly allowed the railway Company to adopt an inferior route. Which is the fact we cannot, of course, divine. The hon. member for East Hastings mentioned one of the Syndicate, by name; he says he hopes the hon. Mr. Smith, and other members of that Company, will not forget their friends who have stood by them in this crisis." That is, I must say, a very appropriate hope in the mouth of a Government supporter on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman also spoke of the Grand Trunk Railway. He asks: "Have the Conservative party not stood by that other great corporation through evil report and through good

report till it has got control of nearly all the roads in Ontario? Have they not helped it out of its difficulties? Have they not given it all the money it wanted? Have they not concealed its accidents? And yet that company goes and throws itself into the arms of the Grits." It is quite true the Conservative party did stand by the Grand Trunk through evil report and through good report; it is quite true they gave that company all the money it wanted, that they sustained it in this way until it got control of nearly all the railways in Ontario. The Conservative party have stood by the Grand Trunk until it became practically a monopoly. So, I say, the Conservative party have been at all times the ally, the backer, the shield of every railway monopoly that has existed in the country; and now, when the Grand Trunk forsakes those who have worked for it so long, it is natural that the hon. gentleman should bewail—that he, who has so many Grand Trunk employees in his riding—

Mr. WHITE. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASEY. Well, his colleague has. It is natural that those gentlemen, who have done so much for the Grand Trunk, and expected so much from it, should deplore its loss, and should hope that the other monopoly by which they are now standing, will remember its friends.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. member know where the Grand Trunk runs?

Mr. CASEY. I think it runs into Belleville, and the hon. gentleman lives in Belleville.

Mr. BOWELL. That is about as near my constituency as the hon. gentleman can go.

Mr. CASEY. I am quite aware that the hon. gentleman's constituency is not in Belleville; but I think the Grand Trunk has something to do with his constituency.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. CASEY. I think the Grand Junction runs through his constituency and is controlled by the Grand Trunk. At all events I say that hon. gentlemen opposite who are all connected with Grand Trunk influences, are in a very awkward position. They have supported that monopoly as long as they could; and now, when they are called upon to support the demands of a stronger, richer, and more powerful monopoly, they find they have lost the friendship of the one that they have stood by so long. Now, to return to the question of the "grinding monopoly." I have not heard any complaints against the millers of Manitoba, except one or two large firms, and chiefly the firm of Ogilvy & Hutchinson. That firm are reported to have such arrangements with the Canada Pacific Railway in regard to the warehousing and shipping of grain, that they are practically able to monopolize the grain-buying trade at certain points. These arrangements, according to Mr. Van Horne, are that wherever a warehouse is erected by any party, no grain shall be taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway, except through that warehouse; so that everybody who ships wheat from that point must sell it to the owners of that warehouse. Therefore, the farmers of any district in the North-West are at the mercy of any one who sets up a warehouse until they can collect capital enough to build a second one. The warehousemen are thus able to control the price of wheat, and they have forced the farmers to sell good wheat as frozen wheat at low prices. I believe it has been bought, not chiefly for milling in Manitoba but chiefly for export; and I have been informed by a friend of mine in Manitoba that the firm of Ogilvy & Hutchinson are likely to make \$200,000 or \$300,000 out of the so-called frozen wheat which they have bought at low rates, and which is as good as any of our Ontario wheat, by sending it in the spring or summer down to the eastern Provinces to sell, and get the advantage

Mr. CASEY.

of the duty on wheat which my hon. friend from Hastings claimed was going to be a great advantage to the farmers of Manitoba. It will be a great benefit to those people who have secured the advantage they possess, by an alliance with the other monopoly which my hon. friend supports. In regard to reaping and mowing machines my hon. friend said, that reapers could be bought in Manitoba this summer cheaper than in Ontario, and he puts the price at \$270. Does he mean self-binders.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Certainly.

Mr. CASEY. I am not prepared to say how cheaply you could buy reapers of that sort in Ontario during the past summer, but if it be true that they can be sold in Manitoba for less than here, one thing must be true: we know they have to pay high freight to Manitoba, and that the manufacturers or dealers expect to be compensated for the risk of sending them to Manitoba. The manufacturers must have been reaping exorbitant profits on those sold in Ontario if they could afford to sell in Manitoba below Ontario prices. But the hon. gentleman's statement could only have applied to a short interval, when there was a glut of reapers in Manitoba, for I do not believe that the average of the year or of any number of weeks, would give a lower price for reapers in Manitoba than in Ontario. Even if they could be sold cheaper in Manitoba that is not the proper criterion by which to judge the question for the people of Manitoba. The question with them is, what could you get those machines for, from the other side of the line, were it not for the heavy duty? I have not the prices at hand, but the people and settlers of Manitoba, when I was there, told me that if they were allowed to bring them in at a reasonable duty, they could get them much cheaper than by importing them from Ontario. That is the only way to determine the effect of the duty on the people of the North-West. My hon. friend took upon himself to lecture the Premier of Manitoba and the other delegates who came down here. He said they had better have minded their own business and staid at home and left the members representing that Province to attend to its affairs here. I am sure my hon. friend, Mr. Norquay, will hear with delight that a leading member of the party he has so consistently supported, should have thus slapped him in the face for having come down to attend the interests of his Province. I am sure that slap in the face was undeserved. Mr. Norquay never did himself greater credit than when he yielded at last to the unanimous desire of the people of Manitoba, and came down here to represent their claims. The very fact that Mr. Norquay, a Conservative, a supporter of the present Government, one whom people are sometimes inclined to call a slavish supporter—and a warm friend of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the very fact that he should come down and urge the claims of the farmers of Manitoba, proves to absolute demonstration that the farmers agitation was not a party manœuvre in the sense meant by the hon. gentleman. It was political, no doubt, in so far as its design was to obtain a political object, but not in the sense of being a party agitation or Mr. Norquay would never have undertaken it. The hon. gentleman made a little calculation to which I think it would be interesting to call the attention of the House. He calculated that the hon. Finance Minister could make a profit of \$6,000,000 by floating bonds in the old country to obtain the \$22,500,000 required to make this advance to the Canadian Pacific Railway. If this is a sound calculation, and it seems as sound as many others that have been advanced on that side of the House in regard to this transaction, then the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Railways have erred greatly in making the advance so small. If so much can be made on an advance of \$22,500,000, why did not they agree to lend the company \$100,000,000 and make \$25,000,000 upon the transaction?

The hon. member for Hastings says they could have done so. I hope he will not withdraw his confidence from the hon. Minister because he has missed this glorious chance of adding \$25,000,000 to the capital of the country. Another point alluded to by the hon. gentleman was the loyalty of the people of Manitoba, their desire to retain Canadian connection. In this particular I am able to corroborate the hon. gentleman's statement. These men are loyal. They are mostly picked men from Ontario and the other eastern Provinces who have gone up there full of energy and enthusiasm, and they are more loyal to Canadian connection than many of us are because I believe they have a broader sense of what is for the interest of the country at large. But that loyalty, that love for Canada, is being put to a tremendous strain. My hon. friend did not undertake to tell us how many pounds of pressure to the square inch are being put on that feeling of loyalty, or how many pounds of such pressure it will stand. We have heard no serious talk of annexation or independence in the North-West; but if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to create such a cry, if they wish to bring about a desire for independence, or for annexation on the part of the people of Manitoba, they could not have chosen more thorough-going means than those they have adopted. If there is anything calculated to make people disgusted with the country with which they are connected, it is the feeling that they are oppressed by that country. Whether rightly or wrongly, the people of Manitoba, doubtless, do feel that they are oppressed by the people of old Canada, and if there is anything calculated to add force to this feeling of oppression it is the pecuniary loss and injury, which they certainly suffer. A case was brought to my notice this afternoon. A worthy clergyman called to see me and told me that a brother who had taken up land in the southern part of Manitoba, one of the many places in which the Canadian Pacific Railway had proposed to build branches, had gone to work on his land last year but was unable to sell his grain in consequence of its distance from the railway, and he was seriously questioning whether it would not be better for him to throw up his land and leave the country. The prospect had been held out that the Canadian Pacific Railway was going to build a branch in that section. They put that line on their maps but it was not built, and the settlers there seriously question whether it is worth their while to go on with their homesteads. I think it is—but no doubt in the meanwhile they are suffering hardship and wrong—from the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway will not build branch lines in their neighbourhood, and will not allow anybody else to build them. Speaking of these branch lines, brings me to another clause in my hon. friend's speech. He said the people of the older Provinces had, after the Grand Trunk had been established by Government assistance, put their hands in their own pockets and built lines themselves, had granted bonuses and subscribed stock in those roads for their own use. He said further, that the people of the North-West could do the same thing, that the Government had built the stem, and the people would have to furnish the branches at their own expense. The hon. member cannot be unaware that the people of Manitoba have, time and again, expressed their willingness to do this, to put their hands in their pockets and build branches. We know the South-Eastern Railway Company, the Emers and North-Western Railway Company, and the Tramway Company were prepared to put their hands in their pockets and build branch lines south of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They had got their charters from the Local Government and made arrangements to go to work, and had been promised bonuses, but the Canadian Pacific Railway would not allow them. I say the Canadian Pacific Railway would not allow them—the monopoly would not allow them—because it was distinctly in the interests of that monopoly, it was avowedly for the

sake of the bargain made with that monopoly, that my hon. friends opposite disallowed those charters. It was distinctly for the sake of the Canadian Pacific Railway that the people of southern Manitoba were not allowed to put their hands in their pockets and build the branch lines the member for Hastings said they ought to build at their own expense. But northwards, they are allowed to build branch lines, because any branch line in that direction would be simply a feeder to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and would bring more profit to the promoters of that line, simply because all the money spent by the struggling settlers to the northward of that line would bring more money to the pockets of these wealthy speculators. So they were allowed to build branch lines, and have they not done it? Does not the Manitoba and North-Western Railway exist? Does it not approximately follow the route chosen by the Minister of Railways. Does it not justify the correctness of his first impression on that matter, and does it not show the incorrectness of his permission to the Canadian Pacific Railway to take a different line? The people of Portage la Prairie have given \$100,000 to that railway; the people of the county and town of Minnelosa have given it a large bonus; the people of the municipality of Westbourne have given \$75,000 to that railway. These seem pretty big figures even to us here, and, when you remember that Portage la Prairie is only a town of four or five thousand people, that the town of Westbourne is what we should call down here a mere country village, that the country around it is what we would consider thinly settled, that these bonuses represent an almost intolerable tax upon the sparse settlers in those regions, you can form some idea of the eagerness with which the people to the north of the Canadian Pacific Railway have desired to get branch lines, some conception of the feeling existing, that it was a matter of life and death to them.

**Mr. ORTON.** Do I understand that the policy of the former Government was to go to Portage la Prairie and Westbourne.

**Mr. CASEY.** I do not know what the hon. gentleman understands, but that is my understanding of the matter. I cannot enter into a discussion with the hon. gentleman just now. My understanding of the original route approved of by the hon. Minister is that it was to branch north-westward from some point in that neighbourhood and strike the Saskatchewan country—I do not remember the exact place at which it was to branch off or where it was to strike, but that is the region of country it was to traverse. From these bonuses, which are absolutely enormous in view of the thinness of the population, you can get an idea of the conviction the people had that it was a matter of life and death to have these branch lines, and you can also get an idea of the eagerness with which the people to the southward would subscribe their money to build branch lines, if they were allowed to do so, but the monopoly which grinds down not only the people of Manitoba, but the people of this country, will not permit them to have these branch lines, or to do anything in regard to railway building which may interfere with its interests.

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

#### After Recess.

**Mr. CASEY.** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. White) has referred to the fact that the people of his county have bonused branch lines for their own benefit. This very fact, with which the hon. member is so familiar, that the people, even in a comparatively rich county like Hastings, felt the need of branch lines and paid for them at their own cost, should have opened his eyes to the necessity which would be felt by the struggling settlers in a new country like Manitoba to have similar accommodation.

**Mr. CASEY.**

But I must not omit to notice a little humorous remark of the hon. gentleman in reference to the reaper question, although I have already passed that part of his speech. My hon. friend asked: "Why do they not make reapers in Manitoba if they find the cost of reapers from Ontario excessive—have they not cheap coal there?" Certainly the hon. gentleman's humour has been developed by his trip to Manitoba, for a more humorous question than this I cannot imagine. Have they not cheap coal in Manitoba! In Manitoba, a place which is one of the most distant from the ordinary supplies of coal, a country whose own coal supplies are only beginning to be opened up, a country in which the only railway charges exorbitant freights for the carriage of that native coal upon which the country must depend in the future! He referred to the mine of Medicine Hat, and told how cheaply the Company was carrying the coal to Winnipeg. I am aware that last autumn the railway Company charged \$4 a ton freight on this Medicine Hat coal to Moose Jaw, which is less than half the distance to Winnipeg—not much more than one-third the distance. If it was \$4 to Moose Jaw it must have been enormous to Winnipeg. I believe the lowest point native coal has touched there is something like \$9 per ton. If the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) thinks it will pay to use that coal at that price and import iron for the manufacture of agricultural implements in Winnipeg, as a means of escape from the burdens imposed by the National Policy on the agricultural population of Manitoba—if he really thinks that, he has very strange ideas in regard to the manufacture of agricultural implements. But I have no doubt at all he intended it as a witticism, and as such I must regard it. He grumbled because the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) had said the road was being built too fast. He said the ranchmen at the foot of the Rocky Mountains did not think it was built too fast. Oh, I suppose not, but then I do not know that the road was built entirely in the interests of these ranchmen. I think the farming population, the poor people of Manitoba, have as much right to be considered in respect to building this road as those few of our Canadian aristocrats—I use the word not in a bad sense, but in a good sense. I give all credit to those gentlemen for their enterprise in trying to develop the business of raising cattle in the North-West, in developing the grazing lands there, and thus adding to the wealth of the country; but their interests should not be considered at the expense of the farming class. All they can do is quite insignificant in increasing the general wealth, as compared with what the agricultural population are doing. They will, no doubt, obtain considerable wealth for themselves, and they deserve it; but their interests are not to be compared for a moment with the interests involved in the rapid and efficient settlement of the rest of the country. I use the word "efficient" advisedly, because I hold that the settlement springing up along the Canadian Pacific Railway is not an efficient or convenient settlement; it is a mere ribbon of settlement stretching across the continent, without cohesion, where people are without near neighbours, and where it will be impossible for them to obtain the advantages of schools, roads, &c., that can only be had where the population is moderately dense. This plan of rapid settlement in a long strip, is the worst plan that can be adopted in the interests of the country. There was no great necessity for this undue haste. The Company had up to 1891 to finish the road, and they have been constructing it a much more rapid rate than that time limit required. They have not pretended that this rapid construction was done in the interests of the country; they have admitted, impliedly, that it was done in their own interests. They thought it would pay them to build it rapidly, they wanted to earn their land grant rapidly, and so they built the road rapidly. But, to pretend that this rapid construction was in the interests of the country is

absurd, because the sort of settlement that it induces is extremely inconvenient, and costs those who go there the ordinary comforts even of new settlements. I think those are the principal points of my hon. friend's remarks to which I need allude. I come now more directly to the question raised by the amendment of the hon. member for Marquette. That amendment asks that when we are granting such a favour as this to the Railway Company, we should have some relaxation of the terms which they originally imposed by virtue of the influence they have exerted upon the powerful minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, the conditions which they imposed by that influence upon the people of this country, and especially upon the people of the great north-western territories. Sir, it is not at all improper at such a time to ask for some relaxation. We all know that in days of old when some young king had been rather extravagant with his revenue, and was compelled to call his loyal Commons together and ask for a benevolence in the shape of further grants, it was usual and customary for those loyal Commons, for the sturdy people of that period, to demand a relaxation of some of the burdens imposed upon them, the removal of some monopoly, the abatement of some grievances. Now, Sir, our position is very similar. If there ever was a corporation with something closely resembling royal power, it is the corporation that controls the destinies of the great North-West—and I will say the destinies of the whole Dominion also, as appears from late transactions. If there ever was a head of a corporation who had a right to be dubbed with a royal title it is King Stephen the First. He had his ministers and courtiers, and acted in a truly royal manner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You must make it Stephen the Martyr.

Mr. CASEY. Well, Sir, I do not remember that King Stephen the First was Stephen the Martyr; but, I think that if this present King Stephen is ever to be martyred, certainly it will not be at the hands of his loyal and trusted ministers who sit opposite me on this occasion, for no king, I think, ever had more loyal ministers, "these ministers of his that do his pleasure"—if my right hon. friend wants quotations I will give him that—because they have done his pleasure on this and on other occasions when he has had occasion to come to this House. He has instructed them on this occasion to lay before his loyal subjects his request for further supplies. They have done so. They have put aside all other business that might interfere with the speedy granting of these supplies. They have assured us, in the case of this royal personage, that it is absurd, inconvenient, and improper to enquire into the grounds upon which these supplies are asked. They have been formally, by resolution, requested to have such an enquiry, and they have said it was improper, and they have refused it, and have been backed up by their friends in the House in that refusal. They have said that there is no necessity for postponing the consideration of this demand for further supplies. There is now a request, Sir, from a portion of the loyal subjects of this great king for the abatement of a monopoly, the abatement of a nuisance, of something that is to them a daily and an hourly oppression, a daily and an hourly pecuniary loss. Now, Sir, I have no doubt that his ministers will refuse that; but, I claim that it is very proper to ask for this abatement, and my hon. friend from Marquette has only done his duty to his constituents and to his Province in asking it. If he had not done so, it would have been the duty of some other member of this House to demand the removal of this monopoly clause from the contract by which our present monarch was seated on the throne. I need not dwell on these quasi historical precedents for saying that it is a proper time to demand the abatement of a nuisance of this description. Why, Sir, we have had an instance already in this House, a few days

ago, of such a demand being made, and a successful demand, although the grievance complained of was not in connection with this particular Canadian Pacific Railway contract. We have the authority of the Ministerial organ in Toronto, a paper which, by the terms of the printing company's by-law, is the personal organ of the First Minister, that the supporters of the right hon. gentleman from the Province of Quebec have been demanding what we may call, in general words, better terms for their Province, although I believe part of the so-called better terms consisted of the settlement of an old account, and their demand is said to have been at first unsuccessful. On the eve of this crisis, those hon. members, according to the right hon. gentleman's own explanation, met together and brought to bear on him in a corporate way that sort of "constitutional pressure" which is usually brought to bear on such occasions. And they have found the crisis a good one for their purpose. They have found, as nearly as we can gather from the oracular statements of the Minister of Railways and the remarks of the First Minister, that some sort of promise, hint or indication was given that their claims would be recognized. I say here was an instance where the redress of grievances was demanded by a section of the right hon. gentleman's own party, and it has been apparently granted. I am not saying anything about the propriety or impropriety of that demand; that is a matter which need not be discussed here. All I wish to urge is, that the hon. gentleman's friends from Quebec appear to have been thoroughly satisfied that their demands were just, being demands which were made in a former Session and repeated again. Those members have taken the constitutional means of demanding redress of those grievances when asked to do something for this great Company, and these grievances apparently will be redressed; if not, they will be very much disappointed. If the hon. members for Manitoba, whom the right hon. gentleman claims to have with him, with one exception, had chosen to bring "constitutional pressure" to bear on the First Minister, perhaps they might have been equally successful; perhaps, indeed, they brought some such constitutional pressure and obtained a promise of something for Manitoba. If those hon. members have not obtained a promise to remedy grievances, their constituents will call them to serious reckoning. If they have obtained a promise, it would be interesting to know what it is; if not, it will be very disappointing to their constituents. I think the constituents of those members have a vague idea that a great deal of money is being paid away, in which Manitoba will receive no share or benefit. The Conservative members of Ontario supporting the right hon. gentleman, had a grand opportunity to bring some "constitutional pressure" to bear upon him on this occasion. There are several questions in dispute between Ontario and the Dominion Government. There is the question of boundary, also of our right to legislate upon our own provincial affairs. If the Government supporters had chosen to bring their united strength on the First Minister, no doubt concessions would have been made in respect to these matters. Even in regard to the financial question, I do not think it is exactly settled as to what amount of money is in the hands of the Dominion Government belonging to Ontario. I have heard rumours that there was some dispute about that. Some people insist that the expenditure of Ontario will very soon exceed the limits of the Provincial subsidy and the other ordinary sources of revenue. There was therefore a grand opportunity for the members of Ontario, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) and other strong supporters of provincial rights, to have brought pressure to bear on the Dominion Government in order to obtain something for the Province. I would like to know if they have done so. No doubt their constituents would like to know. They should follow the noble example of members from Quebec, who, no matter what their errors in some respect,

are to be admired for the way in which they cling together and work unitedly for the benefit of the Province, and yield to no considerations, whether of party or anything else, tempting them to vote against its interests. If only the Conservative members from Ontario were animated by the same spirit, and acted unitedly in the same determined and constitutional manner, Ontario would not be in the position she is in now in regard to the questions at issue between her and the Dominion Government. The Conservative members have power to obtain for the Province what they believe to be her rights; if they have not done so, their constituents will call them to a very serious reckoning. Before we leave too far behind this question of monopoly from which Manitoba asks to be relieved, I must allude to the manner in which monopoly nearer home is spoken of by the First Minister's personal organ, by his organ in the city of Montreal and other organs throughout the country. They say that an unholy alliance has been formed between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grit party, and that our object is to impose on Ontario a gigantic monopoly, namely, the coalition of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk in operating all the roads of the Province. This, they say, would be an intolerable and gigantic monopoly. In the first place, that coalition of which they speak is utterly imaginary, as are many of the other facts published in the Government organs from time to time. I do not doubt the desire of the Grand Trunk to bring about something of the kind, or that under certain circumstances the Canadian Pacific Railway would be equally willing to bring about such an intolerable monopoly; but to assert that any hon. member who was going back to the people for election would endanger all his future prospects of being elected by such an alliance was a monstrous notion, as those who put it forward well knew. But what is this bug-a-boo with which they threaten us. What would be the worst result which could happen to Ontario if this unholy alliance were formed. If the Opposition came into power and did for the Grand Trunk, their alleged allies, what the Government are doing for the Canadian Pacific Railway, their actual allies—I will not say allies, but masters—the worst thing would be such an intolerable grievance as now exist in Manitoba and the North-West. The condemnation of hon. gentlemen opposite comes out of their own mouths. If such a grinding monopoly would be intolerable in Ontario, where there is plenty of capital to build new roads, what must be the grievance where one line of railway constitutes the only means of travel and transportation to the people of that country? If such a monopoly would be intolerable here, it is surely something more than intolerable there. A description of the relative agonies of rheumatism and gout runs in this way: rheumatism may be compared to the turning of a thumb-screw until the pain is unbearable; gout is another turn of the thumb-screw. A coalition of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway would be the first application of the thumb-screw in Ontario; in Manitoba the monopoly is like another turn of the screw. And what people could be expected to endure what is worse than unbearable? In the whole of this discussion, there has been a great deal of talk by hon. gentlemen opposite about patriotism, and many accusations have been brought against us for being unpatriotic. Why? Because we called attention to what we claimed to be an oppressive monopoly, to the improper conduct of the Government in dealing with lands in the North-West, and to their improper conduct in yielding on every occasion to this Canadian Pacific Railway. It is patriotic to do these things of which we complain, to create a monopoly of this kind, to make the people of Manitoba practically the serfs of such a monopoly, to make constant drafts on the Treasury of this country in favour of this monopoly, to break through the usual and ordinary course of business to confer favours on this monopoly, to yield to every desire of theirs, to conceal the facts necessary for hon. members and the country, to form a decision on this

Mr. CASEY.

question—all this is patriotic, it is the very acme of patriotism, but to find fault with such conduct, to attack those who are guilty of such conduct is unpatriotic and disloyal. Disloyal, undoubtedly, it is to the power whom hon. gentlemen opposite serve. It is disloyal to the interests of King Stephen the First, but it is the highest loyalty to Canada. Who have been the patriots of every age? Is it not those who have called attention to grievances which existed? How could grievances ever be remedied if attention were not called to them? How can monopolies be removed unless they are agitated against? How have they been removed in England and other countries except by exciting strong public indignation against them? And removed they will be. Those who are now denounced as unpatriotic because they call attention to things which militate against the desirability of Manitoba as a place of residence or immigration, will in a few years be recognized by everybody, in and out of Manitoba, as acting in the true interests of the country, because in that time the things complained of will be remedied, and those who have secured the remedy will earn the gratitude of that country. Supposing it was unpatriotic to call attention to things which make Manitoba seem undesirable as a place of residence, does anybody imagine it would have had as great an influence in checking immigration to that country as the conduct of hon. gentlemen has had? When this contract was brought down, we were promised that 25,000 people would go in there the first year, that 50,000 would go in the next year, and that 75,000 would go in this year; and the First Minister showed good reasons for our expecting such an immigration—the nature of the soil, the probable progress of the railway Company. Now the nature of the soil is as good as it was then, and the progress of the railway has been greater than he estimated, but where are the 75,000 immigrants? Why are they not there? Simply because this very monopoly clause has oppressed those who have gone into that country already, and they have sent bad reports to their friends who intended immigrating; because the land policy of the Government has disgusted many who have gone there; because of these and other such policies on the part of the Government, that large immigration has been checked. In the days of the boom, immigration was rapid enough; the Government did their best to stimulate that boom, and they did so to an extent that they knew to be unhealthy. The boom boomed out, and the reaction came, and for that boom and the reaction and the consequences that followed upon everything connected with Manitoba, the Government are distinctly responsible. These are the things which check, and which will continue to check immigration into Manitoba, and until their whole policy in connection with the railway, with the land, and immigration is changed, we need not expect the effects to follow which otherwise we might naturally expect, and which the hon. gentleman expected when this scheme was first before the House. I have only one more observation to make, and that is, that this is not merely a Manitoba question. Hon. gentlemen may flatter themselves that Manitoba is theirs, no matter what they refuse to her or what they give to the railway Company. They may possibly be correct, but I do not think so. They may have means of coercing Manitoba that we know nothing of; but I do not think they have any means of coercing the other Provinces, and we know that almost every farmer in Manitoba is a brother, or a son, or other relative of some elector in the older Provinces; that most of them have dozens and scores of relatives in these Provinces; that they keep these relatives posted with regard to all the disadvantages of this railway policy, and that these relatives in the older Provinces will keep these in mind when the next day of reckoning comes; and the Government will find that they have lost a great many votes in the older Provinces as well as in Manitoba by their policy. I recommend this fact to the consideration of the

Government and their supporters. I think, also, they will find it advantageous to drop the sneering tone in which they refer to Manitoba and her business. We used to be told that "you cannot check Manitoba," that we Grits were the only people who abused it, and the Government and their supporters the only people praised it. But did we not hear the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White) giving a slap in the face to the Government of Manitoba for meddling with things that do not belong to them? And the other day the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said the people of Manitoba were spoon-fed, a remark which my hon. friend who sits behind me very properly resented. It is an expression which is not correct—it is one which is thoroughly incorrect. I do not know of any Province, the people of which have derived less benefit from the past expenditure of public money, which have been made in the name of that Province. No doubt in certain parts the people derived some benefit from the money which was spent in the construction of that railway, but by far the greater part of the wages which were paid the men went out of the country. The contract was made with an American firm, and Americans were engaged to fill the important positions on the railway staff, and as little as possible of the money went to Canadians. And a great part of the profits made by the Company will go where they have already gone—to Montreal—and will be spent in splendid palaces for the royal person I have already spoken of. Some of the spoon-feeding, some of the pap has gone in that direction, and there will be little left for Manitoba. Hoping that the people of Manitoba will appreciate these compliments of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that they will do us the favour to continue to make such compliments, I will resume my seat.

Mr. POPE. I am given to understand that in my absence the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) referred to something which took place in 1879, that he referred to a pamphlet that was published in which there appeared an American advertisement. I was condemned by the hon. gentleman for having taken that advertisement. Now, Sir, I did not receive that advertisement, but I confess I did wrong, and I confess that any of us, on this side of the House, will always be wrong whenever we attempt to give any patronage to the Grit press. I happened on this occasion, as I wanted to accommodate a Grit friend, to give him a little of our patronage; and that gentleman put in the middle of that pamphlet—true to his friends, true to gentlemen on the other side of the House, he could not refrain from putting it in—that American advertisement, although I had ordered the pamphlet. I wish this matter to be understood, for it seems to be a very important question with hon. gentlemen opposite. I think I heard it referred to by the leader of the Opposition; I heard it mentioned by the hon. member for Brant, and I was told that the hon. member who has just sat down had referred to it. Now, let it be understood once for all, that I will never be accused of such a folly again, so long as I have a seat in this House. Now, Sir, one word with respect to the hon. gentleman who preceded the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I listened with a great deal of pleasure, and I received a great deal of information, as I am satisfied did every man who was in this House last night, from the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross). Every man who heard that hon. gentleman must have felt that he received information that was new to him from a man of experience, from a man who has travelled through that country from one end to the other. It was information important enough to be sent to the other side of the water, for it was really an immigration advertisement, telling plain facts with regard to the North-West, and pointing out to the emigrating world on the other side of the water that there was a country where they might well come to settle in, with

benefit and satisfaction to themselves. But, Sir, I was sorry to hear another hon. member, the other night, advertising throughout the length and breadth of this land, to every capitalist and every intending settler, that they should not go to that country. Why, Sir, does he know anything about that country? No, Sir, he never has seen it, and knows nothing about it. And yet, in the face of the testimony of the hon. member for Lisgar, who had seen the whole length and breadth of that country, in the face of the reports of Professor Macoun, which have been read all over Canada, that hon. gentleman comes here and denounces that country as unfit for settlement. He tells you that it costs more to get water there than it would cost to buy a farm in another place. And who is this man? How does he agree with those men who have come from that country, and who have seen ten times as much of it as probably he ever will. From the hon. member for Lisgar there was no uncertain sound. What did the hon. member for Marquette do? Why, Sir, he gave his vote like a man.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. Clap your hands, gentlemen; you are pleased with a very small thing. Rejoice when you can, for it is very little you can rejoice over. The hon. member for Selkirk voted for these Resolutions, and I believe we shall yet hear his voice raised in defence of that country, which he was sent here to defend, and which every man has defended but one. I do not say that any member from the front benches went back and told the mover of the amendment before us that if he gave his vote against the Resolutions that night, he might move against the monopoly clause to-day. I do not believe any hon. member of this House would be so bad as that. It is possible that someone may have put it into his head. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman thought he was doing right. I have no doubt he thinks his constituents, when he goes back, will renew their confidence in him; but I do not think the people of Manitoba generally will endorse his action. But where do we stand to-day in relation to that monopoly clause? Have not hon. gentlemen opposite, day after day, and hour after hour, been pointing to us, and asserting that we put the monopoly clause into that contract? Did not my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) declare that the Pacific Railway should be protected in that country? Did he not, as well as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in the Railway Committee, declare and vote that no other railway should be built in that country?

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the hon. gentleman wants an answer from me, I will give it at once.

Mr. POPE. Yes, I do.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I never made any such declaration.

Mr. POPE. Then, I am very much misinformed. I can tell the hon. gentleman that he gave his vote—I know the hon. gentleman will not deny it—in the Railway Committee, that no road should be built in that country south of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I never gave such a vote.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman gave his vote in Committee—I assert it positively—and so did the hon. leader of the Opposition—

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. POPE. That no roads should run west or south-west. That was the position the hon. gentleman occupied. What position does the hon. member for Marquette occupy with respect to his constituents to-day? Would he never have a railway at all? I can tell the hon. gentleman that he never would have had a railway unless in its inception, while it was being built, it had protection. The hon. member for Marquette knows that quite well. Everybody knows

it perfectly well; and yet the hon. gentleman who has just sat down gets up here and says: Why, you are doing exactly the same thing in Ontario. In Ontario? Has the Grand Trunk not had an opportunity to develop that country? Has it not had time to get its business established? How can the Grand Trunk be cited as an analogy to this road? I can tell the hon. member for Marquette that if there had been no such protection for this railway, he might have gone to the capitalists of the world, and pleaded in vain for assistance to build this road. For a time there must be protection, and that was the resolution voted by the hon. member for East York and by every member of the Opposition at that time in the Railway Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. POPE. Yes, yes. I know it perfectly well, for I was there myself; and the leader of the Opposition was there, and he voted too.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not.

Mr. POPE. I tell you, you did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. We cannot have these flat contradictions.

Mr. POPE. I made no contradiction, Sir; the hon. gentleman made it. I stand by what I said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. POPE. Such, Sir, is the position with respect to this monopoly—that if we had not given that protection, we should have had no road; and the hon. gentleman heard my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways, come down, the other day, and say that the directors of this road did not care to continue that monopoly for any length of time, but that they were willing, when the road was completed, and when they had secured the traffic that was due to that road, to allow of competition. Still, this did not satisfy the hon. gentleman. He comes forward, and against the protest of every other member for Manitoba, moves against this monopoly clause. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he thinks his constituents will endorse conduct of this kind, whether he thinks he will ever again sit on the floor of this House, or whether we would ever have had a railway had not this protection been extended to it.

Mr. TROW. It was not my intention to make any remarks on this subject, which has been so thoroughly discussed, but I can scarcely resist the temptation of saying a few words in reply to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. That hon. gentleman, above all others, should know something about that country—not that he has paid it a personal visit, but that his Department is so closely connected with the settlement of the North-West—that although such unguarded expressions might be excusable in other hon. gentlemen, they are not excusable coming from him. In the first place, he defends his Department for issuing that pamphlet, but he never before attempted to make any explanation of it. The matter has often been called in question, and this is the first time any explanation whatever was attempted, to show why and how this pamphlet was issued. The pamphlet in question certainly had an evil tendency. It was printed and circulated at the instigation of the Department, probably to the number of 70,000 or 80,000. These copies were in circulation—

Several hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TROW. I say yes; and they would have been circulated in their entirety without anything being expunged had I not called attention to them at the time. What was then done? The moment the matter was called in question, the hon. gentleman got his officials to cut out the objectionable pages and they were issued minus several pages that

Mr. POPE.

advertised Dakota, Minnesota, and other parts of the American Union. The hon. gentleman seemed to me somewhat unguarded in his expressions. He accused the hon. member for York (Mr. Mackenzie) and the hon. leader of the Opposition, of not being opposed to a monopoly clause. When they denied this, he persisted in his statement that they had actually voted in the Railway Committee for the monopoly clause. The hon. gentleman should have accepted the word of these hon. gentlemen, acknowledged his error and said he was misinformed. But no, he still persisted in declaring that he was right and they were wrong. I have travelled pretty extensively in that country and know something about it. I have no desire to decry it. I have travelled thousands of miles through it in various directions, not by rail, on a pass, like the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White), when the snow covered the ground to the depth of two feet, and the train running at the rate of probably thirty miles an hour. He could not know much about the country. I would ask how, if any gentleman traveling through a country, no matter how denuded of timber it was, and could only see a few miles on each side of the track with the soil covered by about two feet of snow, and on a train going at the rate of twenty or thirty miles an hour—I would ask how any one could form any idea of the soil under such circumstances? I do think, without egotism, that I know as much about that country as any hon. member in this House. There are lands there for millions, good homesteads for millions, but for an hon. gentleman to say that the whole face of the country is good, is preposterous. There is no country that I know of that is all good. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) last night accused the Reform press of this country with retarding immigration by the articles that emanated from Liberal papers in various parts of the Dominion. Now, if there is one paper under the sun that has done more to people the North-West than another, it is the *Toronto Globe*. If there is one paper that has advocated its attractions and resources day by day and year by year, since the country was settled, since Confederation, it is the *Toronto Globe*. The *Globe* even sent down, at an enormous expense, their agent through that country, and one of their agents, whose expenses were paid by the *Globe* Co. travelled with the Marquis of Lorne to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. Indeed, I thought at the time that he was exaggerating, because he said that 90 per cent. of the lands in the whole country were good. I have travelled in Europe and in many States of the United States, and more particularly in the North-West, and I say I have never travelled in any country in my life in which 70 per cent. of all its lands were good. In regard to the North-West, I say there are millions of acres there unfit for settlement, but there are tens of millions of acres really good and adapted to successful settlement. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are entitled to great credit for their push and perseverance in carrying through that great work to the foot of the Rocky Mountains in such a short space of time, but I question the propriety very much of carrying it through so rapidly, for the simple reason that the land being locked up all south of the line by the policy of the Government, the Syndicate taking a very large proportion on each side of the line, and the colonization companies owning large portion, all new settlers are anxious to get the best portion of the country naturally travelled westward in advance of the railway, and lots that were accessible have been taken up all through the line. The consequence is there is a series of scattered settlements from one end of the country to the other. It would be much better if 100 or 200 miles had been made in one season in advance of settlement. The people would then have had their communities, they could have arranged for school and municipal organizations, and it would have been much better for the country and the people. My impression is, after having travelled pretty extensively in

that country, that the railway is located in the wrong part of the country. I do not know why it was constructed there. The old survey adopted by the late Administration, was certainly preferable. The lands were better, easier of access, and with more timber and good water, and settlements sprang up through them for at least 300 miles from Winnipeg with the expectation of getting immediate railway communication. I recollect, some years ago, when the policy of the Mackenzie Administration was to construct a line north of Lake Manitoba, the hue and cry of the Conservative party was: Why not run south of Lake Manitoba and benefit the present settlers? Why not run through a settled portion of the country? Even if you should diverge somewhat from a straight line, it is your duty to accommodate the pioneers of the country. This Government certainly have not adopted what they advocated then, because, after leaving Portage la Prairie, there was scarcely a settler to be found from Portage la Prairie to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, and I question very much if the railway Company had to purchase the right of way from a single settler. For 500 or 600 miles the grades are probably much easier, but the country is not so well adapted for settlement. After leaving Regina, and more particularly Moose Jaw, the country is not adapted for successful settlement. It may in the course of time, but it is my impression that it is barren, it is denuded of its timber. Probably there never was any timber on it, but, at any rate, there is not sufficient rainfall there for the growth of cereals. However, there are other parts of the country that are good. There are millions of acres in southern Manitoba that have been closed up from settlement for years but are now opened for settlement, and no doubt there will be a rush for that portion of Manitoba, which is probably the best portion of the Province. I have heard hon. gentlemen say—particularly the Minister of Agriculture and Immigration—that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) may be called to account for his stewardship when he returns to Marquette, for his unguarded remarks here to-day. I wish that hon. gentleman to know that the member for Marquette has been in that country for years, and has travelled in that country for seven or ten years to my knowledge, and knows a great deal about that country, and knows what he is talking about, and he is responsible alone to his constituents and not to the Minister of Agriculture; and, as to the member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), his vocation in life did not lead him to travel much through the country. He was principally in the city of Winnipeg. He may speak of the city and its surroundings, but he does not know as much about that country as the member for Marquette.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The member for Marquette said he had not visited the country westward.

Mr. TROW. I am aware that he has; he has been as far as Moose Jaw and Birtle; he has been, at any rate, 300 or 400 miles west from Winnipeg, and therefore he knows something about the country.

Mr. RYKERT. A great authority that.

Mr. TROW. The contract that was entered into by the Syndicate with the Government was alleged by all parties, at the time, both Reform and Conservative, to be a good bargain. It was acknowledged by the press of both sides and by the whole country at large that they had succeeded in dictating their own terms to the Government and in obtaining a wonderful contract, a very remunerative contract from the Government—the \$25,000,000 and the 25,000,000 acres of land, with all the exemption from taxation, which in itself is a matter of great importance. There is no doubt that there are members in this House who pay at the rate of \$20 of taxation for each section of land, and, if you make a calculation of what the Syndicate save in that way on their tract of

land—they have 39,062 sections, which, at \$20 each, gives \$781,240 a year, and that, for twenty years, is a very valuable consideration. The hon. Minister of Railways, above all other hon. gentlemen, has handled his case—though it is a bad case—with a great deal of ingenuity and a great deal of ability. I question if there is another gentleman in the Dominion who could have handled that case so cleverly. In the first place, he states that the Syndicate made no overtures, were not anxious for any additional subsidy, but that the Government were anxious that the work should be immediately constructed. He further stated, if I am rightly informed, that they would carry out the contract in its entirety.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I do not think I made any such statement as that they made no overtures. I do not think he will find that anywhere. If I did make such a statement, it is certainly an erroneous one.

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman knows best what he did say, but I was certainly under the impression that the Syndicate had made no plea for the \$30,000,000, that they had no particular desire, that they were capitalists and would fulfil their contract, in compliance with the terms of the contract, by 1891, but it was an object for the Government to encourage settlement and to increase immigration, to get these parties to construct the work more rapidly at both ends, the portion to the north of Lake Superior more particularly, and that portion through the Rocky Mountains. Now, I question very much the propriety of the construction of the railway north of Lake Superior so rapidly. I do not know but that you have already all the facilities now which are essential and requisite to carry on successfully the immigration as well as if you went all the way by rail. It is a kind of rest for an immigrant, after coming out from the old country by water, to go 1,000 miles by rail, and then another rest of 1,000 miles by water. I do not think it would retard immigration the least, and that railway north of Lake Superior runs for 700 or 800 or 1,000 miles through the most inhospitable country on the face of the globe—I do not speak now of Manitoba, but north of Lake Superior, from Callander even to Winnipeg. It is questionable in my mind whether there are 10,000 acres adapted for settlement along the whole line of the route, and, if you carry on a railway through a country not adapted for settlement, it strikes me forcibly it will be carried on with a very large expense to the country, and will not be remunerative to the contractors. Unless there is some way-freight for a railway, it is utterly impossible for it to be a paying concern. If the Syndicate are prepared to give ample, good and sufficient security, it strikes me forcibly that they could obtain what means were requisite from the capitalists of Europe, where moneys are obtained for such enterprises by all nations and by all contractors. That is the proper place where money can be obtained at a much more reasonable rate of interest than even from the Government. Why, the Minister of Railways stated that they could obtain the money at 3 or 4 per cent. in Europe, whereas the Government are charging 5 per cent. It seems to me that it is bad policy on the part of the Syndicate, if they have good security, to get it from the Government at any rate. The question is, why should we tax the people of this Dominion \$7.75 or \$8 per head of the population, probably \$40 to \$50 for each head of a family in this Dominion, for this Syndicate? They are men possessing ample means, and if they have ample security to give, it is my impression that they can obtain all the capital which is necessary by giving the security which is spoken so highly of. I think the settlers in that country have been somewhat deceived. I know that thousands of the settlers have settled around Westbourne, Gladstone, the Little Saskatchewan, Minnedosa, Shoal Lake, Birtle, Shell River, Silver Creek, Ellice and other places, with a full knowledge and impression

that the Government had agreed to construct a railway on that route. And now, what is the result of it? There is no private enterprise that can accommodate them, and the result is that the settlers in and around Birtle and Shell River have to travel at least 150 miles with their grain to Brandon, before they can sell one bushel. It is true, the country yields, and has yielded, abundantly, though this last season the crop was a partial failure. Hon. gentlemen seem to say that it is decrying the country for hon. members on this side of the House to say that the crops were frozen. The first I ever saw about frozen wheat was in the *Montreal Gazette*, in a telegram from Winnipeg to Montreal. It reads as follows:—

“Manitoba wheat crop.—Ogilvie telegraphs from the North-West as follows:—Receipts of wheat continue light; damage by frost is as bad as expected, fully one-half being ruined.”

That is in the *Montreal Gazette* of the 3rd of October.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Would the hon. gentleman read the telegram that came from Winnipeg two or three days afterwards, and which was also inserted, correcting that statement, and saying that it was entirely an error. I may remark here that that particular telegram was intended for Mr. Ogilvie's brother, and not for publication at all. Its publication was a mistake.

Mr. TROW. I have read the telegram word for word as it appeared in the *Montreal Gazette*. It has been published and spread broadcast through the country. The country was assured by Hon. Mr. Ogilvie, who has more interest in the productions of the country than any other individual in it, that such was the fact.

Mr. WHITE. The Hon. Mr. Ogilvie had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. TROW. It was from a Mr. Ogilvie at all events. Apparently, the Senator has something to do with it. However, it was published in the *Gazette*. The First Minister seems to consider that the speech of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) was great help to his party, that hon. gentleman knew so much about the country, and had spoken so favourably of it. The hon. member for Lisgar has been much flattered for the vote that he has given. Well, I do not know that he is a great acquisition to the party opposite, because so far as I know he has never belonged or identified himself with the Opposition. We know, at all events, that he has never allied himself with the Reform party since he entered Parliament.

Mr. RYKERT. Read him out, then.

Mr. TROW. By no means. We would take the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), scrap-book and all, if he would only come over.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And all the Bleus of Quebec.

Mr. TROW. It is true that that hon. gentleman sometimes changes his mind. I believe some years ago he was a respectable member of the Reform party. He fell from grace, at all events, and probably he is satisfied with his present position. Sir, I contend that there is no justification, no reason, for taxing the community \$8 per head for the benefit of the Syndicate, under our existing financial circumstances. The money may be recouped, it may possibly be refunded. The hon. Minister of Railways, and those who support him, say that it will all be refunded, that there is sufficient and ample security. I hope that is the case. I have confidence in several members of the Syndicate, that they are men of honour, men of capital, and it is to be hoped that the money that is to be voted to them will all be refunded to the country. However, past experience shows us that other influences may be brought to bear which may disappoint our expectations of getting this money back. We have the case of the Grand Trunk Railway before us, and it may turn out that this money will become a bonus, and that

Mr. Trow.

we shall not get it back. However, I hope I am mistaken in that respect, and that we shall get it all back with interest. Sir, I should not have troubled the House with any remarks were it not that the hon. Minister of Agriculture made some uncalled-for expressions in reference to the pamphlets and votes of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I am anxious to see this discussion come to an end, but I nevertheless feel called upon to refer to some statements that have been made by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, which are so at variance, in my judgment, with the truth in relation to the North-West, that I should be recreant to my duty if I left them to go uncontradicted. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat remarked that some of those who had spoken favourably of that country had gone up there on fast trains and on a free passage. Well, I visited that country and I went up on neither. I went up on a purchased buck-board, bought with my own money. In about two months I traversed over 2,000 miles of the prairie country; consequently, I can speak from personal observation; and more than that, I want the House to understand that I am speaking as a thoroughly practical farmer—indeed I am almost egotistical enough to say that in respect to the character of the soil, I would put my judgment against that of any hon. gentleman in the House. Before I reached the extremity of that country, my previously favourable opinion of it was verified by the indications of growth I saw there. However, before I go further, I wish to make a remark on a statement made by the hon. gentleman who just sat down, when he claimed that the *Globe* newspaper did more than all other means to settle that country. Now, I will read an extract from a remark made by the ex-Finance Minister, who said:

“But, he admitted, that although the attacks of the Liberal party were bad, they were not a circumstance to the attacks of the Liberal press. As to the Liberal press, he had hardly any words too strong to convey his disapprobation—”

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Go on, go on.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am going on as rapidly as I can read. I am suffering from a sore throat to-night.

“of their conduct towards the North-West and towards the railway.”

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must trouble the hon. gentlemen to read what I stated from the *Hansard*. What he is now stating is a deliberate falsehood. I do not accuse him of making it, but I say he has read a statement which is deliberately false—not by intention of the hon. gentleman, however, I have no doubt.

Mr. FERGUSON. The only reply to the hon. gentleman is that, so far as I am concerned, the statement is not deliberately false. It was the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson) who made a statement which brought me to my feet. I believe he stated very distinctly that west of Moose Jaw there was no land fit for agricultural purposes in that country.

Mr. WATSON. Not from my own experience, but from information received.

Mr. FERGUSON. His experience does not amount to anything. If he gave a statement to this House without sufficient knowledge, his act is as iniquitous as that of a judge rendering judgment without hearing the evidence. In the few remarks I propose to make upon the North-West country, I shall speak as a practical farmer. I went there neither as a speculator nor as a tourist, but with a view to satisfy myself of the agricultural capabilities of the country of which I had heard and read so much. I can venture this assertion, and I do it without fear of contradiction successfully, that it will yet be found, and in a very early period, that the great grain and food producing region is west of

Moose Jaw. As I said before, I have travelled over the country on a buck-board, leisurely, going where I pleased, and I was not confined to the railway and looking out of car windows, as was attributed to many hon. members by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow). I saw, west of Moose Jaw, west of Medicine Hat, and south of Calgary, as fine wheat, oats, pease, and barley grown on the Indian farms and on the farms of some settlers who had been there for some fifteen or sixteen years, as I have seen grown in the most favoured agricultural districts of Ontario, and I think I live in one of the best of them. As to the district between Moose Jaw and Medicine Hat, of which we have heard so much as being a barren desert, many who have gone over the country are quite mistaken as to its character. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), the other night explained to some extent the cause of that misapprehension, saying that it was owing to the character and colour of the grass. That country, for a couple of hundred miles, is covered with buffalo grass. Many hon. members do not know exactly what that is; I did not till I went out there. It is not long, wavy, bunchy grass, but a short grass, not more than from three to five inches in length, and owing to the early spring, it matures in the first part of June. It cures on its foot and turns white. It is not burnt, but simply ripened on its stock; and anyone who has driven a pair of horses over it for a month, with no fodder except that grass, must know that it is nothing else than matured hay. There is sufficient moisture in the soil to produce a new crop by the first of August. That crop grows to a height of two inches if burnt over, and of four inches where it has not been burnt over. It is simply because the season is so much earlier than it is in Ontario that persons unaccustomed to and not looking carefully at the face of the country, miscalculate the character of the Province. Mention has been made of people leaving there on the ground that there is neither fuel nor building material. I will confine my remarks chiefly to Alberta, regarding which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) should have informed himself before he addressed the House. As to wood, there is not much in that country, but nature, through its wisdom, has compensated that district by supplying an almost unlimited supply of coal. The result of my observations is that I can unhesitatingly state that in the whole Province of Alberta I saw no place, nor do I believe there is a locality, where a farmer cannot, with his own cart, need haul fuel more than a distance of five miles, and in half the cases within that distance. As to building material, as far west as Brandon—I am now coming back to Manitoba—I know good building material, American pine and our own Rat Portage pine, is sold within a few cents per thousand as cheaply as it can be purchased to-day in the lumber yards at Ottawa. I saw as good siding for buildings sold retail to hundreds of settlers at \$25 per thousand, as you see in the Ottawa market to-day. Doors, frames and window sashes, with glass, can be bought even cheaper than in Ottawa.

Mr. WATSON. I never saw good siding sold in that country at the price named.

Mr. FERGUSON I did, and did not hesitate to help men who went from my county to load lumber on their waggons bought at these prices. As to the price of fuel, there is such an abundance so easily reached, that with ordinary and reasonable opportunities given to mining companies by the Government, which, no doubt, will be given, and such rates as I found proposed for the transportation of coal by the Canadian Pacific Railway, coal will be supplied almost as far east as Winnipeg—I know as far east as Brandon—to settlers all along the railway line and villages and towns which are rapidly springing up, within twelve months from to-day, at 25 per cent. less than coal of the same character is

supplied to towns and villages bordering on the banks of the St. Lawrence. As to the question of transportation, I do not wish to divulge the profits of any coal miner, but I have the most reliable information that coal can be put on the surface there with very large profit to miners, at \$1.50 per ton, and the agreement for transportation which was being made while I was there, was 40 cents a ton for 100 miles. Anyone can calculate the cost to carry it 400 miles and lay it down. As to water; there are places in that country where water is scarce, and it is in the district beyond Moose Jaw. It is not that there is not water in the soil. Here is the difficulty: All over that region there are immense deposits of pure tenacious clay, almost pure aluminium, that is, clay without any porosity whatever, and so the water only permeates the gravel beds. When you find a district thus overlaid, you will find no water except surface water—but you will find lakes from one to 100 acres on this clay—until you reach a gravel bed; but these districts are very few and scarce. Mention has been made of a locality where the railway Company went 300 feet to find water. They did that to suit their own convenience at a special point on the railway. I know, as a matter of fact, that at a station west of that point, a man who went to start a store there, acting on my suggestion, went to the side hill and dug into the gravel instead of boring down into the clay bed. I had to go south, and on returning ten days afterwards, we drank from a bucket of water taken from a well, only twelve feet deep, in which there were five feet of as nice water as I ever drank in my life. This difficulty in respect of water only applies to the central portion of the Province of Assiniboia. Running east from the mountains in Alberta, there are from eight to ten beautiful rivers, the character of the water of which, unless seen, cannot be appreciated. We all talk about the beautiful water of the St. Lawrence, but that is not a patch on it. As an experiment, I dropped a five cent piece into one of the streams, and I distinctly distinguished it at the depth of a long fishing rod which I had at the time. That is the character of the water, and it is so cold that in the middle of August it takes a vigorous fellow to take a dip into it. As to the character of the face of the country, I state most unhesitatingly—and I believe that observation on a more extended scale will shortly verify my statement—that in no portion of Ontario is there a smaller proportion of land unfit for agriculture than in the district of Alberta. I travelled there for days, and in various directions, and from one hill, or rather from one beautiful, rolling, undulating slope to another, and I frequently saw thousands of acres in one valley of the finest loam that the sun ever shone on. I say, as an agriculturalist, that I never left any portion of the earth which I have visited, with such a degree of reluctance, as I left the district of Alberta. My hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. White), spoke about living out in the snow. I may say that I saw snow there one afternoon, but I was told that it was 80 miles away. I saw it from Calgary, and speaking of that place, I may say that the man who has not visited Calgary has not yet seen one of the most pleasing sights, one of the finest landscapes, that could be presented to any man's view. I am not very much in the way of quoting poetry, but certainly if not the loveliest village ever was built. A finer site for a town could not have been selected, for they have abundance of water, they have coal, in the neighborhood of the mountains, they have timber, and they have mines. I believe that in a short period that town will be the rival of Winnipeg, and before the next ten years the people of Alberta will be knocking at the doors of this Parliament for a charter of incorporation, as by that time, I am sure, they will have attained the limit of population provided by the British North America Act. There seems to be some dispute as to the merits and demerits of the Tariff as affecting the price of agricultural

implements. One implement, which was more especially referred to, was reaping and binding machines. I admit that I did not price them, but I did price reapers, mowers, horse rakes, waggons and ploughs, and I am satisfied that with regard to those of which I knew the value myself, they were sold in that country, in many instances, cheaper, and in no instance dearer, than in Ontario, and cheaper than they were before. As to the supply, I might take Brandon as an example, and I am satisfied that it would take a most ingenious man to stack upon an acre lot the quantity of agricultural machinery carried over there this winter. As to the rapidity of construction of the road, and the location, I may say that I had some doubt about the location before I visited the country, and took in the topography of the region. The road, I am satisfied, runs through as good a portion of the country, in an agricultural sense, as the northern line, and it has this advantage, as has often been stated by the Minister of Railways, that it is 100 miles shorter, a most important item in a national highway. In my judgment, if the character of the country, on the northern line, is as represented by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), it will be rapidly penetrated by railways; in fact, it is being so penetrated already; and the main national line being to the south of that country, we will be able to procure the whole carrying trade of that region; whereas, if it had been built on the northern survey, it is possible we might have competition to the south, which of course, is impossible under existing circumstances. The member for Perth also spoke about the difficulties of settlers drawing their grain for hundreds of miles; but if a road had been built to the north, the people in the southern part of the country would have had the same difficulty to contend with. The real difficulty is that the country is so vast that it is impossible to construct a railway to every man's door, or to every little town, in the two years during which the road has been operating. As to branch lines, there appears to be some discrepancy as to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. One hon. gentleman argued that all the money should be spent on the main line, while another declared that the prosperity of the country was being impaired, and settlement paralyzed, because branches were not built. This is a discrepancy the hon. gentlemen can reconcile, as they please. There is one branch line, however, which would be of vast importance to the country. Many settlers were induced to go into the southern part of the country, that part south of the main line, in consequence of the hope that the Manitoba and South-Western would be constructed; but that road having been suspended, for some cause or other, and the Canadian Pacific Railway having acquired its charter, I think it should be pushed forward as rapidly as possible, because there have been settlers there a longer time without railway facilities than in any other part of the country than I am aware of, and I think their claims should be well and carefully considered. As to the farmers' delegates, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) denies that there was any political cabal, or that the movement originated for political purposes. Now, I chance to know something about that movement, as I happen to have some friends in the hon. gentleman's own town, as well as in Brandon and Winnipeg. If, as the hon. gentleman claims, that movement was strictly in the interests of the country, he should have been one of its leading spirits; but he says: No; I am afraid of my political position; I will not join in it at all, else somebody will find fault with me. The very fact of his absenting himself from the meetings, and taking no part in the proceedings, is an evidence, to my mind, that he was satisfied with the erroneousness of the whole movement. As to the character of the men sent down here, I am going to give a little comparison in a professional way. If the medical profession were to hold a convention in their interests, in, say the

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville).

Province of Ontario, I am quite sure that they would not send carpenters or blacksmiths, or even lawyers, if you like, to represent them, but medical men. There is an association of farmers, so called, who come down here, as they claim, to represent the farmers; but it is a question in my mind, if those men ever cultivated one square rod of land, and I doubt if they know peas from buckwheat, still, they come here to present the grievances of the farmers to the Dominion Parliament. The proposition is an absurd one. In the neighbourhood of Brandon, there are two or three men, whom I happen to know, prominent and successful farmers, old residents, and notoriously political friends of the hon. gentleman, and I would ask him why did not such men as Mr. Sifton, Mr. Mackenzie, or Mr. Stewart, and others of that character, come down on this delegation. But not one of them came; they were sensible, prudent men, who would have nothing to do with this little bit of political clap-trap, whose case was printed in the *Globe* office, on King street, Toronto. This was the place where these bomb-shells were prepared, which were to burst upon the country. Now, I travelled, as I said, on a buckboard. I took occasion when I met a farmer on his farm to ask him: "Well, neighbour, where did you come from?" "Well, I came from Carleton." But eight out of every ten men I met came from Huron and Bruce. Well, I found that every man I met, I may say without a single exception, who was on his farm and went there to make the country his home, expressed himself as perfectly satisfied, and as having no wish to go back to Ontario. I did find a few growlers—where did I find them? Loafing about the piazzas of the hotels; and I will venture the wager that 95 per cent. of the growlers were this class of men. True, my professional friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) the other night, gave an instance of one or two of the supporters of the hon. gentleman going out to that country and not finding where to place their feet. They could not find a spot in Manitoba, in which to-day there are more than 15,000,000 acres of unoccupied lands, while west of the boundary line there is a country capable of supporting 25,000,000 or 30,000,000, of not any denser population than we have in Ontario. And yet these supporters of my hon. friend, these strange kind of Tories, could not find a place to stick their heads in. I came across one or two men who said they had always been Conservatives and voted with the Conservative party; but they went up to the country, and were unfortunate; and, on enquiry, I found that they expected something from the officers of the Department, contrary to the expressed Statute, and did not get it. The law was administered so fairly and properly in the interest of the actual settler that these men had to come back. Many of these men were unsuccessful business men—unsuccessful newspaper men—or, perhaps there was some chap who had been unsuccessful in running an election, and who thought that if he went up there and selected a valuable property, he could get it in some way by bull-dozing the Government. These were the kind of men who said they were Tories, and who growled. These were the only class of men whom I found there growling. I asked: "Well, what is the matter?" "Oh, it is the land regulations." "Well, what do you object to in them?" "Oh," they say, "it is the land regulations." Now, as to the land regulations, their advantages were explained so fairly and so fully the other night by the hon. member for Lisgar, that it is unnecessary for me to make any long reference to them. But I feel that our land regulations are so liberal, so generous and so inviting, compared with those prevailing in Dakota, that I cannot refrain from mentioning a few of their features. Hon. gentlemen know that one of the first things that meets a Canadian or any other man who goes to settle in Dakota or Minnesota, is the oath of allegiance, especially against Great Britain. Do we impose any such conditions upon any one who goes to our

North-West? We say: No; you give us your citizenship for three years, and we will give you the land. The American term of residence is five years; ours is only three years, or rather only six months in each year of the three. And with reference to preemptions, no settler in Dakota can get a preemption until he gets a certificate of his homestead. The result is, that he is obliged to locate his preemption 30 or 40 miles away from his homestead, and then he only gets eighty acres. In our North-West, the moment a man makes his homestead entry, he can make his preemption entry, and he gets the two side by side; and he receives all the advantages that can accrue to him from his occupation of that preemption, as he does from his occupation of his homestead. It is just as sure to him as his homestead, provided he fulfils the necessary requirements of his homestead. So that there is no comparison between Dakota and our North-West in that respect. And yet hon. gentlemen get up in this House and state that one of the causes of the exodus, which I could not discover, is the inferiority of our land regulations to those of the United States. Now, with regard to the exodus. I found a great number of men in Manitoba, from Dakota, from Minnesota, and especially from Montana. I met one very intelligent man at Medicine Hat, who had been a mixed grazer and farmer in Montana; and he said to me: "As compared with Montana, this is God's country." That was his expression. Now, I have heard it said that there are large settlements of Canadians in the United States, and hon. gentlemen opposite attribute these settlements to the difference in the land laws of the two countries. I say that is absurd and unfair. I know that there are large settlements of Canadians in the western States—whole districts for miles around; I am speaking more particularly of Michigan and Illinois, in which there are large numbers of people from my own neighbourhood. Men whom I have lived with for fifteen years have gone out there. And why did they go? For this simple reason: they were led away by the profuse and attractive advertising, not only of the American Government, but principally of American railways that had lands for sale. I remember, twenty years ago, seeing something that I thought should not be tolerated by the Canadian people—the immense placards which were hung up at every prominent point in the country. I remember seeing in the Union station at Toronto, and also at Montreal, immense glass cases, about six feet long, containing specimens of all sorts of grain from Illinois, Minnesota, and other western States. I remember one advertisement in particular. In front there was a prairie scene, with long waving grass, and on one side a herd of buffalo; immediately in the rear were a number of engineers, with their instruments set up, and behind them were men laying a railway; behind that again were three or four ploughs, a reaping machine, a threshing machine, and other instruments at work, and behind that were a lot of carts drawing wheat to the railway. Now, what immigrant could resist an advertisement like that? Why, it was a whole lecture in itself. We had no prairie lands to offer at that time, and any young man, or old man either, who was intelligent and vigorous, and was desirous of making a home for himself and his sons at the least expenditure of labour, was not going into the back woods of Ontario, where he would have to cut down maple trees, and ash trees, and elm trees, to make a place for his home. Here was a country completely devoid of all these obstructions, and it attracted a lot of people; hence the settlement of Canadians in the north-western States. I know many of these old men were strong in their allegiance to British institutions, but they went there for the sake of pecuniarily benefiting themselves and families, and they lived and died British subjects. I know some to-day who never went to poll a vote; though their sons voted, they did not. What I want to point out is this: that the young people of to-day

are just as strong in their attachment to Canada as those old men to whom I refer; and when we have a country as extensive, as good, and as accessible to offer to these people, we will not have many more of these American settlements, provided hon. gentlemen opposite do not deter people from going in there by their cries about cold, want of fuel, bad water, blizzards and bad land regulations. In speaking of the frost, the hon. gentleman says the thermometer went down to 40 below zero. I noticed that one day on my own verandah, it went down to 38°, and the strong wind and the damp atmosphere at the time, I am satisfied, registered more on my feelings and those of any man in the country than 45 of the clear atmosphere of the North-West. Although the frost may have a deterring effect on those who do not thoroughly understand the conditions and the effect it has on that country in an agricultural sense, the cold period in the far North-West is much shorter than it is either in Manitoba or Ontario. Winter comes on in the extreme North-West about, perhaps, the middle of November, and men who have lived there ten years say that during all that time there was no season in which they could not sow their grain on the first of March, and the winter is practically gone by the end of February. As to the effects of frost, naturally it may be difficult to get through the winter until those people have built for themselves comfortable houses and got cheap fuel. But it has this effect upon the country, that every inch of frost that penetrates into the soil during the winter and thaws out in the spring, it disintegrates the food elements of the plants which are growing upon it, and adds to the store value of that country as an agricultural region. We know that as you approach the Mississippi from the north, even as far south as southern Dakota, where the frost does not penetrate to such a great depth, from six to eight years is about as long as the average surface of that country would preserve its maximum virgin production, for the simple reason that the frost does not penetrate any further, and as no sub-soiling has been attempted, the roots of the plants do not penetrate into the soil that has not been loosened by the frost. In the lands in this section, which have for years been under cultivation, the falling off, from this cause, is not compensated by the increase through new territory; but our North-West will preserve her maximum production of that under cultivation four or five years longer, so that even at a much less rapid pace of settlement than our neighbours, her maximum will be continued for a much longer period. There is another feature to which I draw attention. Every hon. gentleman who has paid attention to the zone belts of the earth, in which food cereals are produced, know that it is in the north temperate zones that nearly all the grains are grown, and the nearer the northern limit of that belt in which grain is matured perfectly, the better is the quality of the grain. What I illustrate by that is this: that we, having to-day in that North-West country a larger area of land fit for agricultural purposes, when we get a fair proportion under cultivation, we will produce a larger quantity continuously of a better quality than the American States can ever hope to do, and I state what I know is a matter of fact, when I say that wheat near our own boundary in northern Dakota is more valuable than that grown further south. Why is that? Simply because the grain is of a better quality—it is what is technically called of a flinty character, and, when grown, will produce more flour, and is used to mix with the softer grains grown in the southern wheat belt. In the southern belt, the same wheat cannot be grown more than three years successively, because it so softens that the germinating properties are lost and half the seeds will not sprout. A large quantity of our wheat, even as early as three years ago, was sent down to that region for seed wheat, as the hon. member for Marquette well knows. The ultimate result of this will

be that when that country is fairly under cultivation, when it has a population of five, six or eight millions, its production will be so great that when exported either by the Hudson Bay route, by the Canadian Pacific Railway or Port Arthur, I care not how, and launched on the Liverpool markets, those who schedule the bread stuffs and make up their prices for the season will not only ask how much is the production in England, in Russia, or in India or the United States, but the great question will be what will be the export from Canada? The production of Canada will regulate the prices of the world. This question has been dealt with so long and so variedly and by so many hon. gentlemen in this House, who have many years ago made their maiden speech, that there is very little left for me to say, and I feel that my remarks will have, perhaps, less interest than they might have had at an earlier date. But there is one thing, in speaking of the country west for settlement, which I think is very important, and the reason I mention it is that in reading, as I always do, carefully the reports of the geological surveys, I find no mention is made of it, nor is it mentioned by any surveyor or others who have travelled through that country. I think, therefore, that I am perfectly justified in drawing attention to the fact that in the extreme North-West fuel will be so cheap that the difficulty mentioned by the member for Marquette with reference to building timber will be easily remedied. Now I quite disagree with him. I am satisfied—I know it—that the cheapest building material, of the most durable and beautiful quality that exists on this continent, exists in that North-West Territory. I referred a few minutes ago to the large deposits of almost pure clay. Those beds are the deposits of the disintegration of the hill rocks, long before the country was settled, anyway, and the lime which the rocks contained has been carried off while held in solution. The clay, almost pure, is deposited—and I refer especially to the coal regions—in immense beds over the coal. The only substance that these clay beds contain, aside from the clay, is a silicate sand which is insoluble in water. What drew my attention to this was, that I saw at various places on the river banks, natural brick kilns, burnt and almost ready for the carter, of acres and acres in extent. It came in this way: The deposits were made over the coal beds by the action of water. In the course of time, ravines have been formed and cut through the coal beds. Eventually, the grass grew over the ravines, and, by some accidents in prairie fires, the coal caught fire, and continued back for acres under the surface, converting the whole superincumbent mass, from 150 to 200 feet, into one mass of beautiful brick. It is the character of the brick I wish to draw the attention of the House to. It is a brick formed from the clay, entirely devoid of lime, containing a silicate sand. In burning, after mixture, there is no expansion of the particles of lime. The brick is almost perfectly compact. It is a silicious brick. It is a crude glass, impervious to water, and almost indestructible by atmospheric influence. I found blocks in the Saskatchewan and in the Bow River, and north of the Red Deer River, which must have lain there, perhaps, for a thousand years, where they had fallen off, by the action of water and weather, into the water. Taking them up and breaking them with my hatchet, I found they were perfectly dry. Taking up ordinary limestone and smashing it, I could see evidence of the porosity and moisture there, convincing me that that brick was more impervious to water than our blue limestone. I found where they had drifted down the river for many miles, they were as smooth as any slate I ever saw polished. So much with reference to the building material. There is a scarcity of wood, it is true, and transport will cost something, but in that country you find the clay always overlaying the material for converting it into brick—the coal beds—you find it over the whole country; and brick may be moulded into any form—pillars, corners, mouldings—into

Mr. FERGUSON, (Leeds and Grenville).

any shape possible for the construction of a beautiful edifice, while in the kiln it may be converted into this indestructible brick, on the ground, from the coal that is there. There is another feature, that, when burnt, they may be polished, because they are so compact; and I saw thousands of evidences of their capability of being polished from the action of the water. That is not all. These clay beds vary from 25 to 50 feet, which were deposited at several spaces of time, and of different colours, the colour having been given, no doubt, by the character of the vegetable at the time the deposit was made, and the colour fixed by the silic acid in this sand, which, I think the hon. the Minister of Finance, from his knowledge of chemistry, knows, is the acid that fixes all vegetable dyes. There you find, in one stratum, a clay which makes a beautiful garnet red brick; in the next, a nice brown; then, a beautiful golden yellow; and, at the top, a snow white. There is the material and the character and the profuse nature of this supply. I am satisfied that, when that country comes to be settled, the towns and villages there will be the handsomest, the most durable, and the cheapest that ever were constructed on this continent, and that we will have ornamental buildings of material much more beautiful, because it takes a better polish, as indestructible, and at much less cost to the producer than the ordinary limestone rubble wall of Ottawa. So much as to the building material. I have given my view of the water and the fuel, and have stated my opinion as to the soil. I visited those farms and saw the results in wheat, barley, peas and oats. Let me detain you a moment longer. The barley of the North West region will be the select barley of this continent. During the time of its grain maturation, the atmosphere is dry, and such a thing as a bag of brown barley will never be produced. And, if my friends from Quebec will not take offence, I will say that, as for peas, the region is unsurpassed. I plucked peas, whole bundles of them, six miles south of Calgary, when I could count the peas in the pod 20 feet from the fence I was standing at. I forgot to mention as to the vegetation. I myself plucked and pulled cabbage, carrots, turnips and beets on the 8th August, seven miles south of Calgary, took them on the buckboard, and had them put in a tent, and eat them. I found one garden which will astonish some hon. gentlemen here, containing 15,000 heads, and there is not a head in this House as big as any of them. Just one word to the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). He stated that, to his personal knowledge and his belief—that is a lawyer's way of putting it—the majority of the people in Manitoba were as loyal in their feelings and sympathies and desires to the Canadian Government and institutions as a very considerable portion of the people in Ontario. That was about the only statement that I accepted fully from him, because I thought he was speaking for himself, politically, and his associates. Just one word in conclusion as to the Resolutions. Having had the honour of a seat in the House for a number of years, I think I am able to read between the lines, and to understand the cause of the opposition to these Resolutions. If my memory serves me aright, and I think it does, I have heard it stated by hon. gentlemen in this House—or if not in the House, in the vicinity of it—that all the monetary capacity of 4,500,000 Canadians, backed by the endorsement of Great Britain, could not build that road in the time specified. Now, we have almost indubitable evidence that within half the specified time the road will be constructed. And by whom? Under whose auspices? By the Conservative party. Hence the feeling of antipathy. I must say that it would, perhaps, have been better for the country if there had been no necessity for making this loan. It would have been better if circumstances had not placed the Company in a position that obliged them to ask for this loan. But since they have come back to us and have plainly, distinctly, and, I have a right to

assume, honestly and fairly, laid before the Government, and the Government before the House, the cause of the difficulty, I think they are entitled to favourable consideration. I look at the matter, not from a Canadian Pacific Railway standpoint, but from a broad national standpoint. Whatever question there may have been under the old contract as to the security offered for the performance of the work, this new arrangement makes it infinitely better. So, on the ground of security, my mind is perfectly clear. As to the object to be attained by the early construction, I am equally clear. It is well known to every hon. gentleman in this House that both the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Canadian Government, through the Minister of Agriculture, have advertised in every country in Europe, I believe in almost every language spoken in Europe, in a manner and with a profuseness that have never been done before. The result is that we are attracting the attention of the people at a specially opportune season in Europe in our endeavour to procure immigrants. It is well known to every one who reads the newspapers that there are social commotions in all the over crowded districts of Europe, such commotions as never existed before—land difficulties in Ireland, and land difficulties in Scotland, too; Communism in Germany, and Nihilism in Russia. These people are looking for some escape, for some country where they can go and reap the reward of their labour. We have so advertised the country, we have so directed attention to it, that the earlier we give them a thorough Canadian route, unembarrassed and unobstructed by rival land agents, the better for the country and the greater the volume of immigration we will secure. The Railway Company have informed the Government that they will be able to finish the road within half the time allowed by the contract; these people in Europe have been advised of that, and to suspend the construction of the road under present circumstances for six years longer, would lose us a large proportion of that immigration. Once the tide of immigration, like any other enormous tide, is flowing in any special direction, it requires a greater amount of exertion to arrest it than it does to hold it after it is started. One circumstance struck me to-day in a discussion that took place in another part of this building—in Committee. A gentleman gave us in figures his estimate of the advantages to the country from the immigration into the North-West, considering the money they brought in, the revenue the country will derive from their consumption of dutiable goods, &c., and he estimated that the 80,000 immigrants who came in last year represented an increase of \$5,000,000 to the wealth of the country. Now, if, for the next six years, we have the same amount of immigration, and no greater, it will represent an addition to the fixed capital of the Dominion of \$30,000,000. That, to my mind, is a reason sufficient to warrant the loan, and I shall vote for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a personal question. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down was good enough to state that I had used these words—that I could find no words strong enough to express my disapprobation of the conduct of the Liberal press? Now, I should like to know, is there any human being having a seat on the floor of this House, stupid enough to suppose that I declared I could find no words strong enough to express my disapprobation of the conduct of the Liberal press. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman appreciated the utter absurdity of putting such words into my mouth. I told him, at the time, he was utterly mistaken, and I request him now, either to withdraw that statement or else to prove it—whichever he pleases.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). As the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) a few days ago put some very pertinent questions, I desire to say a few words in answer to his enquiries. He insinuated a few days ago that my motive for

making a speech on another question was my justification for voting for the Resolutions in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is not my desire, Sir, to make any recriminations in debate on an important question of this kind. But I desire to call his attention to the fact that in 1872 I voted for Resolutions in this House giving a land grant of 5,000,000 acres, and a cash subsidy of \$50,000,000, for the purpose of building a railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. At that time, the Government of the day assured the representatives from Nova Scotia that the building of that road would not cost the people of the older Provinces of this Dominion one farthing. Although a large amount of money has been expended on that road since that time, I am happy to say that neither directly nor indirectly has the people of the rest of the Dominion, of the older Provinces, paid one farthing towards the expenditure on that road up to the present time. We did, it is true, borrow money for the purpose of building that road, but it is equally true that we received as much from the sale of lands in that territory as paid for the interest. In 1872, the Government of the day promised that not one farthing would be taken out of the pockets of the rest of the Dominion. The right hon. the leader of the Government, 18th January, 1881, said:

"Both Governments were pledged that the North-West should pay the cost of its own railway. We saw and felt that there was no reason why the taxpayers of the Maritime Provinces, or of the old Provinces of Canada should, out of their own pockets, pay for railway construction in the North-West. Those hon. gentlemen felt, as we felt, that in order to develop that great country, we should make an advance, borrow money and loan it to the North-West, which was rich enough when its resources were developed to repay principal and interest for the advance which they wished Parliament to make. We did ask Parliament to make the grant. Parliament made the grant, but under a solemn pledge given by myself and my colleagues, that we believed and knew that by a proper and vigorous administration of the affairs of that country, not one farthing would be taken out of the pockets of the rest of Canada, and that the North-West should pay for and build its own railway."

With this statement before him, any business man in the Dominion would consider it a justification for his vote on this question. The Minister of Railways was asked in regard to the repayment of the loan. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) said:

"In regard to the return of this money, I ask the hon. Minister of Railways, with his experience as to the difficulty involved in getting money back into the Treasury from a railway company, whether he really and honestly expects that the money will ever return?"

"Sir CHARLES CUPPER. Yes, every dollar."

That statement, combined with the assurance of the leader of the Government, should have satisfied the hon. member; but it appears to me to be very difficult to satisfy him. Let us suppose that we will not get the money returned; what position will we then occupy? We will have advanced \$25,000,000 in cash, have given the Railway Company a road which cost this Dominion \$28,000,000, for which the hon. member for Digby and the members of the former Government were responsible, and we will have advanced to them \$32,500,000, which give an aggregate amount of \$15,500,000. What shall we have as security? We will have 100,000,000 acres of land set aside for the purpose of the road, and also 21,000,000 acres which the Company give as security, together with many other valuable securities for repayment of the loan. That land, at \$2 per acre, which I consider a very low price for such land as is described to me by persons who are personally acquainted with the North-West, will amount, together with other securities to no less than \$24,000,000. Out of this I assume that the cost of surveys would be about \$40,000,000, thus leaving a net balance to the credit of the Dominion of \$124,500,000. Under such circumstances, I do not consider that the people of the Maritime Provinces, or the rest of the Dominion, need fear to advance \$22,500,000 on such security as the Company now offer. The hon. member for Digby, asked another question, in these terms:

"I ask my hon. friends from Nova Scotia, who I am sure are desirous of doing anything they can, both for the Government and the Province they represent, if they have looked at the Public Accounts and the amount of the public debt, if they have noticed that in 1867, when the Province were confederated, the whole gross debt amounted to \$93,000,000, and that in sixteen years we have increased that amount to \$202,000,000, and it is now proposed by the hon. Minister of Railways, with one stroke of the pen, to add \$30,000,000 more."

I think it is hardly fair for the hon. member for Digby to say that we will add \$30,000,000 to the debt of Canada simply because we advance \$22,500,000 on such substantial security as I have described. But the increase in the debt of this Dominion since 1867 can be accounted for. This first increase of the debt was on account of the better terms given to Nova Scotia \$1,100,000. I would ask the hon. member for Digby if he would object to that increase? A large portion of the increase of the debt was due to the building of the Intercolonial Railway. Would the hon. member object to that increase? Another increase was owing to the assumption of the debt of \$11,000,000, due by Ontario and Quebec, on account of which Nova Scotia received \$1,500,000. Would the hon. member object to that? Another considerable amount of the increase in the public debt was due to the very large deficits which occurred during the administration of affairs by the Government of which the hon. member for Digby was a distinguished member. Surely he would not object to that increase? The whole question in regard to increased debt depends altogether as to whether the increase is one in the interests of the Dominion or not. Other items of increase were owing to the Dominion undertaking and completing public works which developed its resources, and on account of which a large amount of revenue was collected, and the expenditure was not only justifiable but in the interests of the whole Dominion, and consequently in the interests of the Maritime Provinces. He commenced his speech in the usual sympathizing manner. We were accustomed to that in a particular part of the Province to which I shall not allude, in connection with questions of this kind. He said:

"Almost every hon. gentleman who has risen on this side of the House has spoken in opposition to the Resolutions, and for that reason they have been charged with being disloyal, to some extent, and with being enemies to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman has thought proper to say that because I moved this amendment to defer for six months the consideration of this question, I must necessarily be an enemy to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I deny the charge, Mr. Speaker. This House has now been occupied for the last fortnight, almost, in the discussion of these Resolutions. We know, Sir, it must be very important for this country to have this matter settled one way or the other, as soon as possible. I say I am not an enemy to the Company, because I hold certain members of that Company, whom I know very well, in high respect—in much higher respect than any hon. gentleman who sits on the Treasury benches. I would be the last man in this House to say one word against those gentlemen composing the Company, or do anything at all to interfere with the progress of the great work in which they are engaged in completing our line of railway to the Pacific coast."

Good language this to be used by any person in any part of the Dominion and very emphatically in favour of the construction of that road. But the hon. gentleman's sympathies were not only with the different members of the Company, but with the great country through which that railway is to pass; but, notwithstanding all that, his allegiance to party would compel him to protest, immediately after, against the scheme which the Government proposed in order to build the railway through that great country. This question has been so exhaustively discussed that it is utterly impossible for a member from an outlying district in this great Dominion to advance anything new, and I would not have spoken at all only for the very serious question raised by my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail). But before sitting down, I beg to call the attention of the House to a letter which I received from one of my constituents who happens now to be at Port Arthur. It is so interesting, and has such a bearing on this discussion, that

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

I think it my duty to read as much of it as refers to the subject under discussion. It is as follows:—

"Undoubtedly you may be surprised to hear from me in this part of the Dominion, to which I came last November, having been previously over the summits of the Rocky Mountains. I went there in July, and remained until work was suspended, about the 1st of October, as it was doubtful through which of two different passes at or near the summit the railway would pass, the grading having been finished to that point, which is seventy miles into the Rockies. It is very singular there was hardly any rock excavated in all that distance to the summit. There is a gap made by the Bow River through the Rockies, carrying a level flat varying from one to three miles in breadth all along to the summit. Since my return to Port Arthur the times are rather dull, but we anticipate a good summer, and I intend to remain here until the next fall. There is a large tract of excellent land between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. The Eagle River country, particularly, about 200 miles west of Port Arthur, contains hundreds of thousands of acres of bush lands to settle on, and the rivers and lakes are teeming with excellent fish. I would like to have my family there, as well as other friends from Cape Breton. The land is easily cultivated there, and I would rather settle on it than on any prairie lands."

Having heard so much of the value of the prairie land of the North-West, and having heard upon such good authority as this letter, that the lands between Port Arthur and Winnipeg are even superior to that, I have come to the conclusion that there is not much risk in expending all the money necessary to finish the road from Callander to Port Moody. It is evident, to my mind, that the building of this railway will vastly benefit Ontario particularly, because a large portion of it passes through that great Province. No person can question that it will benefit Manitoba and the North-West Territory and British Columbia. I am glad of it; and it will always afford me pleasure to give the inhabitants of these sections of the country as much money as will be required to build their railways, particularly when the cost of those railways is paid by the great country itself. It is also a benefit to Cape Breton, as you will perceive by the letter of my correspondent. If he fails in the future as he did in the past, in securing railways for Cape Breton, he finds that there is an outlet for him and his family to the great North-West; and I must say if I can influence the people of Cape Breton, and divert the tide of emigration which now exists, unfortunately, from that Island to the United States, and induce those people to go to the North-West Territory, I conclude I have done well in voting for money to build railways into that great country. Now, Sir, my conclusion is this: That as we voted in 1872 for the building of that railway from Callander to Port Moody, on terms which bore more heavily on the people of the North-West Territory than the present one, or rather bore more heavily on the assets which we possess there, to meet our liabilities, I feel no difficulty in voting for the proposition which is before the House on this occasion, when assured that it will benefit the great country to the west and will not injure any one in the county from which I come.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). The member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) challenged a quotation which I made, and I would like to say that I find the extract to which I referred on page 196 of *Hansard*, of this year. It is as follows:—

"But he admitted that although the attacks of the Liberal party were bad, they were not a circumstance to the attacks of the Liberal press. As to the Liberal press, he had hardly any words too strong to convey his disapprobation of their conduct towards the North-West and towards the railway. Now, Sir, I am not responsible, nor are my friends responsible, for all that the press of Canada choose to say. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite would like to be held responsible—at least, I hope they would not—for all that their press choose to say about the North-West, or about other public subjects."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, is it possible that we have in this House a gentleman possessing the education of my hon. friend—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. An hon. gentleman gave way—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, Sir, I am surely entitled to make a personal explanation, and to say that the hon. gentleman placed in my mouth words which I stated were used by Mr. Ives, and he apparently does not know grammar enough to see the difference.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is perfectly in order for the hon. gentleman to make an explanation; but I thought he was going further.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, no; I was going to make an explanation of what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then the hon. gentleman is quite in order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg to call attention to the fact that those words are the words of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, and not mine, as the hon. gentleman can see if he chooses to read the words as they are.

Mr. RYKERT. Bosh! rot!

Mr. SCOTT. I do not intend to trouble the House by speaking on the Resolutions, but in the few remarks I have to offer I will endeavour to confine myself to the subject, that is, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). I must say that I was not a little surprised when that hon. gentleman thought it his duty to cast a vote against the Resolutions. I felt that a gentleman representing a constituency in Manitoba, could not be true to the trust reposed in him—could not have that belief in the future of his Province that he ought to have, if he cast a vote in that direction. I felt, and I feel now, that the present and the future prosperity of that Province depends very largely upon the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and as a representative from that Province, I felt that it was my duty to the country to cast my vote in favour of those Resolutions. I must say now that I for one feel that it is also my duty to cast my vote against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Marquette, which is especially directed to the Manitoba members. The hon. gentleman says, and the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Casey) also said, that the road has been constructed too fast; and we have heard that repeated during the whole of this discussion by hon. members on the Opposition side. We heard this statement for the first time when these Resolutions were submitted to the House. Before that, did we ever hear anything but praise to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for building that road as rapidly as they have done? But now we hear that increased rapidity means increased cost. I contend, however, that the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway has done more to draw the attention of the world to our North-West than all else besides. The people on the other side of the Atlantic have seen that a railroad can be constructed, and constructed more rapidly, than any other across the American continent, on Canadian territory: and that must convince them that in a country where there is such little difficulty in railway construction, we must have soil that is easily worked. Those who grumble to-day at the speedy construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, were the first to grumble a few years ago because there was delay in building that road. As soon as the present Company obtained their charter, the road was pushed forward very rapidly. I am sure the hon. member for Marquette must remember that before the hon. the Minister of Railways visited the little straggling hamlet of Portage la Prairie in 1879—when, with the consent, I have no doubt, of his colleagues, he diverted the road six miles into the town—the people of Portage la Prairie were prepared to move out six miles. But what has been the result of the hon. Minister's action on that occasion? The town has doubled in population as well as in wealth.

The hon. Minister of Railways, on visiting the town again, was taken by the hand by every warm-hearted Grit in the town; he was feted and dined and wine and almost kissed by those Grits, they were so thankful to him. Two years afterwards—not to their credit, be it said, they sent the hon. gentleman who now represents them to oppose the present Government, and to speak in disparaging terms of his own Province in order to justify the vote which he has given on this question. With regard to the farmers' grievances and the difficulties which now obtain in the Province of Manitoba, I admit that there is considerable agitation; I will admit also that there are complaints, and the sooner those complaints are remedied the better it will for the Province and the whole Dominion at large. But I must say this: that the grievances could and would be easily rectified and corrected were the proper measures taken. I am opposed, and I think every hon. gentleman who represents a constituency in this House must be opposed, to this frequent sending of delegates to the Government in reference to every little matter which may affect their constituents, and I believe a great deal will depend upon the way in which people will place their complaints before the Government. I think the Government have shown a disposition at all times to meet the people from the prairie Province, and have shown that they were most anxious and willing to do all they could to further the interests of that section of the country. With regard to this agitation, I do say that it has been manipulated by a set of wire-pullers to a very great extent—by men who have not the true interests of the Province at heart, but have little objects of their own to serve—men who are hostile to the present Government, and want to make as much political capital out of this agitation as they can. I must say that the language used by many members of that farmers' convention has been anything but beneficial to the country; on the contrary, has been most injurious. Only a week ago, at a meeting of this Farmers' Union, one gentleman prophesied that ten years would not pass before this Province must become separate from the present Confederation. That is about as patriotic as some other utterances coming from the same quarter. Another gentleman—and I take the report of the *Free Press*, the Grit paper, which, of course, must be correct—the President of the Farmers' Union said:

"While the people in this country wanted to respect the law and be law-abiding citizens, it was a question of bread and butter. We are bound to reverence the Imperial Parliament as a mother, and our loyalty was first to it, and the men of this country must know whether they were to be the honoured sons of a hoary empire, or the bastard infants of a juvenile confederacy."

Such language, coming from such a quarter, must have great weight with the present Dominion Government. Now, Sir, as to this question of the twenty years' limitation, or, as it is generally called by those opposed to it, the monopoly clause of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter. When the charter was under discussion, the Manitoba members then supporting the present Dominion Government objected to that clause. We are informed that the great difficulty and the great fear was that we would not get an early completion, at all events, of the road running north of Lake Superior. We felt that although living in the North-West and a thousand miles away from the other portions of the Dominion, it was our duty, as loyal subjects, to support the building of a line through Canadian territory, and we gave our vote and our assent to the twenty years' limitation. To show what effect this agitation may have, I may say that when the railway known as the South-Eastern was chartered by the Local Government, and the charter was disallowed by the Dominion Government on the grounds of public policy, because it conflicted with the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, the people of Manitoba were up in arms. The Federal elections took place in 1883, a few months afterwards, and I was informed that

as a supporter of the Government, I would not get a corporal's guard, that I could not obtain twenty votes in the whole city, that my defeat was a foregone conclusion, on account of this disallowance. I replied that the Government would have committed a breach of faith had they allowed this charter, and that the men who were urging the Government to break faith in this matter would be the first to malign them for having done so. Then, as to-day, we heard the same cry that the whole of Manitoba was in a state of revolution, that the people were in a solid body opposed to the Government. The Reformers brought out their most solid men, and to make the thing doubly sure they induced a Conservative to run as an Independent. I received more votes than both of them. This little agitation to-day, I believe and I hope, will result in good for the Province, but at the same time, I have no sympathy with any set of men who, while professing to assist their country, are doing all they can to injure it. I feel that in the Province of Manitoba we will now have the right to build roads in any direction we please; I believe the Government will deal with any charter coming before it on its merits; and I can state positively that the feeling of ninety-nine out of every hundred people in the Province of Manitoba is in favour of allowing that monopoly clause to be struck out of the charter. We do not want to deflect all our trade to the American Pacific, but wish to give all our trade possible to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have every reason to believe the Canadian Pacific Railway, as soon as constructed, north of Lake Superior, will be able to compete with any American lines. I further claim that it really is not a monopoly, and that limitation was placed there, I believe, wisely by the Government. To-day we know the Canadian Pacific Railway have not been as successful as expected, but I believe that clause was placed in the contract to strengthen the Syndicate in the money markets of the world, and when this Bill is passed I believe the Company will be in a position to rapidly construct the road, thus giving us what we require most in the city of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West, to-day. We will require other outlets, and that very soon. I am strongly in favour of the Hudson Bay route, and have strong faith in the possibility of that route. I believe that in 1891, the year in which the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be completed under the charter, we will have a road to the Hudson Bay, and both lines will not be sufficient to move the immense quantity of grain which will require to be shipped from that country. The Government should, in my opinion, do all that lies in its power to give assistance to the construction of branch lines of roads; and so soon as a section of country gets settled up roads should be built there, and every 25 or 30 miles of country will sustain a railway. Objection was made by the member for Perth (Mr. Trow) that the Canadian Pacific Railway was built through a barren country, and he claims that it should have been constructed on the old northern line. Well, I believe a charter was granted and an application for the extension of the charter has been made for a line running through that section, and no doubt, in a very few years we will have another road running to the Rocky Mountains south of the main line, so that so far as roads running south and west are concerned, we will have sufficient lines, but our great object is to have a network of railways striking the main line. I will not detain the House longer in reference to this matter, but simply wish to correct the hon. member for Marquette, and to say he does not represent the opinion of the people of Manitoba in casting his vote against the Resolutions now under consideration.

Mr. WATSON. I wish to say a few words of personal explanation. It has been stated by the hon. gentleman that I did not represent—

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman is clearly out of order.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SPEAKER. He asks for a few words of explanation. The hon. gentleman has not the right to reply. It is only the mover of a substantive motion who has the right to reply.

Mr. KIRK. I shall not detain the House beyond a few minutes, as I only wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Inverness. During the last two Sessions that hon. gentleman has made several lengthy speeches, and the burden of his speeches has been justice to Cape Breton. I am glad to-night he has found a subject upon which he can glorify this Dominion, and for which he is willing to support this Government on the ground that they are doing justice to Cape Breton—by voting \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a railway to the North-West. He justifies this on the ground, and in this he repeats what the leader of the Government has said, that this vote will not cost the country one cent, and he points to the fact that there is sufficient from the sale of lands in the North-West to pay the interest of the debt incurred in the building of this road. What are the facts? The hon. Minister of Railways, in presenting his case, made this statement:

"I hold in my hands a statement showing the amount received on account of Dominion lands, homesteads, pre-emptions, sales, colonization companies, timber, grazing, minerals and miscellaneous receipts in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and I asked the hon. Minister of the Interior to divide this so as to show, as far as possible, by contrast, the effect upon this important question of the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. From the 1st July, 1870, to the 30th June, 1880, ten years, we received from all these services the sum of \$817,426. From the 1st of July to the 31st December, 1883, we received \$3,572,876."

Now, Sir, in answer to this, it was stated by the leader of the Opposition, and it has not been contradicted or denied up to this moment, that the sum that was paid during this period for the government of that country out there, on three different heads alone—that is, maintenance of Indians, \$3,096,000; Mounted Police, \$1,135,000, and Dominion Lands, \$1,340,000—was in all, \$5,571,000. Now, if these figures are correct, and they have not been disputed, I should like to know where he gets the money to pay the interest which this money is going to cost them. I have but little more to say. I believe it was maintained by both political parties that this road was expected to be built without adding one cent to the taxes of the people of this Dominion. Has it not already added largely to the taxes of the people? Why is it that the taxes of this Dominion have been increased from 17½ to perhaps 35 per cent.? Why is it that the necessaries of life have been taxed? Why is it that the fishermen of the hon. member's county have to pay a tax on their cornmeal and flour and all the other necessaries of life? Was it not to raise a revenue for the purpose of building this railway? Everyone knows that it was impossible to build this railway at the rapid rate they are attempting to build it without increasing the taxation. It is for that reason, because the taxation of the people has been increased, because, if we voted this \$30,000,000 additional to the debt of the Dominion, the taxes of the people must necessarily be further increased, that I intend to record my vote against the Resolutions of the hon. the Minister of Railways, and for the amendment.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I think I may be pardoned for saying a few words. It is very seldom that I trouble the House, and I may say that only the innate modesty and proverbial diffidence of a sailor have prevented my opening my mouth before, but I conceive it to be my duty, inasmuch as it has been said that this railway is being built for British Columbia, to say something on it before it reaches British Columbia. I have listened with marked attention to all the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who compose the Ministry, and I have listened with equally marked attention

to what has been said by the members of the Opposition, and from the two I have been able to draw sufficient conclusions to induce me to vote in favour of the Resolutions. There are several reasons why I think the members from British Columbia should vote for these Resolutions. One is, that it shows an honesty of purpose on the part of the present Administration to carry out the terms with British Columbia. It is also a noteworthy fact that, in any case, no matter how much the progress of the Canadian Pacific Railway may be expedited it will, at the best, as far as British Columbia is concerned, be five years behind time, with regard to the original terms of Union. This I do not blame the present Administration for, nor am I inclined to hit those that are down; but I must say that the delay has been mainly attributable to the apathy and indifference of the Administration which preceded that which I have the honour to support. We come here, one and all of us, in a triple capacity—first, to represent our individual constituencies; secondly, the interests of the Province of which that constituency is a concomitant, and lastly, although perhaps we might more correctly say firstly, the interests of the whole Dominion. I regard the Canadian Pacific Railway not as built in the interests of British Columbia, but in the interests of the whole Dominion. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Homer), one of my colleagues from the Province of British Columbia, has very tritely remarked that it will be a surprise, and a most agreeable surprise, to the whole of this Dominion when they reach the Pacific coast, that they will be placed in communication with 700,000,000 souls, and the commerce to the Dominion cannot be over-estimated from China, Japan, India, and the islands of the Pacific Ocean. There is another thing that I might say. It will be very refreshing, I think, to members from Ontario—not so much to the members from Quebec, Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island, but to those from Ontario, and those who are at present inhabiting the North-West Territory and Manitoba—to be able to get in forty-eight hours to a sight of salt water, as they will by going west to the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. KIRK. If they go east, they will see salt water.

Mr. BAKER. There is another reason why British Columbia should, in any case, support these Resolutions. We have, for a number of years, been labouring under all the disadvantages of being in the Dominion, without reaping any of the advantages. The operation of the Tariff in British Columbia has alone been enough to make the people of that Province cry out as regards the tardy construction of the railway, not for the last two or three years, but previous to that; so that, when the railway is constructed, we shall be placed in closer connection with the eastern Provinces, and be able to derive some of the advantages which attach to home industries. I will not detain the House, as I see everybody is anxious to get to a division, and I am not particularly anxious to inflict the House with any words from your humble servant, but I do think that inasmuch as we have, as far as I can see, about two to one, it might be taken for granted that the Ministry have certainly weighed these things much more closely than we have done or can possibly do, and we should give them credit for a certain amount of perspicuity. I shall, with all my heart, support the Resolutions now before the House, without casting any reflections upon the opinions which may be evinced by the gentlemen who may vote on the opposite side.

Amendment (Mr. Watson) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS :		
Messieurs		
Allison (Lennox), Armstrong, Auger,	Geoffrin, Gillmor, Gunn,	Mulock, Paterson (Brant), Platt,

Blake, Burpee (Sunbury), Cameron (Harou), Cameron (Middlesex), Carwright, Casey, Casgrain, Catudal, Charlton, Cockburn, Davies, Fairbank, Fisher, Forbes,	Harley, Holton, Innes, Irvine, Jackson, King, Kirk, Lister, Livingstone, McCraney, McIntyre, McIsaac, McMullen,	Ray, Rinfret, Scrivner, Somerville (Brant), Somerville (Bruce), Springer, Thompson, Trow, Vail, Watson, Weldon, Wilson, Yeo.—49.
--	---	--

NAYS :  
Messieurs

Allison (Hants), Amyot, Bain (Soulanges), Baker (Missisquoi), Baker (Victoria), Beaty, Bell, Belleau, Benoit, Benson, Bergeron, Bergin, Billy, Blondeau, Bossé, Bowell, Brecken, Burns, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Victoria), Carling, Caron, Chapleau, Cimon, Cochrane, Costigan, Coughlin, Coursol, Curran, Cutbert, Daly, Dawson, Desaulniers, Dickinson, Dodd, Dugas, Dundas, Dupont,	Farrow, Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.), Ferguson (Welland), Fortin, Foster, Fréchette, Gagné, Gigault, Girouard, Gordon, Grandbois, Guilbault, Guillet, Hackett, Haggart, Hall, Hawkins, Heeson, Hickey, Homer, Hurteau, Jamieson, Kaulbach, Kilvert, Kinney, Kranz, Labrosse, Landry (Kent), Langevin, Lesage, Macdonald (Sir John), Macdonald (Cape Breton), Mackintosh, Macmillan (Middlesex), McMillan (Vaudreuil), McCallum, McDougald,	McGreevy, McLelan, McNeil, Massue, Mitchell, Moffat, Montplaisir, O'Brien, Orton, Pain, Patterson (Essex), Pinsonneault, Pope, Reid, Riopel, Robertson (Hastings), Ross, Royal, Scott, Shakespeare, Small, Sproule, Stairs, Taylor, Temple, Tilley, Tupper (Pictou), Tyrwhitt, Valin, Vanasse, Wallace (Albert), Wallace (York), White (Cardwell), White (Hastings), Wigle, Williams, Wood (Brockville).—112
---	--	--

PAIRS :

<i>Government.</i>	Messieurs	<i>Opposition.</i>
Landry (Montmagny), Ives, Bourbeau, Méthot, Desjardins, Robertson (Hamilton), Wright, Rykert, Quimet,		Bourassa, Campbell (Renfrew), Échard, Bain (Wentworth), Robertson (Shelburne), Sutherland (Oxford), Macenzie, Landerkin, De St. Georges.

On the main motion being put,

Mr. WELDON. We have heard, during the course of this discussion, a great deal about the North-West, and we have had statements put forward by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. White), and an interesting account by the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson). I can only hope that the boasts of these hon. gentlemen regarding the future of that country may be realized, and that the fears entertained to the contrary, may prove unfounded. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. White), made a eulogy of the North-West country, and claimed not only that it would benefit the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but he also claimed that it would benefit the Maritime Provinces. He did not point out, nor has any speaker ever endeavoured to point out, how we in the Maritime Provinces are going to be benefited by the Canadian Pacific Railway; but we must remember that the Maritime Provinces will have to pay their share of the burdens, since they form a portion of the country. During the Confederation campaign, it

was put forward in New Brunswick that St. John would become the Liverpool of Canada, and it was urged as one of the main grounds in favour of Confederation that to our ports in the Maritime Provinces would be drawn the trade of Canada. Now, the policy the Government foreshadowed when the Canadian Pacific Railway matter was first brought before this House—a policy which has been reiterated in this House and in the Railway Committee—was to make that road wholly on Canadian territory, with no connection with American roads, that it should be entirely a trans-continental railway on Canadian soil, stretching from ocean to ocean, from a Canadian port on the Pacific to a Canadian port on the Atlantic. If that was the policy of the Government, and if it was considered beneficial in the interests of the North-West and in the interests of Canada that that restriction should be made, then I do not see why the same should not apply to the Maritime Provinces; and if that policy is a sound principle in the North-West, I do not see why it should not equally be sound in principle when applied to the east. The lines were not to be connected with American lines, and the policy of the Government was announced to be to divert the carrying trade wholly to Canadian territory. Now, I do not see why that policy should not apply to the Maritime Provinces, and why the winter port of the Canadian Pacific Railway should not be in Canadian territory, on the Atlantic Ocean. The Minister of Railways has put that forward; but he has also said that the advantages of Portland, to some extent, will over-ride the general policy, and that so far as the east is concerned, they will be justified in departing from that policy. I hold that so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, we have a right to exact a pledge that so far as the Government have control over this Company, they should give some assurances to the Maritime Provinces that the resources of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be applied in endeavouring to form connections with the ports in our Provinces, and thus to fulfil the promises that have been made that the trade of the North-West should find an outlet in Atlantic ports in Canadian territory. In the Maritime Provinces we have ports in which every facility is afforded for shipping. The first port I may mention, is that of St. Andrews. It is open all the year round, and is well adapted for the purposes of shipping. Then we have the port in the county which I have the honour to represent, the port of St. John, at the mouth of St. John River, and very well adapted for the purpose. I can recollect that twenty-three years ago, when the Allan line first came to Portland, their ships were not able to get a cargo at Portland, and were obliged to come down to St. John to load or unload a portion of their cargo, and then return to Portland to fill up, and to get the Canadian mails which they carried across the Atlantic. In view of the facilities of that port, of the improvements in the harbour, of the knowledge possessed by our pilots, of the extensive trade there, and extensive navigation, I think it offers all the facilities required. The objection which used to be put forward with regard to the Bay of Fundy are almost entirely done away with. During the past year, a large number of steamers have loaded in that port, and without a single exception all those steamers, during all periods of the year, have forsaken navigation in and out of the Gulf. We have, then, the port of Halifax, one of the finest—I may almost say the finest—ports in the world, in which I was going to say the whole navy of Great Britain might ride in safety. It is also one of the nearest ports to Europe. The hon. Minister of Railways said some time ago that he hoped the day might come when the old prestige of Louisburg might be revived, and that that magnificent harbour which caught the attention of France so many years ago, and which is equal in many respects to any harbour on the continent—that that harbour might also become a winter port for the termination of the

Mr. WELDON.

Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be the duty of this Government to facilitate and encourage trade. If we look across the border, we find the cities of Baltimore, New York and Boston, vying with each other in endeavouring to afford facilities to attract the trade from the west to flow into their ports. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in our own case, it is the duty of the Government and the duty of the Company, in its relations to the Government, in using the resources afforded by the Government, to form a connection with the ports in the Lower Provinces, and thus to give those Provinces the advantages of being a terminus of that road. Now this is a matter which has already been under consideration by the people of the Maritime Provinces, and they are becoming alive to it. I would call the attention of the House to certain resolutions passed by the Halifax City Council, of which, I presume, copies have been sent to the members from the Maritime Provinces. In January last, the Halifax city council passed resolutions, some of which, in regard to the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, are as follows:—

“Whereas, It has come to the knowledge of the Council that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have it in contemplation to locate their Atlantic winter terminus at an United States port, and

“Whereas, The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, although, in one sense, a private corporation, such as would be, under ordinary circumstances, empowered to locate their road so as to secure the largest practicable profit to the Company's shareholders, on the other hand have undertaken a great national work with a view of building up and consolidating the various sections of the Dominion; and

“Whereas, The exceedingly great assistance given to the Company in their undertaking by the Government and Parliament of Canada, make it evident that the Company, in constructing and completing their road, are doing a work which is regarded as a great public necessity, and which would have been done by the Government had no company been found able and willing to undertake it; and

“Whereas, The refusal of the Government and Parliament of Canada to allow an intermediate link of the great inter-oceanic highway to be located even temporarily in a foreign country, indicated a fixed determination that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be in all its parts a purely Canadian work; and

“Whereas, The location of the Atlantic winter terminus of the railway in United States territory, would derogate much more from the national character of the work than the utilization, for temporary purposes of the American lines south of Lake Superior, between Saute Ste. Marie and Manitoba; and

“Whereas, The Lower Provinces, whose people have contributed largely towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, are entitled to derive therefrom the comparatively slight advantage of having its winter terminus situated within their territory;

“Therefore, Resolved, That in the opinion of the Council, the projected location of the Atlantic winter terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at a foreign port, would be a direct violation of the principles enunciated and acted upon by the Government and Parliament with respect to the road around Lake Superior and an irreparable injury to the people of the Lower Provinces, and that it is the imperative duty of the Government of Canada to take such steps as may be found necessary to secure the location of the eastern winter terminus of our great inter-oceanic railway at a harbour within our borders.”

Such, Mr. Speaker, are the resolutions passed by the city of Halifax. They are approved by the city of St. John and by the city of Quebec. As we have learned from members of the Government, so far as Quebec is concerned, the members for that Province appear to have attained their object. As regards the Maritime Provinces, it will be urged that trade will always go to the nearest port, and that Portland and Boston have advantages which will cause the trade to go there. But there are advantages as regards Customs regulations and other matters, in having the terminus on Canadian territory that more than counterbalance any advantages possessed by the American ports. In New Brunswick we are building railways, and the New Brunswick Railway, to connect with the Intercolonial at Riviere du Loup and running down to St. John will afford facilities which, with the encouragement of the Government, will enable that Company to have a terminus at one of the ports I have mentioned. I do not speak for any particular port, although my predilections are in favour of the city which I represent; but the Company might take any of those ports, and the Maritime Provinces would be willing to concur in

the choice. We have heard a great deal about patriotism from hon. gentlemen opposite, and I think, in view of the position of the Maritime Provinces, we have a right to appeal to that patriotism of which hon. gentlemen are fond of speaking, in order that the eastern terminus of the Pacific Railway may be placed within the Dominion, and not at a port over which a foreign flag waves. Without taking up the time of the House further, I beg to move the following amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the said motion be left out and the following inserted instead thereof:—The said Resolutions be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with power to provide as a condition of the proposed advance, that so long as any part of such advances or interest thereon remains unpaid, none of the resources of the Company shall be expended towards acquiring interests in railway or railway securities in the United States, with a view to an Atlantic Ocean terminus in the United States territory.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not intend to address the House on this question, although it is one of the most important which has come before Parliament for many years. As I found that the disposition to orate was so prevalent on both sides of the House, and that hon. members desired to place their views on record, I thought it was much more to the point to listen to those who have had practical experience and vote when opportunity offered, rather than occupy the time of the House when others were so much more disposed to speak on the subject than I was. It was not that I did not feel the importance of the occasion, which has kept me so long silent, but because I thought that on an important question like this, one in which the great future of this country is involved, one in regard to which Canadians look forward with hope and satisfaction, I preferred allowing those hon. gentlemen who are well informed on the subject to state their views. I did not intend, half an hour ago, to address the House on this subject; but a question has arisen which closely and particularly affects the Maritime Provinces, and it is because the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), has chosen further to delay the decision of this matter by moving an amendment which has the aspect of a sectional character—I will not say it is drawn with the purpose of catching sectional votes, but it has that appearance—that I, as one of the Maritime Province members, wish to place my views on record in reply to the hon. gentleman. What is the purport and substance of the Resolutions? That a large enterprise has been entered into by the people of Canada, that a sum of money is being asked in aid of the completion of the enterprise, one of the bases of which is the completion of a line to the Pacific Islands and Ocean. The subject has been ably and fully dealt with by hon. gentlemen who are responsible for placing it before the House—I refer to the hon. members of the Government. The Minister of Railways, with that fullness which always characterizes the utterances he places before Parliament, with that detail which is convincing and which ought to be satisfactory to every man who has listened to it or read it in print, with that decision which always characterizes his acts, has laid the views of the Government before this House and the country, in a way that has satisfied me of the propriety of supporting the Resolutions which he has submitted. I must say the line of argument which has been pursued, and the course followed by the two parties in the House, differ very materially. On this side of the House, there has been moderation and argument, while in the large majority of speeches on the other side, I deeply regret that the remarks which have been made by some of the gentlemen reflected on the credit and reputation and character of men to whom this country points to-day, and who will be pointed to with pride and satisfaction when this great enterprise is completed. These men, I say, and their reputations, have been attacked in a manner anything but creditable to the discussion and to the persons who have

made these attacks. I am not going to enter into details of this great scheme at this late stage of the debate, and this late hour of the evening; but I say this, from a Maritime Province point of view, that the remarks of the hon. gentleman from the city of St. John (Mr. Weldon), meet with no sympathy from the Province from which I come, and to which I belong. I am well acquainted with the sentiments and feelings of the people in my native Province. I am at least quite as high in authority as to the wishes of the people there, as the hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment, and when he tells this House, speaking as a Maritime Province man, and giving his utterances as one coming from the great commercial capital of the Province of New Brunswick, and referring to the facilities and advantages which the ports of the Maritime Provinces afford for the creation, as he calls it, of a winter port, I tell him that, in my opinion, he is not speaking in sympathy with the great body of the people who live by the sea. He talks about the creation of winter ports, and he says that these people who now come to the House asking for the aid which this Parliament is going to give, and which the country is going to endorse, ought to be asked to guarantee the creation of winter ports in those Provinces. Sir, I tell him, that nature creates ports, and it is the greatest nonsense in the world to talk of creating winter ports. The Almighty has created them, and nature has placed them where they are, and the course of commerce will find those ports which are the most advantageous for shipment. No matter what Parliament may do, we cannot annihilate distance and space; and as every mile of transit creates an additional cost of the traffic which passes over it, if the circumstances of the port as to distance and its proximity to the markets to which the produce is being sent, are not of that character which enables it to compete with ports which are nearer, then, I say, no advantages which the Government can give will enable the line of trade to take that direction in opposition to the natural obstacles which may be placed in its way. My hon. friend talks about making St. John and Halifax winter ports, and he says that no money should be expended to enable these gentlemen who are associated together, carrying out this enterprise, to find an outlet to American ports. Sir, it is not these gentlemen, it is not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company who have a voice in saying where the exports of the North-West are to be sent from. If I, as a merchant in Winnipeg or Toronto, desire to send my produce to Europe, do you suppose I would let the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway dictate to me from what port I shall ship it? I will ship it from the port where I can get the cheapest freight, where there is the shortest transit, where there are the cheapest facilities for sending it to the European markets, and where I can get my insurance and my ocean steamships at the lowest possible rate. It is that which will command the traffic and trade of the country and fix the direction in which shipments shall be made from our western country. I am anxious to see our Maritime Provinces ports built up. I am desirous that the great and magnificent ports which we have by the sea may be utilized in connection with this great enterprise, can be made, by means of this and other Canadian enterprises developed by Canadian capital, the great outlets and *entrepôts* of the commerce of the country. But we are not going to say that we will embarrass a scheme of this kind by requiring, before we grant this money, that a stipulation shall be placed in the Resolutions, that exports by this line shall pass out of Maritime Provinces ports and that from a particular port shipments must be made. What is going to be the effect if the amendment of my hon. friend should pass? Will it secure a winter port for my hon. friend any more surely than if it does not pass? No, Sir; we cannot con-

trol where the shipments can be made from. Shippers will utilize every outlet, and the object of those persons engaged in creating this great means of communication will be to get to the nearest common point where shipments can be made. If it is found that they can be made more cheaply at Halifax or St. John than at Portland, New York or Boston, they will go there; but if it be found that a person in Winnipeg, or Chicago, or any of these western ports, can ship more cheaply from New York or Baltimore, or Philadelphia, or Portland, than from Halifax or St. John, you may depend they will send their produce there. It would be wrong and unparliamentary for me to say that the object of this amendment is not for the benefit of Canada or the promotion of this great enterprise. I do say, however, that its object is to embarrass the passage of these Resolutions; for, if the amendment is carried, the result will be to paralyze the object we have had in view for weeks past, and to prevent this enterprise being carried out in the way desired, by the expressions of opinion which have been made in this House. I shall not occupy more time in discussing the matter further than to say, that so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, they are satisfied to let the opportunities which they have develop, and show whether or not the Canadian ports can be made available as winter ports, for the outlet of the produce of the West. I am anxious that they should be so. I am sure that the Government and Parliament are desirous that they should be so. What have they done? They have made a commencement by the establishment of a grain elevator at Halifax, and I have no doubt that if similar enterprise is shown, and similar aid given—as it will be given—to the erection of elevators at St. John, some portion of the traffic will be shipped from those ports; but we are not going to embarrass or arrest the progress of the action which the Government have laid before the House, for the purpose of enabling my hon. friend to record a resolution which will show that he has got some interests in developing, on the part of the locality he represents, the means of shipment, simply because they are Canadian ports. I rose simply for the purpose of expressing my opinion as to what the wishes of the people of the Maritime Provinces are. I have no doubt they would desire to establish these ports that hon. gentlemen speak so freely about; but Sir, they cannot defy nature; they cannot go in opposition to natural laws. If winter ports can be established in the Maritime Provinces, I am sure the Government will use every means to develop them and to utilize such ports as we possess. In conclusion, I would simply observe that I have no fear about the vote that will be given on the motion of my hon. friend. I am sure a large majority of the members from the Maritime Provinces will vote against it, and thus prevent my hon. friend from defeating and embarrassing the great measure which this House has for some time been deliberating upon.

Mr. KING. I must crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments, while I endeavour to give expression to my own views with regard to the subject under discussion. The amendment moved by my hon. friend from St. John city and county has a special bearing on the interests of the Province from which I come, as well as of the Maritime Provinces as a whole. I hope I shall not lay myself open to the charge of want of patriotism if, in the few remarks I make, I shall confine myself to the standpoint of the Maritime Provinces. I have listened, during this and the other evenings through which this debate has extended, with a good deal of patience to the speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen representing constituencies in Manitoba, and representing North-West interests; and I must say that I feel proud of the loyal utterances of those men who stand up nobly in the interests of the Provinces they represent, and

Mr. MITCHELL.

I claim the same right to advocate the claims and the interests of the section from which I come. I was surprised at the course pursued by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in dealing with this question to-night. The hon. gentleman will pardon me if I say that I think he did not fairly understand the tenor of this amendment. There is in it no provision to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to utilize any ports in Canadian territory. As I understand the amendment, it goes just this far and no further—that with respect to the loan of \$30,000,000 of the money of the people of Canada to the Canadian Pacific Railway, until that is paid, no portion of it shall be used in securing a terminus in a foreign country.

Mr. FOSTER. No portion of that money?

Mr. KING. No portion of the money of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I do not think that the amendment stipulates in any way that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are required to select a port in the Maritime Provinces. Now, I propose to refer briefly to some remarks which fell from the lips of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), a few evenings ago, when addressing this House on this all-important subject. I am sure that hon. gentleman did afford a great deal of pleasure to the very large audience which happened to be in the House on that occasion, in that speech which consumed something like three hours and a half in delivery. But I could not help thinking, during the course of his remarks, that it was unfortunate for him that he could speak so fluently that he required so little time for consideration before dealing with that subject. I may be pardoned if I suggest to the hon. member that the next time he has a subject of this kind to deal with, he should devote two hours and a half to its consideration, and the other hour to delivering his speech. The hon. gentleman thought proper to carry us back to a time prior to the Confederation of the Provinces, and in doing so he represented to us his position at that time as a boy sitting on a school form of the school of the district of which he was an inhabitant. The hon. gentlemen told us of his youthful aspirations, of his dreams, and of his ambition to become a citizen of a great country. He told us that the desires, such as those to which he alluded, and which pervaded the minds of the youth of this Dominion, culminated in Confederation. Well, it may have been so. I confess that we in the Maritime Provinces think that that measure did not originate in a common school. We think the desire to confederate these Provinces originated rather in a political school; and an opinion prevails largely in the Maritime Provinces to-day, that those who attended that school, charged with our interests, were somewhat overburdened, and that if they had to do that work over again, they would discharge it in a way more to our interest than they did at that time. But, Sir, the hon. member for King's, now that we have not only the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in this Confederation, but the great North-West, must feel satisfied. But I noticed that he spoke of this country as an almost illimitable country. I wonder what he meant. Is he looking to that great territory of Alaska? Is it possible that before this House rises, the hon. gentleman will move for a Committee to enquire into the possibility of getting that territory, so that we may have a territory that is illimitable. One would naturally suppose, from the way in which the hon. gentleman spoke of Confederation, that the people of the Maritime Provinces were fully satisfied with the result of that Union. Now, standing in my place as the representative of a constituency of New Brunswick, I have no hesitation in saying that if there is one subject on which I think a large majority of the people of the Maritime Provinces, of both shades of politics, would agree, it is that, so far as their interests are more immediately concerned, Confederation has been an utter failure.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not at all.

Mr. KING. I go further, and say that if Confederation has proved a failure, so far as the interests of the Maritime Provinces are concerned, I charge it upon the idea which is often expressed, and which has taken possession of the mind of the hon. member for King's, that we must have a great country. I think the hon. gentleman forgets that we have in the Maritime Provinces a great country—that we have there millions of acres of land awaiting settlement—and we might be satisfied with that, without reaching for a country stretching from the United States boundaries to the north pole. The hon. member for King's went further, and he said we were committed to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I admit we were, but not to its completion by 1886. As I understood the contract entered into in 1881, the road was to be completed in ten years, or 1891; but he says we have raised the expectations of the people? Who raised the expectations of the people? I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the expectations of the people in the county he represents have been raised to believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be completed at the end of 1885, and if so, the hon. gentleman himself alone is responsible for having raised them. He says that it is in the interests of Canada that the road should be completed by the end of 1885, that:

"In hundreds of thousands of homes in England, Ireland, and Scotland they are sitting round their firesides to-night talking about that plucky Canadian Dominion, which, with its 4,500,000 of people, has undertaken to weld all its parts together by building a railway 3,000 miles in length. They are reading documents which have been scattered by this Government, and by means of this very same railway organization, and their thought and feelings, and sympathies, are being drawn out to this country of Canada as a field for immigration, and as a country whose people are full of energy, full of enterprise, as shown by the very fact that they have undertaken, and promised to perform this gigantic work, and have it finished by 1886."

Who promised the people sitting around their firesides in England, Ireland, and Scotland that the road should be finished in 1886? Did the Parliament of Canada promise it to them? Why is it that we are expected to take so much greater interest in the wishes and feelings and the prosperity of the people living on the other side, than of our own people? We have a right to consider this question from an entirely different standpoint. I do not think it is the duty of this Parliament to look across the water and consult the wishes of people who, for aught we know, may never cross the Atlantic. The hon. gentleman proceeded to give reasons why this loan of \$30,000,000 should be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in reading over his speech, as carefully as the hon. gentleman read over the speech of the leader of the Opposition, I find that only two reasons are given—one to which I alluded, and another of the same character, that the completing of this road in a year and a-half would promote immigration; and that to delay its completion five or six years would imperil the interests of the country in that respect. I do not agree with the hon. member in that statement. It does seem to me that if to-night there are people in England, Ireland and Scotland sitting round their firesides watching the efforts of the people of this country, they will be more interested in seeing that a system of economy is practised by the Government which, if they should make this country their home, would afford them a guarantee that they will not be subject to the heavy taxes that weigh them down in their own country. The construction of a railway in my own Province had much to do with helping many of our poor people in getting on their feet; but if it had been put through in haste, no such benefits would have been derived. Complaints might have been made by some parties that sufficient progress had not been made. But on the whole, I am satisfied that the benefits which accrued to our people were much greater in

many counties along the north shore of New Brunswick than if this railway had been put through, as the Canadian Pacific Railway is now being put through, with undue haste. What is applicable in this case, is doubly applicable in the North-West. All the hon. members who have spoken on this subject, have admitted that the great North-West is to be a great country, and that it will never, or, at any rate, it will not for a long time to come, become a manufacturing country. I ask hon. gentlemen, whether it would not be in the interest of the people of the North-West that much less haste had been displayed in the construction of this road, since a large portion of the supplies would then not have to be brought from the States, and the settler of the North-West would derive the full advantage from the construction of the road during a longer term of years. What applies to the people there to-day, will equally apply to those going in to-morrow. The result of this rapid construction will be that in a year and a-half from now, before two crops are grown, the whole expenditure will be made, and the home market, which is so great a feature of the National Policy, will be taken away as a centre in the North-West. Speaking of immigration, it seems to me that people about to leave their homes in order to better their condition, will naturally compare the public debts of the different countries which open a field for emigration. Up to the present time, the largest portion of immigration has been drawn to the United States, and while the debt of the United States has been reduced to \$30 per head, ours will very shortly be increased to \$50 per head. Is it not fair to suppose that when intelligent people look into this condition of affairs, they will find a greater inducement to settle south of our boundary than to cast their lot in the North-West? The hon. gentleman has told us that he is perfectly convinced the security offered by the Canadian Pacific Railway is ample. I do not propose to say anything with regard to those gentlemen composing the Canadian Pacific Railway; I have very little acquaintance with them, and I have no right, so far as I am personally concerned, to meddle with the business which is particularly their own. But in dealing with this question, I propose to deal with it from the standpoint of a representative of New Brunswick, holding the Government of the day responsible for the way in which this great subject is disposed of. I do not propose to trouble the House with going over the number of items which were included in the statement of the hon. member for King's, which footed up something like \$121,000,000, and which he says is ample security for the loan of \$22,500,000, forgetting that \$22,500,000 was not the whole of the loan, but that there is \$7,500,000 additional, making it \$30,000,000. There is one item, however, which I do propose to call attention to. He says:

"Therefore, when they come and ask for a loan of \$22,500,000, and offer securities worth \$141,147,953, because I add the \$35,000,000 of stock, at the rate of 60 per cent., which will make \$21,000,000 more, I believe the security is ample."

Now, I think I was justified in the remark I made at the outset as to the hon. gentleman's want of consideration in dealing with this question, and I am sure now that, after having revised his speech and considered the matter more carefully, he does not pretend to say that if, in the event of this Company not being able to repay this loan of \$30,000,000 to the people of this country, this road became the property of the people of Canada, he would attach very much importance to a security like that \$35,000,000 of stock, which would be nothing more, under those circumstances, than the assets of a bankrupt Company. I hope it will never come to this. I hope that the gentlemen who are securing this large amount may, and I think it is to the interest of the people of this country that they should, be able to repay this amount, but I think the hon. gentleman attaches too much importance to this small sum, this trifling

sum of \$21,000,000, which goes to make up his assets of \$141,000,000. I am sure that there are a number of farmers, to say nothing of the intelligent business men, in his county, who know what value to attach to a security in a case of that kind. But the hon. gentleman goes further. Supposing that the line should become the property of the Government, we have every evidence, he said, to lead us to conclude that it would be a paying investment; and how does he attempt to prove it? From the returns of the Company, which I have no doubt are correct, which were laid on the Table of the House, he says: I show you that the year before last the receipts were so many millions, and last year they were \$5,000,000 in round numbers, and for nine months the net receipts were nearly a million dollars, I think he puts it, and therefore it is a good investment. Now, the hon. gentleman ought fairly to have stated that, in the same report which gives those figures, it is clearly shown that something over a million and a quarter of dollars was credited to the actual receipts of the road for the transportation of the material used in the construction. It strikes me that, if he had subtracted that from the amount he has given us, it would have reduced it to that extent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman surely does not mean to say that I did not state that to the House? If he reads my speech in the *Hansard*, he will find that I gave the exact amount credited.

Mr. KING. I am not referring to any remarks made by the hon. gentleman, but I am speaking of the statement of the hon. member for King's, in his printed speech in the *Hansard*, and if I am not correct, I have no doubt the hon. member for King's will take the opportunity of correcting me. I am quite sure that if, in two years from now, this property should become the property of the Dominion Government, and the hon. gentleman happens at that time to fill the position he now holds, and I have no doubt he will, if the whole amount of \$35,000,000 which he values at \$21,000,000, were offered to him for his Sessional indemnity, he would take the \$1,000 and leave the \$35,000,000. Then the hon. gentleman gave us some calculations which he said he had made very hurriedly. I am not going to dispute the correctness of his calculations, nor do I recollect exactly the figures he gave, but his statement was something like this: that, in ten years from now, it was safe to presume that we would have 500,000 increase of population in that North-West country. He estimated that there would be 50,000 a year for the next ten years, and that 40,000 of that 50,000 would be an agricultural population, and that one out of four would be a farmer, and that therefore there would be 80,000 farmers in that country in ten years; and he says that, if proof were wanted that it would be a good paying investment, it was found in the fact that these people would be in the North-West and would be very large producers of wheat. I am not disposed to criticise the hon. gentleman's statement, except so far as this, that it is evident that, if the people of the North-West ever go very largely into wheat growing, they have not their eyes turned in this direction for the probable destination of their wheat crop. He must be aware that there is at this time a Committee of this House investigating the question of a Hudson Bay route, and every gentleman from Manitoba who has spoken on this question has made statements which lead me to conclude that they are looking to Hudson Bay, and not to Port Arthur, or the all-rail route north of Lake Superior, as the outlet for their products. I think it would have been fair for him, in putting this matter fairly and squarely before this House, to state that fact, because he is not ignorant of it; he knows that the expectations and hopes of those people are in that Hudson Bay route; he knows that the First Minister himself, a few days ago, made statements which led us to believe that he had faith in that Hudson Bay route.

Mr. King.

and we know that the evidence which is being elicited by that Committee from day to day goes to show that, for months, at any rate, that will be a port, and they even say it is probable that an outlet will be found there during the whole year. It strikes me, at all events, that the hon. gentleman cannot take into account the probability that the whole of the wheat crop of that country will take a direction which will afford traffic to this great trans-continental line. But suppose that the road should become the property of the Government, suppose that you get 500,000 more people in the North-West. They give us, I was going to say, a good deal of trouble here now, but I do not blame them. We know, however, that they receive a great deal of attention, that their wants and wishes receive more attention than the wants and wishes of people from other parts of the Dominion, and I am satisfied, from what I have seen, that, when this road in the North-West becomes the property of the Dominion Government, it will be run in the interests of the people of Manitoba, and they will not allow the Government to make very large dividends out of the road. Therefore, I do not think the people of the Maritime Provinces, who have no interest that I can see in the development of the North-West and the building of the railway, more than the interest they have in the whole Dominion of Canada, who have no direct interest in it, at all events, have not much to expect when this road becomes the property of the Government. For my own part, I hope this Company will succeed in completing that line, and that it may remain their property and they may operate it in their own interests and for their own purposes. We have enough Government railways now, and as to the proposition of the hon. member for King's, that the Government should assume control of all railways, I think the returns laid upon the table of the House as to the management of another railway which has cost us a good deal of money, I mean the Intercolonial, which the Government do operate, show that, taking it all in all, it has not been very profitable to the people of this country. I do not say, and I do not wish to be understood to say, that the Minister of Railways, in the management of that road, has not displayed as much business tact as possible and done the best it was possible to do under the circumstances, but that he has utterly failed during the last six months to make both ends meet—in fact, that he is short \$115,000, will not be disputed. Then, if you add the road between Montreal and Quebec, and add the 600 miles north of Lake Superior and the 400 miles from Prince Arthur's Landing to Winnipeg, and cut off the traffic of the North-West by a route to Hudson Bay, it is decidedly problematical whether we are to derive any very great or grand return from that investment. There is another way in which I would view this question and in which I would ask this House to look at it. I quite confess that when we talk of \$30,000,000, the sum is almost beyond my comprehension. I have heard hon. gentlemen say that it is a mere bagatelle, a mere trifle; but, Mr. Speaker, if we contrast it with other things of which we do know something, then we can come to some conclusion as to the extent of this loan. A short time ago I happened to pick up the last bank statement which had been made, and I observed that the whole bank note circulation of the Dominion of Canada is just \$30,000,000—a remarkable coincidence, to my mind, that the amount which the Government proposes to loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in order that the country may reap the benefit of the completion of that road in two years instead of six, is just the amount of the bank note circulation as shown by that statement. Then, there is another way of viewing it. I find by the same return, that the paid up capital of all the banks in Canada to day, is in round numbers, \$61,000,000. The amount the Government proposes to loan to the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way Company, is just one-half that sum; in other words, if the banks had to furnish that sum, it would wipe out one-half the banks doing business in Canada to-day. There is another way of looking at it. We are called plucky because we are willing to engage in this vast enterprise, and because we are willing to invest our millions in it. We sometimes refer to the wealth of our neighbours to the south of us, and I would like hon. gentlemen just to make a calculation. We are giving a loan of \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Now, if the 55,000,000 of people in the United States were to make a loan in the same proportion, what would it amount to? The people of the United States, in order to exhibit the same pluck we do, would have to vote \$385,000,000. Then, in addition to that—and a fact that is lost sight of by many—in addition to this loan of \$30,000,000, we have to provide \$12,000,000, or nearly \$13,000,000, to pay the balance of the unpaid subsidy which is due to the Company on the completion of the line, and that, I suppose, has got to be provided inside the next two years. This will make the sum of \$43,000,000 in hard cash. It may be a mere bagatelle, but I fancy the people of this country, who have no direct interest in the construction of this railway, will feel that instead of its being a mere bagatelle it is a great burden indeed. The hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), in reply to the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., (Mr. Davies), said that we had a right to believe that the people of this country were satisfied with what was proposed to be done with their money. He said: We have heard of no protest from any part of this country; no public meetings have been called to protest against the expenditure of public money. I dare say that is quite true. But I would like to make a suggestion to the hon. gentleman. It may be too late—I fear it is too late. I would like to have suggested to him to go down to his county as soon as he understood the character of this transaction, and that he should have asked the people to assemble at some place in that county. I am well acquainted with his constituents. I have the honour to have been born in that county, and I take a great interest in it—not that I do not think it is quite safe in his hands. I think if he had gone down to his county and asked the people to meet him and had put this matter before them and said: Gentlemen, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company entered into a contract in 1881 to build the Canadian Pacific Railway for \$25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land, and to finish it by 1891. They have got along splendidly, but the Government thinks that it is necessary for that that road be built in two years from now. If he had stated that the Company were willing to go on and complete the road in the time specified by the contract, but that in the interest of the people of England, Ireland and Scotland, the Government desired to have this road completed in two years instead of seven; and if the hon. gentleman had then asked his constituents if they were willing to allow themselves to be taxed to the extent of \$200,000—I think that would be about the proportion of his county for the whole sum; if he had gone further, and told the people of his county that from the experience we had of the past, loans of this character made to railways seldom found their way back into the Treasury, and that it was just possible this might go in the same way—I would like to know what answer that hon. gentleman would have received from his constituents. If he had also told them, as I have shown, that all the available cash at the time had been handed over in order to pay their part of the loan, I think, Sir, they would have told him to go back to Ottawa and mind his own business; to do what he was instructed to do; that if he had any money of his own that he wanted to invest in the North-West, he had a right to do so, but that, so far as their money was concerned, he had no right to do anything of the sort. Now, Sir, to look at this ques-

tion again from a Maritime Province standpoint, I have another calculation and a few figures which it will not take up much time to submit to the House. In the inception of this work, after the acquisition of the North-West Territory, it was generally believed it would be found necessary to construct a trans-continental railway. I do not think there was much objection to that by anybody in the Maritime Provinces. But it must be borne in mind that our people were given to understand that \$30,000,000 in cash was all the people of this country would be required to pay in order to insure the completion of the road, and that the balance of the expenditure would be entirely made up from the proceeds of the sale of land in that territory. Now, Sir, I am not going to say to-night that the people did not themselves, in the last elections, perhaps, assent to that contract; although I am satisfied that if they had known all that has taken place since then, a very different tale would have been told. But the transaction was beyond their reach; it was closed; they had no redress. Now, Sir, let us look at what the Maritime Provinces are called upon to pay in connection with this transaction. First of all, we have \$5,000,000 expended in surveys in that North-West Territory. I am not going to say these surveys have been worth very much to the Railway Company, as I believe they have not adopted the line which was originally decided upon for that road; but, that the expenditure was made for that purpose is a fact. Then we are to give, in completed roads, an amount which, according to the Minister of Railways' own estimate, will be \$23,000,000. Then there is the \$25,000,000 cash subsidy, \$9,000,000 from the proceeds of the land, and this \$30,000,000. Then I think I may fairly claim to add \$3,000,000 for interest on the cost of construction up to date, and these items, together, make just \$100,000,000. I think I may fairly say that the people of the Maritime Provinces represent one-fifth of the population of the Dominion. If so, it follows that the proportion to be paid by the Maritime Provinces is \$20,000,000 in round numbers. New Brunswick's proportion will be \$7,000,000, and from this large expenditure I have no hesitation in saying the Province will never derive any direct benefit. If the hon. member from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) can be accepted as the exponent of the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—and I hope he cannot—New Brunswick has nothing to look forward to in connection with the line. We have been told for years that the terminus would be placed in the Maritime Provinces and that we might expect to reap some benefit; but after the statement of the hon. member for Northumberland, St. John and Halifax have nothing to expect. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) urged that the construction of the road would open up a market for our manufacturers. The contribution of \$7,000,000 by New Brunswick will involve an annual payment at 4 per cent. interest of \$300,000. Does the hon. gentleman consider that manufacturers in St. John and Moncton will receive benefit in proportion to that large outlay? I do not. I will, no doubt, be told that I do not represent the majority of the people of the Province. I am sorry to say that the people of New Brunswick are rapidly becoming powerless to redress their grievances, and the country is fast drifting to ruin in consequence of the extravagant expenditures in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway and works of a similar character. In some counties the people are showing a disposition to go in and obtain a share of the spoils. I hope the hon. members for New Brunswick will support the amendment, and as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) went so far as to say that he should insist on traffic which originated in the Dominion being shipped from a Dominion port, we confidently count on his support to the amendment. If there has been any motion or amendment in the course of this discussion which has borne directly on the interests of the Maritime Provinces, especially the

interests of New Brunswick, it is the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention, at this early hour of the morning, to review the Resolutions before the House, and I intend to confine my remarks to the amendment which is now the subject of discussion. It must be apparent to every hon. member that the desire of the mover of the amendment is to embarrass members who represent constituencies in the Maritime Provinces. If that be his intention, I think he has taken a very awkward way to secure the object he has in view. For this reason, I have not the slightest hesitation in recording my vote against the amendment, on several grounds, the chief of which is this: If we were to accept the amendment, we should erect an almost insurmountable barrier to the attainment of the object which the hon. member pretends to have in view. I will give way to no one in my desire to see the traffic of the great Canadian Pacific Railway come through Canadian territory to a Canadian terminus and be shipped there. I believe that is going to be the result of the great enterprise which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have in hand, but if we throw obstacles in the way, and refuse to grant assistance we shall defeat the very object we all have most sincerely at heart. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very difficult to please. They attempt to show that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have gone beyond their contract, have done wrong, in fact, in expending money to secure an outlet on the Atlantic Ocean; that they have gone beyond their contract in acquiring an interest in lines to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. To-night we have had hon. members from New Brunswick objecting to the passage of the resolutions and proposing amendments because the Company have not gone far enough in securing an Atlantic terminus. An hon. member quoted a paragraph from a statement by the president of the Company; but he forgot to mention, after stating that Portland would be a busy place, that upon the return of the directors from Portland to Montreal, an answer was returned to Portland announcing that the Company declined to have anything further to do with the city. We have also the fact that the city of Halifax has placed on the minutes of its council the well understood desire of the people to have a winter port there, in Canadian territory. We are all agreed as to that object; but we differ as to the manner in which it may be accomplished. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has submitted an amendment which would tie up the resources of the Company and prevent them acquiring interest in railways running through the United States. One of the essential elements we have to look to in regard to a winter port in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, is that the Company will take an interest in some American railway passing through Maine. It is known, to myself, at all events, if not to other hon. members, that the representatives from the Maritime Provinces have been urging the Government to adopt a course which will bring the Canadian Pacific Railway into closer connection with the Maritime Provinces, and to that end we have addressed a letter to the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to which we have received the following reply:—

“THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY,

“OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, MONTREAL, 11th February, 1884.

“DEAR SIR,—Referring to your letter of the 5th inst., and to the accompanying memorandum and copy of resolution relating to the question of an Atlantic terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Although I have not had an opportunity of bringing the matter formally before my colleagues in the direction of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I may safely say that ever since the formation of the Company, we have felt that it was only a question of time when the Pacific Railway must reach every important point in the Maritime Provinces, and especially their most important seaports, and that this could only be accomplished either by lines owned or controlled by the Company, or by friendly connections with other lines having identical interests.

Mr. KING.

“This Company, as you are aware, has already invested a very large sum of money for the purpose of securing an independent connection with the lines south of the St. Lawrence. But apart from this, individuals connected with the Company and deeply interested with its success have made large investments in lines leading to the Maritime Provinces, the success of which greatly depends on their connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and perhaps this is the best assurance I can give you of our readiness to co-operate with you in perfecting the connection between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Maritime Provinces.

“It should be decided that the best way of accomplishing the object in view would be by completing the direct line from Montreal to Moncton, *via* Sherbrooke, Megantic, Matawamkeg, Fredericton and Moncton, I think, with the assistance of the Maritime Provinces and with such subsidies for the portion of the line within Canadian territory as may be fairly expected from the Dominion Government, the means might be found to complete the connection, which would be the shortest one possible.

“Yours truly,

“GEO. STEPHEN, President.”

Now, if we were to tie up the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by attaching conditions which would prevent them from investing any part of their funds in American railway securities, with a view of attaining a port in the United States, we would be proposing something which, I believe, would be entirely inoperative. We might, by passing such an amendment, so hamper the Company that they would be unable to accomplish the object in view. For these reasons, I shall not have the slightest hesitation in voting against the proposed amendment. I am somewhat obliged to my hon. friend who moved the amendment for his glowing description of Halifax harbour. It is a splendid harbour, as every one who has visited it knows. I believe it is one which the Canadian Pacific Railway look upon with favour. They must do so, if they wish to find in the Maritime Provinces the port best adapted for the output of the great trade which, as has been so eloquently described by hon. members, will be carried to the east, in future, over this line. I believe that there are other ports of great, if not equal importance, with claims to a share of the trade which will pour down from the west. I believe that we shall have all our ports busy with the shipments which will be brought down by the shortest route to the seaboard, and thence finding their way to Europe. It is for this reason, and because I believe we can rest with implicit confidence upon the Government carrying out the scheme proposed to reach the Maritime Provinces, without imposing such conditions upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, as would really defeat the object we have in view, that I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I promise the House that I shall only trouble them but a very few minutes. With reference to the hon. member who has just taken his seat, I think he has misstated the amendment before the House. It only goes so far as to prevent the money we are voting being spent to build up a harbour in the United States, and I heartily concur in that proposition. I do not intend to say anything about the general question which has been discussed almost *ad nauseum* for the last week or ten days. It has been ably dealt with by both sides of the House; but I just wish to refer to our condition in the Maritime Provinces, and especially in New Brunswick, with regard to the question of a winter port, which is now the subject under consideration. There is no doubt of the fact that it is of great importance that the winter port for the trade of this Dominion should be in some of the Maritime Provinces. The fact that the trade goes to a certain port always brings population; and population always makes a market for the manufactures and farm products. We were led to believe we went into Confederation, that the population of Halifax and St. John were to be largely augmented; that they were to become, in fact, the Liverpools of North America in those Provinces. I am sorry to say that those anticipations have not been realized. The inhabitants of the cities of Halifax and St. John have not increased; they have not even retained their natural increase. St. John has not in-

creased at all this last decade. Halifax has, to some extent, but it has not had the natural increase it would have had if there had been no emigration from it. This is a state of affairs which is to be deplored, and I hope before the subject is dismissed we will have some assurance that those ports will have a fair share of the trade of this Dominion. I confess that we were somewhat startled by the pamphlet which was circulated lately with reference to the acquisition of property at Portland by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the purpose of placing their winter port at that city; and those apprehensions have been very much increased by the speech of the hon. member for Northumberland to-night. I do think that that speech requires an answer from the hon. Minister of Railways. I think that some explanation or excuse should be offered for that speech. That hon. gentleman surely does not treat us with his usual generosity. Speaking of making St. John or Halifax a winter port, he says that we cannot work against nature; that ports are not made, for nature provides them; that trade will find its level, and will go to the nearest port, which is true to a certain extent, and if railway communication had been afforded the Maritime ports by the shortest instead of the longest route, his declaration would have some force. Now, Sir, if there is one gentleman in this Chamber who is responsible for establishing the long road to St. John and Halifax, it is that hon. gentleman. We were to have a commercial railway, and we were given a military railway. A railway by a direct route would be only 425 miles long; we were given a railway 761 miles long; and the hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying that that railway cannot compete with the railway to Portland, which is only 300 miles long. The hon. gentleman, however, says not a word of giving us a shorter route, and he speaks authoritatively, because it appears he was one of the gentlemen who went to Portland to negotiate. I hope he is mistaken, however, and that the Directors of that Company will do something for us. On coming into Confederation, we were promised facilities for trade and commerce. It was said that unless we got such facilities, the Union would not be any stronger than a rope of sand; and I believe that if we were not to have had a commercial railway, and facilities for commerce with the Upper Provinces, New Brunswick would never have gone into the Union. I am satisfied of that; and I have always contended that the fact that we did not get that was a breach of promise, and that we were brought into the Union under false pretences. You may think that is strong language, but it is a fact believed not merely by a majority, but believed universally in the Lower Provinces. We might have had a railway exclusively on Canadian soil 580 miles long; and by crossing the State of Maine to St. John, the distance could have been reduced to 425 miles. I do hope the Government will take measures to give us at least the shortest road that can be built to our principal ports. But whatever is done, we must admit that the route to the American port of Portland has an advantage of 125 miles. But some engineers have given their opinion that the high grades on the Grand Trunk Railway, which are said to be from 70 to 80 feet to the mile, in quite a number of places, are such as will give a short line to our ports a decided advantage, in respect to gauge, and compensate for greater distance. If that short route were built, it would reduce the distance from St. John to Montreal about one-half. Now, I contend that if we are to have any interest in this expenditure for the Canadian Pacific Railway, we must have built for us the shortest road that can possibly be constructed to enable our ports to compete for the traffic. I do hope that the Government will adopt every measure in their power to accomplish that end. We are called upon to pay our share of the enormous expenditure, the extent of which the mass of the people scarcely comprehend. I shall conclude by expressing the

hope that everything that can be done in the direction of giving us facilities for exportation from the Maritime Provinces will be done, and that no part of the people's money, which we are now granting, shall be expended in building up American ports.

Amendment (Mr. Weldon) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Allison (Lennox),	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Armstrong,	Harley,	Platt,
Auger,	Holton,	Ray,
Blake,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Kirk,	Springer,
Casey,	Lister,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Livingstone,	Trow,
Catudal,	McCraney,	Vail,
Charlton,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Davies,	McIsaac,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	McMullea,	Wilson,
Geoffrion,	Mulock,	Yeo.—43.
Gillmor,		

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Farrow,	McNeil,
Amyot,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	Ma sue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fortin,	Moffat,
Bealy,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Belleau,	Fréchette,	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Orton,
Benson,	Gigault,	Paint,
Bergia,	Girouard,	Patterson (Essex),
Billy,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Bossé,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Riopol,
Brechen,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burns,	Haggart,	Ross,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hall,	Scott,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Hickey,	Small,
Caron,	Homer,	Sproule,
Cimon,	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Kinney,	Tilley,
Coursol,	Kranz,	Tupper (Pictou),
Curran,	Labrosse,	Tyrwhitt,
Cuthbert,	Landry (Kent),	Vain,
Daly,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Dawson,	Leasse,	Wallace (Albert),
Desaulniers,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Dickinson,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Dodd,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Hastings),
Dugas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wigle,
Dundas,	McCallum,	Williams,
Dupont,	McDougald,	Wood (Brockville).—104
	McGreedy,	

On the main motion being put.

Mr. BLAKE. There are some other amendments that I think it would be proper, before this measure is concluded, to bring to the attention of the House, but as the hon. Minister of Railways, who appears disinclined to back his opinions by his vote, has announced that the Resolutions do not contain all the provisions of the Bill, it will be expedient to defer the amendments until I see fully the details of the Bill. Therefore, I do not propose to offer the amendments now.

Resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 101) to amend the Act intituled An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for other purposes.

Bill read the first time.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:30 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 25th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## PRAYERS.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 102) to amend the Act 41 Victoria, chapter 16, intituled: An Act respecting the traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Bill (No. 103) respecting the liability of carriers by land.—(Mr. Congblin.)

Bill (No. 104) further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—(Mr. Ives.)

## THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 14) to amalgamate the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto and the Toronto Corn Exchange Association.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 20) to amend the Act incorporating the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Provincial Bank.—(Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Halifax Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Pictou Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(Mr. McDougald.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Commercial Bank of Manitoba.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Union Trust Corporation of Canada.—(Mr. Hesson.)

Bill (No. 19) to grant certain powers to the Commercial Cable Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 10) to further amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 51) to amend the Act incorporating the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 64) to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

## SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Platt.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Manitoba Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the Calgary Waterworks Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Calgary Omnibus, Tramway and Transfer Company.—(Mr. Ross.)

Bill (No. 80) to amend the Act incorporating the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Bell.)

Bill (No. 81) further to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to "The Battleford and Peace River Railway Company."—(Mr. Woodworth.)

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 85) respecting the Erie and Huron Railway.—(Mr. Smyth.)

Mr. BLAKE.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Real Estate Loan Company of Canada, limited.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 89) to amend the Act incorporating the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company and to change the name thereof to "The Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company."—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Bossé.)

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Traders' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 95) relating to the Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa.—(Mr. Tassé.)

## NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 54) relating to the New Brunswick Railway Company and to the railways leased to the said company.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the object of this Bill.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). The Bill is simply to confirm some agreements and leases made by this company with other lines. It will go to the Railway Committee in the usual course.

Bill read the second time.

## THE ALBERTA BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. ROYAL, in the absence of Mr. Ross, moved the second reading of Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Alberta Bridge Company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not object to this Bill being read the second time and sent to the Private Bills Committee; but I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman, who has charge of the Bill in the absence of the promoter, to the fact that it seeks for very extensive powers, for the right to build bridges over all the rivers flowing from the Rocky Mountains, in other words, to take possession of all the ferries at all the good crossings. The hon. gentleman will see that considerable opposition may be expected to it in Committee.

Bill read the second time.

## THE PARKDALE SUBWAY.

Mr. WALLACE (York) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 82) to legalize a certain agreement between the village of Parkdale and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and other railway companies, and for other purposes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like the mover of this Bill to explain its object. I have not been able to place my hands on a copy of the Bill and therefore I do not know its objects, but it struck me that perhaps it was intended to provide compensation for the families of the thirty-two people who were murdered, slaughtered, butchered, on January 2nd, by an accident on the Grand Trunk. I would like to know if that is the intention, and if it is not, we should have, at all events, some explanation of the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. The Bill is for the purpose of legalizing an agreement which has been come to between the village of Parkdale and the Grand Trunk and a number of other railway companies, for the construction of a subway at the intersection of these roads in the village of Parkdale.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have now obtained a copy of the Bill, and I have listened to the explanation, and I must say that I am very sorry that such a provision as I have mentioned has not been made out of the funds of this great corpora-

tion, which is striving to grasp everything which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has not got hold of, and, between them both, they will have the whole country between them by-and-by. I think in the meantime, however, while this slaughtering is going on on the Grand Trunk and other roads, these companies should be held responsible for the destruction which they cause. At all events they should be made to pay damages for the great loss of life and the injuries they inflict. I am told that no practical compensation has yet been given to the families of those people who were murdered or slaughtered on the 2nd of January. There were no less than thirty-two heads of families killed, so that probably 150 souls will have to suffer by the careless management of the Grand Trunk on that occasion, and still we hear hardly a word about these things. These railway people have the audacity to ask for a Bill in relation to the very locality where the accident occurred, and yet they make no provision for these families—no provision for the sufferers by an accident which arose from the misconduct and the disgraceful management of the road.

Mr. BEATY. I may say in reference to this Bill that the city of Toronto had no part in the original agreement, and does not intend to be a party to this arrangement. The city opposes the arrangement, and does not intend to give any aid towards the construction of the subway. I merely mention this by way of protest, so that it will not be assumed that the city will meet any liability for the work.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has just spoken if there is any provision made for the compensation of these families?

Mr. BEATY. No, this Bill has nothing to do with the question of compensation. I suppose if the hon. gentleman wishes to provide for compensation, he can, if he likes, introduce a Bill for that purpose.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am quite aware of that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move the adjournment of the House

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I merely want to make an explanation. Of course I submit if the Speaker tells me to sit down

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I submit to the wishes of the House, of course, and I will sit down; but, before doing so, I will say to the hon. gentleman that he ought to have provided for compensation in this Bill.

Bill read the second time.

#### SAN FRANCISCO, WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. ROYAL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Mr. BAKER. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain this Bill.

Mr. ROYAL. The object of the Bill is to grant a charter to a company to construct a road from San Francisco to Hudson Bay. I suppose the portion first constructed will be from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay and then connection will be made by the shortest route with the Pacific Ocean at San Francisco.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is there any provision in this Bill for compensation to the families of those people who were murdered, slaughtered—

Mr. AMYOT. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman state his point of order, or else shut up?

Mr. AMYOT. My point of order is that the hon. member should not address any member in this House, directly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not addressing any gentleman in this House directly, and I am perfectly in order. I have addressed no gentleman in this House, and I am in order to address the Chair on this occasion, and I intend to do so, with the permission of the Chair. I say that as there was no provision in the last Bill for compensation to the families of those who were slaughtered at Parkdale, by this mismanagement of the Grand Trunk, I hope the hon. gentleman who moves this Bill has made some provision of that kind. That is all I have to say.

Bill read the second time.

#### GEOLOGICAL SURVEY IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to continue the work of the Geological Survey in the examination of the southern and western shores, and of the south-eastern interior of Vancouver Island, during the year of 1884?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Geological Survey will be continued as usual in British Columbia. Much work has already been done, and maps and reports have been published relating to parts of the district named. The country lying along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway is deemed the most important at present, and is now receiving attention. Further examination of the coasts of the Province is very desirable, but cannot be carried on satisfactorily without a suitable steam launch, which is not now available.

#### THE MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, When did the Minister of Inland Revenue tender his resignation, and when was it withdrawn?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was tendered on the 19th of February, and withdrawn on the 21st.

#### REPRESENTATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA IN THE CABINET.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision to have British Columbia represented in the Cabinet at an early date?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Cabinet is full just now, and I have no intention of turning out any of my colleagues.

#### LICENSE ACT OF 1883.

Mr. COURSOL, in the absence of Mr. OUMET, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish throughout the Dominion a police organization, under its own control, in order to secure the effectual operation of the License Act of 1883; or to leave that task to the Commissioners for the several districts and to their inspectors?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the intention to leave that task to the Commissioners.

#### MILITIA TENTS.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant) enquired, Is it the intention of the Minister of Militia, to have tents that may be required for the Militia, manufactured in Canada? Have any steps been taken with the view of ascertaining the price at which tents can be manufactured and sold in Canada? Were any tents purchased from the National Tent Manufacturing Company or the International Tent

Manufacturing Company of Ottawa, during 1883? If so, from whom purchased; the number purchased; the quality and style; and the price paid?

Mr. CARON. A vote has been placed in the Estimates, with the view of having such tents manufactured in Canada. Two offers have been made to manufacture tents—one at \$18, and the other at \$18.65. The only tents purchased by the Department in 1833 were three small square sample tents, intended for officers, at \$19.50 each, complete. They were purchased from the National Tent Manufacturing Company. The cost of imported tents is \$25 each.

#### GAS INSPECTION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint a gas inspector this year for the Province of British Columbia?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That question is now under consideration.

#### MAIL BETWEEN MEDICINE HAT AND FORT McLEOD.

Mr. TROW, in the absence of Mr. CAMERON, (Huron) enquired, Has the contract for carrying the mails between Medicine Hat and Fort McLeod been let? If so when, to whom, and at what price and terms were tenders called for?

Mr. CARLING. There is no mail service between Medicine Hat and Fort McLeod, nor is it the intention of the Government to ask for tenders for a mail service.

#### THE GOVERNMENT HERD IN THE NORTH-WEST

Mr. TROW, in the absence of Mr. CAMERON, (Huron) enquired, Has the herd of cattle belonging to the Government in the North-West been sold? If so how many cattle were there in the herd? When were they sold, to whom, how and at what price, and how paid or payable?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indian herd of cattle in Treaty 7 has been sold. There were 599 head, consisting of: cows, 188; two-year old heifers, 312; steers, 40; bulls, 30; and calves, 32; making 599. These cattle were sold by private sale on 23rd July, 1883, to Col. DeWinton, at \$35 per head, and \$1,000 additional for right to claim any stray cattle belonging to the herd; in all, \$21,965. This amount is payable as follows:—Cash payments, \$5,490; on 23rd October, 1883, \$5,490; on 23rd January, 1884, \$5,490; and on 23rd of April, 1884, \$5,495. All these amounts have been paid except the last, which will be paid on the 23rd of April next.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT FORT McLEOD.

Mr. TROW, in the absence of Mr. CAMERON, (Huron) enquired, Does the Government purpose erecting or has the Government now under contract the erection of any public buildings at or near Fort McLeod, North-West Territories? If so were tenders asked for or does the Government purpose calling for tenders? If under contract, when was the contract entered into, who are the contractors, what is the nature of the buildings, what is the contract price?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only buildings I am aware of are the new police barracks we have erected to accommodate 100 men and 100 horses at Fort McLeod. These buildings have been erected by the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company at a cost of \$45,000. The contract was entered into in August last. Tenders were not invited. The annual report of the Commissioner of the Mounted Police, which is now in the printer's hands and

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

will be presented to-morrow or next day, deals very fully with these buildings and their construction.

#### MAJOR-GENERAL LUARD.

Mr. MULOCK. The motion which appears on the paper in my name concerning Major-General Luard, I am advised by his medical adviser it would be better not to proceed with to-day in consequence of his not being in a very vigorous state of health. Out of regard for General Luard, I must defer to the advice of his medical advisers, and inasmuch as I cannot ask that the motion should stand, according to the Rules of the House, I must do what is next in order and allow it to drop; but, at the same time, I shall put in a notice to bring the matter up at some future day.

Motion withdrawn.

#### HARBOUR IN ESSEX COUNTY.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), in moving for a return of all reports of engineers respecting the construction of a harbour on the north shore of Lake Erie, in the county of Essex, whether at Leamington, Kingsville or elsewhere, together with the estimated cost of said harbour at each place, said: I make this motion to supplement information which has already been applied for, in connection with these harbours. It has been stated in the public prints, that Kingsville harbour, now being constructed, has been undertaken to serve the personal ends of myself and the hon. member for South Essex. I am satisfied no hon. member of this House would make such a statement, without having first seen the papers, and I, therefore, move for the papers, in order to show that the statement that this is a political job is utterly unfounded. I may state that for the last fifteen years, the inhabitants of that portion of the county of Essex bordering on Lake Erie, have been urging on the several Dominion Governments which have existed during this period the necessity for a local harbour in that section. At the General Election of 1874, Mr. McGregor, a supporter of the Mackenzie Administration, pledged himself that if he were returned, the harbour would be built at Kingsville and under that Administration, I think in 1874, a survey of the harbour was made by Mr. Kingsford, one of the engineers then attached to the Department of Public Works. He reported to the Government in May, 1874. In his report Mr. Kingsford states that:

"It seems to be conceded that Kingsville has the preference over Colchester, Leamington or Ruthven. . . . Vessels can make this port, Kingsville, in a westerly gale, with her wind ahead; and it is further contended that there is no difficulty in leaving the harbour when once they get in, as the coast lies in such a direction that vessels can get under way with any wind by hauling to the pier. It is further urged that less sea is experienced at this spot than at any other point on the coast."

Mr. Kingsford estimated the cost at \$36,400. Mr. McGregor represented to the people in that part of the country that this matter was under the consideration of the Government and would appear in the Estimates in 1876-77, but as those were the years of famine, no action was taken by the Government, and no appropriation made. After the change of Government, petitions were sent to me urging that this work should be constructed, and delegations were sent from Kingsville, in 1879 and in 1880, to the Government, to urge the construction of the harbour. In 1880, the Government sent up the late Mr. Lindsay, Civil Engineer, attached to the Department of Public Works, who, with his staff, spent the summer of 1880 surveying the north shore of Lake Erie, in the county of Essex. That gentleman sent in a report on the various places proposed for harbour works and the relative cost of each. He estimated the cost of constructing the harbour at Kingsville \$34,000, at Leamington \$180,000, at Pelee Island \$160,000. The Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works visited these localities personally, and his report will show that, in his opinion, Pelee Island

was the proper place for a harbour of refuge for the shipping frequenting Lake Erie, and he disapproved of the selection of Leamington. He said, however, that with a smaller expenditure a harbour might be constructed at Kingsville, which was only six miles out of the highway of vessels running between Detroit River and Buffalo, while Leamington is nine miles out of that highway. He disagreed with his subordinate, Mr. Lindsay, as to the fitness of Pelee Island, considering the island the proper place for a harbour of refuge suitable for vessels of all sizes. I urged on the hon. Minister of Public Works the expenditure of the larger amount in the most suitable place, but finding that I could not succeed, I did the next best thing and succeeded in obtaining an appropriation for the construction of a smaller harbour at Kingsville and that work is now going on. I am not aware of any jobbery or impropriety in connection with this work. It has been undertaken at the wishes of vessel owners navigating the lakes and frequenting the locality. The natural position of the harbour is such that its construction offers no difficulties, and I am quite satisfied it will be a public benefit to the shipping interests and that for the smaller classes of vessels it will be an excellent harbour of refuge. With a little additional expenditure at Kingsville which, I trust, the hon. Minister of Public Works will undertake, I am satisfied it will be the most perfect harbour of refuge we have in our inland waters. I never heard, until an evening or two ago, in this House, and afterwards in the newspapers, that anyone, either in Essex or elsewhere, thought there was anything improper in connection with the construction of this harbour—a harbour that was promised ten years ago by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power. And it is one that has been urged again and again on the succeeding Administration for the last few years. Although I never promised it to the electors in any political contest, still, feeling that the work was good in itself and must have the approbation of my opponents, I thought we would be more than justified in urging its construction upon the Minister of Public Works. Now that the work is being constructed under the auspices of the present Government, it seems that parties who formerly urged it upon the preceding Government, when they were in power, are trying to interfere with the construction of the Kingsville harbour and are endeavouring to make a little cheap political capital against my friends for constructing it. They may make gentlemen in this House and people who know nothing of the locality believe that there is something improper in it, but they will not succeed in doing so in the county of Essex, and more especially in the immediate neighbourhood where the work is being carried on.

Motion agreed to.

#### DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT MILLS NEAR CALGARY.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), moved for, 1. A copy of all Orders in Council, Departmental orders, orders and correspondence respecting the sale, lease or other disposal of the grist and saw mill owned by the Dominion and situate south of Calgary, North-West Territories, to whom disposed of, when, at what price, and how paid or payable; 2. A statement showing the original costs thereof, the costs expended thereon, when the same was erected, including working expenses; 3. A statement showing the quantity of agricultural land or timber limits disposed of with said mill or mills, or to the person who purchased or obtained the same; 4. All applications for the purchase or leasing of said farm lands and limits; 5. A statement of the machinery in said mill or mills, and the cost thereof; 6. All other correspondence in respect to said mill or mills, lands and limits. He said: On the 11th of this month, I asked the Government the following question:—

"Have any of the saw and grist mills erected by the Dominion of Canada, in the North-West Territories, been sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of? If so, how disposed of, when, to whom, at what price, how paid or payable? Was the disposal by public auction, or private sale?"

And, in reply to that question submitted by me to the Government, the First Minister made answer as follows:—

"The saw and grist mills at Old Man's River was sold by the Indian Department to Mr. Peter McLaren, for \$10,000, on October 22nd, 1881. The sum of \$5,000 was paid down; the balance is to be paid by annual instalments of one-fifth, with interest at 6 per cent. The disposal was effected by private sale. Besides the pecuniary price, the sale has been made subject to the following conditions: That the purchaser is to keep both mills in perfect running order; that he will grind Indian and Government farm produce at one-half the rate charged to other parties; that he will make the lumber required for Government and Indian purposes at \$20 per 1,000 feet for five years; that the grinding of the grain and the making of the lumber for the Government and Indians shall have preference over any other work done at the mill; besides which, he was to take over the servants of the mill from that time."

Now it appears, by this statement of the hon. the First Minister, that these saw and grist mills on Old Man's River were sold by the Government in 1881 to Mr. Peter McLaren for the sum of \$10,000, part cash and part on time, and subject to certain conditions. Now, what I object to and what I complain of is that the mills were sold, as the hon. gentleman states, by private sale, and sold to a political friend of the Government, Mr. Peter McLaren. This same Mr. Peter McLaren is a gentleman who has received a good many considerations at the hands of the Government in the last few years. He is the same Peter McLaren in whose interests, for whose benefit, and in whose behalf the Government thrice vetoed the Rivers and Streams Bill, and thereby violated the constitutional rules laid down by the First Minister himself. I find Mr. Peter McLaren's name more than once in returns submitted to Parliament, as an applicant for and a licensee of large portions of the public domain in the North West Territory, and now he appears to have got this saw mill, and this grist mill, and the lands connected with them, and the plant, and the machinery, for the sum of \$10,000; and he appears to have got it without competition, without asking for tenders, or letting the public know this valuable property was in the market for sale. I say the property is a valuable property. So far as I have been able to trace it up in the Blue-books, the property has cost us a good deal more than we have got for it. The property consists of a grist mill, a saw mill, and the plant and the machinery and the land connected with them, and I am told it consists of something more. I am told that, in addition to this, Mr. McLaren has got a valuable timber limit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He says not.

Mr. CAMERON. Whether the price of the timber limit is included in the \$10,000 or not, I am not in a position to state. I am, however, informed that he has this timber limit in connection with this same saw mill. I do not know what induced the Government to sell this property. The mills were put up for special purposes. I do not know whether that purpose has been served or not. I do not know upon whose recommendation the Government have been induced to sell it. Whether any of the officials in the Department have advised the Government that the property is no longer of service or of use to the Government, for the purpose for which it was originally intended, I know not. Who valued the property I know not, or whether it was valued by anybody in the interests of the Government and the interests of the country or not, I cannot say. I suppose the papers, when they are submitted to Parliament, will give information upon this subject. What I object to in the disposal of properties of this kind, what I objected to in the disposal of other properties that I have had to discuss on the floor of Parliament this Session, is the sale, or the disposal, or the leasing by the Government of valuable public properties without competition,

without letting the public know, at all events that those properties are in the market, or are to be disposed of, or are to be sold. You will see, Mr. Speaker, that it is unfair to the public, that it is unfair to those who desire to invest in the North-West Territory, that it is unfair to the country, that the property of the country should be disposed of by private sale and without competition, or without getting the best price that can possibly be got for it. It puts the friends of the Government in a different position to that in which other public investors are placed, it gives them an advantage over others who desire to invest in the North-West Territory; it is a policy that is bad in the interests of the country and ought to be changed without any delay; and when the Government see fit to change it, I hope they will stick to it and not make constant changes in the regulations or system by which the public domain is to be disposed of in the North-West Territory, that they will adhere to a strictly business principle in the disposal of the property there; and the only fair and honest way is by public competition. Then every man is on a footing of perfect equality, and the man who will give most for the property will be the possessor of it. This property may have been disposed of for its full value. That is not the point. What I complain of is that it is disposed of without public competition. In order to get further information on the subject I move for these papers.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down states that the purchaser of this property is a person who has received several favours from the Government; that he is the person at whose instance the Government disallowed the Streams Bill, and attacked the constitution of all the Provinces. This is not, perhaps, the proper time to argue this question; we may have an opportunity at some future time of arguing it. He states, further, that this Mr. McLaren is an applicant for several favours from the Government. I would like to know what particular ones they are. Mr. McLaren is well known as one of the wealthiest men in this section of the country, and is a large lumber owner. I know of no property that he is applying to the Government for except one limit on Shell River in the North-West. He paid the highest price for it that anyone in the North-West paid for any limits; but he has only one-quarter interest in that limit. The only other property he purchased in the North-West is this saw mill and grist mill—at least he supposed there was a saw and grist mill there. He made the purchase from the Indian Department. It was well known that the Indian Department had been offering that property for sale for a long time, that there were several other offers for the property, and that Mr. McLaren made the best offer for it and got it. But instead of getting what he purchased, what he honestly believed he was purchasing—a grist and saw mill—when he went up there, he found there was no mill there. He paid the full amount to the Indian Department, all they had expended on the property, and more too. Besides that, he gave to the Government \$2,500, which was all the limit was valued at, and he expected to get a mill. He has not to this day been able to get the limit; he has not been able to get the Government to carry out their arrangement with him, by which he would get the limit, the limit he honestly believed he had bought, and of which, by some means or other, he is not yet the possessor. If the hon. gentleman thinks the purchase is such a valuable one—and he stated it was a valuable one—I have no doubt that Mr. McLaren would be willing to give the hon. gentleman the property for the amount of money he had expended on it—in fact, I am sure of it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would like to hear from the Government on the question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will bring down all the papers.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Mr. COOK. How much did he pay for the limit?

Mr. HAGGART. He paid \$2,500, and was supposed to get fifty miles. He has not got anything yet. He considers he has been cheated out of it.

Motion agreed to.

#### CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT AT WINDSOR, ONTARIO.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), in moving for correspondence respecting the employment of D. Brassard and J. Bushell in the service of the Customs Department at Windsor, Ontario, said: This motion has been standing for some time. I wish to take the opportunity to make some complaints as to the manner in which the Customs Department is managed at Windsor. I consider that the staff there is altogether insufficient for the amount of work that is to be performed. The work there has vastly increased of late years, but there has not been a corresponding increase in the number of officers to perform it. More than that, the officers who are performing the duties there are altogether insufficiently paid. The Collector of Customs at the port of Windsor has a great deal more work to do than the collectors at Montreal, Toronto, and other large cities of the Dominion. Although the amount of the entries brought there daily is not very great, the number of entries is exceedingly large. The Collector there is the medium of communication between a great many persons doing business in a number of western cities. They write to him, or wait upon him personally, to make enquiries respecting the Tariff and other regulations of the Customs. Nearly his whole time is occupied with work of that kind, and in addition, he has to do all the correspondence work of his office. His surveyor, who should be engaged at the outside work, has to do clerk's work in the Customs' office; while the clerk is engaged nearly ten or twelve hours of the day in keeping the books. These men are not paid in proportion to their services. These are men who have been for twenty-three years in the service of the Government, and are only getting from the Customs Department the magnificent sum of \$600 a year. The two men whom I have specially mentioned in this return were, I understand, appointed twelve months ago to perform certain services which are of a permanent character, but they have not yet been made permanent officers. They are receiving a *per diem* allowance, although their services are of a permanent character. They are required at the Canada Southern Railway Station, which has now made Windsor its point for crossing the Detroit River. I complain that the officers at Windsor are taken away from their proper duties, and that the superior officers who ought to be engaged in their own important spheres have to perform the duties of inferior officers. The Collector of Customs for the Port of Windsor has been forty years in the public service, and has always been distinguished for his fidelity and his attention to the duties of his office. A very serious responsibility rests upon the Collector at that port. I think at present he receives \$1,700 salary, while there are many Collectors of Customs at other ports throughout the Dominion whose salaries range from \$2,500 to \$3,000. I have repeatedly brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Customs, and I believe it has been brought to the notice of the Department by the Inspector of Ports. I know the insufficiency of the staff, and I think, also, the question of salaries, has been brought under the notice of the Minister, more than once, by the Collector at that port. I think that, while we desire to see all due economy in the Public Service of Canada, neither this House nor the people of Canada want to see their public servants starve. There is another reason why I think the officers ought to be a little better paid. I do not think that any hon. member in this House,

or the Minister, thinks that a public servant should be kept on a starvation salary, especially when he is placed, like the collector at Windsor, in a position where he has to handle public money. When officers are insufficiently paid, they are exposed to the temptation of appropriating public money. Now, I do not believe that any Government officer in the Customs Department at Windsor would be guilty of that. They have the handling of large sums of money which are paid direct to them at the Custom House at the Ferry Docks, and I think that many men treated as they are treated would be liable to be tempted to misappropriate the funds passing through their hands. I am quite satisfied that such is not the case, although, at one time, when certain other officials were in office, discrepancies were reported. I think men holding these positions, with the responsibility of bank officials, should be paid something more than salaries frequently given to porters and messengers in the Departments at Ottawa. I know more than one instance of men with over twenty years service—I know one who has been in the service for twenty-seven years—having salaries of \$600, while young men in the service at Ottawa receive after four or five years salaries of \$1,000, \$1,200, and even \$1,800. The officers in the outside service do more work in a week than the officials at the capital do in a month. The duties of the collector at Windsor are more onerous than the duties performed by any other collector in the Dominion. He has been forty years in the service, he has never received any censure, and is looked upon as a most efficient and excellent officer—the Minister will not gainsay that statement—and yet his salary is less than is given here to a second-class clerk who has served six or eight years. He is the means of communication between the Government and merchants in the western States, and he performs those duties in a most efficient manner. I think means might be taken to increase his salary as well as that of the other officials to whom I have referred. Neither the Minister of Customs or any other business man would treat faithful, efficient, and life long employes, in their private business in the manner in which the officials are treated at that port. During a number of years I have urged this matter on the attention of the Government unsuccessfully, and I feel I am only doing my duty by endeavouring to obtain justice for those men and stating publicly that which I have been doing privately.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to the motion being adopted; but I am not aware of any correspondence with the Department in reference to those officers. The representation made to the Department by the Inspector was that as this other railway company had placed upon the Detroit River ferry boats by which they could connect the line of railway with the Michigan Central, it was absolutely necessary to place officers there to take charge in the same manner as they did at the Grand Trunk ferry, and on that representation the two gentlemen mentioned were placed on duty, as I before explained to the House, at a *per diem* allowance. They have not been permanently appointed, for this reason: I anticipate that additional assistance will be required in order to protect the revenue at that point, and to perform the extra duties which will be imposed on the officers there, or rather I might say created by the fact of the new line of railway crossing at that particular point; and as soon as it is ascertained exactly the number of officers that will be required in looking after the revenue, checking the goods that cross the ferry and manifesting, they will be added to the staff. The construction of new railways, not only at Windsor but also at Clifton, will necessitate the placing of a number of extra hands on the staff from the simple fact of the building of new bridges and establishment of new ferries. I will not enter into the general question raised by the hon. gentleman in regard to salaries. I know it is a common com-

plaint with himself as well as a number of other hon. members; and perhaps it is gratifying to know that I am the only Minister who is abused for not expending public money. If the public service can be properly performed and the revenue properly protected, I am of the opinion that there is no necessity to add additional men, except where it is absolutely necessary, and I am not prepared to admit the theory laid down by many hon. gentlemen that the salaries of a large number of public officials should be increased. Many of the officers to whom the hon. gentleman has called attention are well worthy of the highest salaries which can be paid under the law, but as a general rule the men who occupy positions of a responsible character receive as much as they could earn at any other vocation of life; and while the service can be performed for the amounts now paid I do not believe the country would justify the large expenditure in increased salaries which has been urged upon the Department. I can assure the hon. gentleman that whenever a case is brought under my notice where I believe it will be in the interests of the service that an increase should be given, and that the officer is worthy of the increase or promotion, I shall have no hesitation in bringing it before my colleagues with a recommendation that it be carried out.

Motion withdrawn.

#### POSTMASTER AT DUART.

Mr. CASEY, in moving for copies of all applications, recommendations or other correspondence connected with the appointment of E. McCollum as postmaster of Duart said: This is a motion to obtain information in regard to transactions connected with the post office at Duart, of which I have been informed since I arrived here. I believe that a Mr. Tait has been postmaster for a number of years, although he has not been acting as such for some time. The gentleman who has lately been acting is a Mr. Macdonald, who, I believe, has given general satisfaction to the people of the district served by the office. About two weeks ago, however, Mr. Macdonald received notice, either from the Department or from the Inspector that he was to deliver up the books and papers on a certain day to Mr. McCollum, another resident of the village, who was said to have been appointed in his place as postmaster. Now it is unusual, and not in accordance with the policy of Governments, as a rule, to dismiss a postmaster, or a deputy postmaster, or any person acting as postmaster under the regular officer, unless complaint has been made, and an investigation held upon that complaint. I suppose that some complaint must have reached the Department in regard to Mr. Macdonald, or Mr. Tait, who was the regularly appointed postmaster, and that they had some good reason for taking the action they took. I must either suppose that, or else that they must have been carried away by applications or representations made by some one in the neighbourhood, and that they acted without due consideration in the matter. I am inclined to think that the latter supposition is correct, because I am informed that when the papers came down to Mr. McCollum that gentleman refused to sign them; he said that he had heard nothing about the matter, that he did not know that he was to be appointed, that he had never asked for the position, and that the whole transaction took place without his knowledge. Such being the case, I have been requested to move for any correspondence, applications, or recommendations, connected with the matter, and perhaps the hon. Postmaster General will at this moment give such verbal explanations as will clear the matter up.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I may say that I had a motion on this subject, which I was asked to move by some friends in the neighbourhood of Duart, but as the hon. gen-

tleman represents the constituency in which it is situated, and as he had a motion on the same subject, I felt bound in courtesy to withdraw my motion. The complaint which reached me was, that the postmaster of Duart had been removed for his political predilections, and for my own part I must protest against any interference with postmasters on any such grounds. We have difficulty in getting efficient men; we pay them a merely nominal sum—no remuneration at all adequate to the trouble or labour which is involved in the position. I believe there are a great many postmasters who are only paid at the rate of \$10 or \$20 a year, and though they do not, perhaps, have a great deal of work to do, the office is one which keeps them tied up, for people are in the habit of calling at all hours of the day; they are also responsible for money letters. I know of a case that happened not long ago in my constituency, where a postmaster whose salary was about \$20 a year, had to pay \$100 for the loss of a letter, an amount which took away the whole of his salary for five years. I think we should allow our rural postmasters to freely indulge their political predilections, because the favour is not conferred upon the postmaster in appointing him, but he confers a favour on the Department and the general public in accepting the office. I know of many cases in my own constituency where I think the pay is inadequate. I believe the pay is regulated according to the number of stamps sold and the number of letters sent through the office; but in some cases there may be few stamps or letters transmitted, while there may be a great many newspapers mailed, and the trouble in connection with making up the monthly or quarterly returns may be just as great as where the volume of business is larger. I would be glad to see some scheme by which the salaries of rural postmasters should be readjusted, and placed on a better basis. At any rate I do not think that their position should be regarded from a political point of view. So far as my own constituency is concerned any recommendations which I have made have always been in favour of the best available men in the neighbourhood, and according to the wishes of the people in the locality.

Mr. CARLING. There are no applications in the Department in connection with this office. The facts are that Mr. Tait removed from Duart to St. Thomas, and we took the recommendation of parties in that particular locality for the appointment of a particular man as postmaster. That is really all that has taken place in regard to the matter.

Mr. CASEY. The removal of the postmaster from Duart St. Thomas took place a considerable time ago—some years ago I believe.

Mr. CARLING. No, I think it was in the fall of 1882.

Mr. CASEY. At all events Mr. Macdonald has been acting as postmaster for a number of years.

Mr. CARLING. Not for a number of years.

Mr. CASEY. Well, since the spring of 1882, or some time before that—he has been acting for two or three years at least—since Mr. Tait went to St. Thomas, things have been allowed to remain *in statu quo*. The acting postmaster did the work and received the pay. The mere removal of Mr. Tait to St. Thomas, which took place so long ago, could scarcely be a reason for making the change, for the change in the occupancy of the post office was not made until last month. The hon. member for Essex has spoken of a reason which was hinted to him by friends in the neighbourhood, who objected to the change, the reason mentioned being a political one. I may say that I was informed of the same thing, though I scarcely gave the report credit. It was stated that the reason for the change was, that Mr. Macdonald took some part in a demonstration expressive of pleasure over the fact that the late hon. member for Bothwell had been unseated, and that this allegation had

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).

been used by some parties as a lever to induce the Government to dismiss him and to put some one else in his place. I could hardly believe that that was the reason, but the Minister's explanation has been so utterly unsatisfactory that I begin to think there is something in it. The hon. Minister did not, however, state distinctly whether the appointment of Mr. McCollum has been definitely made, or whether he has accepted the position—whether he is now the postmaster of Duart or not.

Mr. CARLING. I may say that it is not customary or usual to appoint anybody as postmaster who has been acting in that capacity under the postmaster. The Department knew nothing about Macdonald who was acting for Mr. Tait. Mr. Tait removed to St. Thomas and the Department acting upon the recommendation I have mentioned, appointed the other party.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. McCollum has been appointed?

Mr. CARLING. No, a Mr. Britton, I believe, has been appointed.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has not improved his explanation, because he still bases the change on the removal of Mr. Tait from the neighbourhood, and that event took place over a year before. So far as Mr. Tait was concerned, the office was, at the date of the change, exactly as it had been for some time before; and Mr. Tait was responsible to the Government, as he had been for years. I do not see why the same arrangement should not have been continued, why Mr. Tait should not have remained responsible to the Department, and why Mr. Macdonald should not have been allowed to go on with the work as before. I suppose, at all events, there have been some recommendations sent in to the Government, and some complaints made, or the action would not have been taken.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Macdonald was there first, acting for Mr. Tait, and we knew nothing about Mr. Macdonald until the office became vacant. We do not hold Mr. Macdonald responsible for the management of the office at all. We do hold Mr. Tait responsible, and when Mr. Tait left the office, we relieved him from the duties of his office, and put another in his place.

Mr. CASEY. It was not when he left the office, but a year afterwards, and when Mr. Macdonald made himself obnoxious to the Government.

Mr. CARLING. There are no papers except confidential papers, which cannot be given to the House.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman refuses the papers, then?

Mr. CARLING. They are confidential papers.

Motion negatived on a division.

#### OCCUPATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) moved for a return showing the names of persons who have, during the past year, applied to the Department of Immigration to obtain the services of immigrants, giving the number and occupation of the immigrants applied for, and the number and occupation of those whose services were so obtained.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, who is absent, I regret to say, from illness, has requested me to say that there is very little correspondence in the Department on this question; that most of the applications which have been made, have been made verbally to the agents at the different stations, where they are located, and directly to the agents at Quebec where the immigrants land; and what correspondence on this subject there may be in the Department will be brought down at the earliest moment. The demand

for labour during the past summer has been very great, and it has been utterly impossible, the Minister informs me, to furnish the quantity that has been required in the Dominion. This is very much to be regretted, from the fact that wages, particularly of farm labourers and other labourers, have been much higher in every part of the country than before. A large number of navvies have been brought from the other side of the line during the past year, simply because labour could not be procured in this country, although the parties desirous of obtaining this labour had their agents all through the Dominion, at every port where immigrants landed, as well as at inland ports. This circumstance is to be regretted, because it would be well if the immigration was sufficiently large to furnish the demand, not only of the farming community, but also on public works. The papers, so far as the Minister has them, will be brought down at the earliest moment.

Mr. PATERSON. It is pleasing to know that there has been such a demand for labour during the past year as the hon. Minister is able to assure us there has been; but I am sure he will agree with me that we all desire that labour should be found abundant enough to supply the demand for it. If he could conveniently give all the information in regard to the point covered by my motion, I should be glad. He tells us in general terms that the demand has been for navvies and farm labourers; but I understand that a great many mechanics have come from foreign countries to our shores, and he will notice that my motion asks that he should give the occupation of those that have been applied for, and also the occupation of those whose services have been obtained. I judge that, without much trouble, the hon. Minister could get a memorandum from the agent at Quebec, and from the other agencies, as to the number that have really been applied for, as to the trades that they have followed in the old country, and as to whether they were required for those trades in this country. If the hon. gentleman took this trouble, I think the return would be all the more complete.

Mr. BOWELL. I explained to the hon. gentleman that there have been a large number of applications made, of which there have been no record; but I can assure him that all the correspondence covered by his motion will be brought down. There is no doubt that a large number of men who came to this country were mechanics, but if they could not find work as mechanics, they have gone to work at something else. That is the course pursued by industrious men who are willing to work, and all who applied for work on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and have been physically able and willing to work, have received employment whether they were navvies or not.

Mr. BLAKE. I can hardly fancy that the course which the hon. gentleman mentions with reference to applications for labourers by employers of labour, is extensively pursued. It seems to me extraordinary if an employer of labour should make an application to an agent for labourers, there should be no entry or record made of it. It seems to me that it would be one of the first duties of an agent, to keep such a record, in order that the application might be filled at a future time. I can hardly think that the offices can be conducted in such a loose and perfunctory manner as the hon. gentleman's remarks indicate. In reference to those for whom employment is obtained, there should also be a register kept. It would be useful in the case of a man coming and saying: "Well, I am of such an occupation and I want such an employment." He would be told at once: "I have nothing for you; go elsewhere you must look for yourself." If there is to be employment for an individual, the name of the employer should surely be recorded in order that communication might be made to applicants and applications should be entered so that information should be given to the em-

ployers. It would be a great convenience in the management of these offices that a fuller report be kept in the future.

Mr. IVES. If immigration to this country were as small as it was four or five years ago, it might be possible to keep a record at the office of the Minister at Ottawa of all immigrants arriving and of all applications for labour, but with our largely increased immigration of late years, it would be absurd to expect that all applications by the employers of labour to the agents who take charge of all immigrants at their arrival in port should be entered in a record at the Ottawa Department. Those agents travel more or less through the country with the train loads of immigrants, and employers of labour make their applications to them personally. In my own case, I have on several occasions applied to the agents who meet the steamer at Quebec and Halifax, to get me any labourers I might require. For instance, I got a gardener last spring and during the summer, and also half-a-dozen men whom I employed at other kinds of labour, and I did not think it worth while to write to Ottawa to ask the Department to order Mr. Campbell or Mr. Clark to obtain for me a gardener when I saw those gentlemen passing through the town in which I live every week to meet the steamer. I applied to them personally, and I know this is the way the matter is worked by everybody else. I do not see what good could be served if such oral applications were sent to Ottawa. If the object of the hon. gentleman is, by obtaining these returns to base an argument that the enquiry for labour has been small because a very small number of applications are on record at Ottawa, I think it very unfortunate, because I know I have never made an application here, though I have made no less than a dozen to the agents personally, and others, I am sure, have applied in the same way. I wish to give notice of my protest against a return of the kind asked for being taken at all as any indication of the demand for labour or the extent of immigration.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman is on the wrong tack, but it is fortunate that he has cast this suspicion on me, as it will have the effect of causing the hon. Minister of Agriculture to take steps to procure a list of the applications from outside sources, and thus save himself from the unfortunate position in which he would be placed by bringing down a return showing but very few applications. I have not the object in view stated by the hon. gentleman. My only desire is to obtain full information, and my opinion is that a full record should be kept of all applications as furnished by the different agents. We have had reports of these officers which deal with matters, in my opinion, not within their duties and omit other matters within their office. I remember one of those immigration agents who, in his report to the Department, gave us page after page of a dissertation on the beauties of the National Policy, and the state of the crops throughout the country, and a great deal of which information was not within the scope of his requirements. I would suggest that agents should be directed to omit information of that kind and confine themselves to give information really valuable, by keeping a record of the requisitions that are sent to them for labour, so that we may have some idea as to the demands that exist for labour and the means for supplying that demand. Had the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe paid attention to my remarks, he would have seen that my object is simply to ascertain what applications were sent in to the Department through the agents, during the year, so that we may know the different occupations in demand. When my hon. friend asks for a gardener, his request should be entered by the agent to whom it was made, and if he had asked for twenty-five or thirty shoemakers, or carpenters, or men in any other branch of trade, that request should also be entered, with a statement of the branch of trade required. I

have no sinister object in view at all, but solely wish to obtain all the information available, and such information it would be valuable to put in possession of the people.

Mr. SPROULE. I entirely concur with what my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe has said, because I was applied to two or three years ago for the purpose of getting hands to do farming work, and when I wrote to the agent, Mr. Donaldson, at Toronto, although I applied for some twenty-five men I could only get three during that season. The following season several parties asked me to write for farm labourers, and when in Toronto I saw Mr. Donaldson and made verbal application to him but was unable to get any. Consequently this last season I did not deem it expedient to make any application because I saw it would be impossible in our part of the country to get these men sent on as they were taken up before they reached there at all. A large number of applications would be sent in if people thought there was any likelihood of their getting half the men they required.

Motion agreed to.

### MINING REGULATIONS.

Mr. LISTER, in moving for copies of all petitions, letters and correspondence from any person or persons to the Minister of the Interior, or any other member of the Government, relating to the mining of gold and other minerals in the North-West Territories, said: I have reason to believe that a petition, largely signed by miners in the North-West Territory, has been forwarded to the hon. Minister of the Interior, asking that mining regulations should be passed by the Government for the benefit of the miners in that country. I am not aware that the Government has as yet taken any action in the matter, but I desire to call the attention of the Government to the great importance of attending to it at once. I believe there is no doubt about the fact that, as long ago as eight or ten years, it was discovered that the North-West Territories, the Rocky Mountains on this side, contained very valuable minerals. Explorers have been in that country for many years, and, within the last two or three years, a large number of miners have gone in there. No mining regulations have, however, been passed. There is no law by which an explorer, or a "free miner," as he is called, to use the language of the mining laws in force elsewhere, can acquire a title to any property. I believe it is a fact that many persons, whose names I shall not mention at this time, though I may have occasion to refer to them in the future, have taken possession of valuable portions of that country, claiming to have a right to certain lands to the extent of as much as 160 and 320 acres. The result has been to drive off the free miners, to drive away the explorers, who have gone in there with nothing but a pack on their back, expecting from their experience to get the benefit of what they might discover, and there is to-day a state of dissatisfaction and confusion existing in that country. I believe in the mountains there are 500 or 600 miners wintering, ready to commence operations in the spring, and I believe I am safe in saying, that when the spring opens, that number will be added to by at least 1,000, and, unless the Government take speedy steps to issue mining regulations for these men, confusion must ensue, if nothing else. I have been informed that the Government have received claims from a number of these people, and that in pursuance of the permission they have received from the Government, they are in possession of this property. I am informed that the Government has granted, or proposes to grant, mining licenses for forty acres of land. If any such thing as that is done, it is in contravention—it is against the well-known laws of all mining contracts of this continent. A mining claim should not be more than 300 by 1,500 feet, and the Government should, in no case, pass the

Mr. PATERSON (Brant)

fee in the land to the miner, and should give, at the most, the quantity of land I have suggested. I trust the Government will see fit at an early date, or even now, to answer to this motion, because I merely bring it forward for the purpose of again calling the attention of the Government to it. I bring it forward at the request of numbers of miners who have written to me, and who are very much dissatisfied indeed and I hope the hon. Minister who is representing the Minister of the Interior in this House will, to-day, give such an answer or utterance to this motion as will satisfy these people in the North-West Territory. If there is one class of men above another whom the Government of the country should seek to pacify and assist, it is the miner, who, as I stated a moment ago, went into that country, into those mountains, with nothing but his pack on his back, enduring all kinds of hardships, for the purpose of benefiting the country. Everything in the way of assistance that is possible should be given to these men, and I trust the First Minister will now give such an assurance to these men as will satisfy them. I remind him that spring will soon be on, and hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of men will be flocking into that country, and the consequence will be very disastrous indeed unless the Government, in its wisdom, sees fit to do something in the meantime.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says that he has had a great many complaints, and there has been dissatisfaction expressed by a number of miners. I think, if he had stated that he has received communications from prospectors, he would have been more accurate.

Mr. LISTER. Well, call them prospectors, if you like.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are a good many prospectors, I have no doubt, who are there, and I hope will do good service to the country by developing the mineral resources, especially at or near the Rocky Mountains. He says a good many have gone in. They have gone in this year, and, though most prospectors, if they have found a good thing, do not disclose where it is, yet, from the rumours we hear, and the evidence which, with more or less certainty, reaches the Department of the Interior, there is, no doubt, a general opinion that there is a considerable mineral region of both gold and silver near the Rocky Mountains, or in that vicinity. The law already gives certain rights—inchoate rights to prospectors, certain encouragement to prospectors, and, when they become miners, the claims of those who really make discoveries, who have spent their money and developed the riches of the country, will of course be considered in preference. The hon. gentleman knows—or perhaps he does not know, as he did not state it—that mining regulations were issued last year, and there may have been some applications, but if so they were very few, under those mining regulations; but the fact that those regulations were issued has called forth a great deal of discussion, a great deal of information has been sent, and the Department of the Interior has examined the Australian laws, and the laws in force in the United States, in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, for the purpose of preparing an amended system of regulations for miners. I may inform the hon. gentleman that these regulations have been prepared for some little time, and were until lately under the consideration of the Government, as prepared by the Department. Those amended mining regulations are now approved and ready for publication in the *Gazette*. They will appear I believe in the next *Canada Gazette*, and will be laid on the Table, and I hope the hon. gentleman will find they are such as he can approve.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is a pity the hon. gentleman did not cause these researches to be made in the mining

regulations of Australia, Nova Scotia and the United States before he issued his regulations, instead of afterwards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Last year?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will look at the regulations, he will find that there are some of those adopted taken from the United States and some from Nova Scotia. They were prepared with a view to the experience of both those American mining countries. Since that, the consideration has been extended to other countries, in consequence of Australian miners, prospecting in the North-West, having made certain valuable suggestions, which have been taken up.

Mr. LISTER. I desire, in answer to the First Minister to say that application has been made to the Department of the Interior, not only by myself, but by actual miners—not prospectors—for a copy of these regulations, and they have not been able to get them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, not yet.

Mr. LISTER. Not the new ones, but the ones you say were issued last year; and if we cannot get them in Ottawa, it is very unlikely prospectors could get them in the North-West Territories. These prospectors are the men who have to be protected, and the difficulty with them is this: Several of them who have discovered what they believe to be mineral leads have been warned off by these companies that I have referred to—men who claim that they have a right to 320 acres of land and 160 acres pre-emption for mining facilities—large companies who, I believe, have no claim at all unless the Government has given them one. When these prospectors have discovered what they believe to be mineral lands, the companies tell them that the land belongs to them, that if their discoveries are within the limits of that permit, then they have no right to them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can only say again that if such is the fact, that large tracts of land have been granted to particular individuals, then I say it is a violation of every mining law on this continent, British Columbia included. I believe the mining laws of British Columbia are the best on the continent, and if the Government will follow those laws it would be doing justice to everybody. I hope when these mining rules come down—I won't pretend to criticise them now—I hope the Minister will have followed the mining regulations of British Columbia. Those are the mining regulations the miners of that country want—not that large tracts of land should be locked up in the hands of a few individuals. We want to get a large number of miners in there, because that is one way to develop the country, and we must encourage them with fair regulations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the permission of the House I would say one word. The hon. gentleman says that he knows—that he heard from miners—that they have found people claiming to have possession of 320 acres from the Government. I think I can safely say, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have heard it; I can safely say on the part of the Department that such a statement is erroneous, quite erroneous, thoroughly erroneous. If the hon. gentleman had been up there himself he would know that there are very few valuable lots which somebody has not laid a claim to. If people are prevented from settling by the pretended claims of others, very few will find vacant lots at all.

Mr. LISTER. The mining regulations will settle all that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no doubt in the world but that what the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) says is correct, that persons who have gone in

there during this last fall with a view, I suppose, of developing the resources of that country, have been warned off by men who have been there before them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Every claim-jumper warns off his neighbour.

Mr. CAMERON. On several occasions this last fall, when I visited the summit of the Rocky Mountains, I heard parties make these complaints, parties who had gone there with a view of prospecting and making their fortune. They went up into the mountains, and they were warned off by two or three companies who have established themselves in the neighbourhood of the railway there, and who claim to own a large portion of the country. How they do it is quite clear. When these men go there they stake out, say, so many feet, and send the claims down to Ottawa. But they do not confine themselves to staking out a claim for the company; but they put in fifty or one hundred claims in the name of their employes, or their friends in Canada, or in England; and in that way they pretend to get possession of a very large portion of what is considered a valuable region. Now, whether they have any right to it or not, of course is out of the question, but that the thing is done is beyond all reasonable doubt; and the sooner these regulations are promulgated and the people know exactly what they can and cannot do, the better it will be for the interests of the people up there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The pretended claim is made in this way: A person goes into the mountains, or near the mountains, and he finds, or fancies he has found, a mine. He may apply as a settler and claim to have a homestead and pre-emption as agricultural land. The hon. gentleman knows, however, that that would give him no title to either gold or silver, under the Act.

Motion agreed to.

#### SHAREHOLDERS IN THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MULOCK, in moving for a statement showing the names of all shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the amounts of stock held by each of said shareholders on each of the following days, namely: the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th October, 1883; 4th, 11th, 18th, and 25th of November, 1883; 2nd, 9th, 16th, 23rd and 30th of December, 1883; 6th, 10th, 20th and 27th of January, 1884, said: This motion covers the period of about four months. I think, perhaps, it would be as well to cut down the number of days asked for and with the permission of the House, therefore, I would limit the motion to the 14th, 21st, and 28th October, 1883, and the 4th of November, 1883. I desire, if possible, to ascertain to what extent this stock is passing into the hands of the ordinary investing public.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B. C.) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before that reasonable request is put, I wish to correct the statement I made respecting the days on which the tender of resignation of Mr. Costigan was made, and his withdrawal of it. His tender was on the 18th; it was given to me on the 19th, and withdrawn on the 20th—just twenty-four hours afterwards.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said the 21st, this afternoon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has given me a corrected memorandum. I spoke from recollection.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is rather unwise to move the adjournment of the House. We have now been forty days in Session, and have completed [scarcely any business yet. The paper is very full, and I would like to know upon what grounds the hon. gentleman moves the adjournment. If it is for the purpose of going to the festivities this evening, nobody is kept here, they can go if they like. But, there are a large number of gentlemen who desire to stay and attend to public business.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in that regard, and I would like to know whether he is not going to the festivities himself?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will state to my right hon. friend that I have been honoured with a card of invitation, but if the House sits and attends to business I will not go. If it does not sit the probability is that, like a great many more, I will go. But I think it is my first duty to stay here and attend to the business of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason I asked was, that I supposed my hon. friend was most patriotically going to sacrifice his wife's relations, and going to the ball himself.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

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

### After Recess.

#### ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria), in moving for copy of Order in Council passed in September last, providing for the payment of \$130,000 to the Government of British Columbia, on account of Esquimalt Graving Dock reimbursements, said: The House has been engaged in considering a question involving millions and this is only a small matter of a few thousands. I desire to obtain the information for two reasons: First, that I may know the precise date on which the Order in Council was passed; and second, the exact amount embodied in the Order in Council, as leading up to some other matters that will shortly come before the House and which will materially affect the interests of British Columbia.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE STEAMER SIR JAMES DOUGLAS.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria), in moving for detailed statement of all monies expended upon the dredge steamer *Sir James Douglas*, in connection with the hauling out, lengthening of, repairs to, and launching of said vessel from 1st January, 1882, to 31st December, 1883, said: In this connection I would state that I am very sorry to be called upon to move for this statement, because I have reason to know that some years ago something like \$28,000 or \$30,000 were expended on this steamer, and it was considered necessary by the Department to expend this amount, although my knowledge leads me to suppose that whenever the amount of money necessary to be devoted to repairs to any steamer exceeds two-thirds of the original value, it is better to condemn the vessel. But there is another matter connected with this expenditure for which I desire to obtain the information, and it will be subsequently asked for in another notice of motion which I will be called upon to move.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) also moved for statement showing numbers of officers and crew of steamer *Sir James Douglas*, their names, rank, pay and date of first appointment, the average cost per month of maintaining said vessel, for the twelve months ending 31st December, 1883, nature of service in which she has been engaged for the period mentioned,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

increased speed obtained by lengthening, date on which she was last swung for adjustment of compasses, and copy of deviation table made therefrom. He said: The main object of calling for this statement is that I may be in a position to know whether in the Province of British Columbia there has been great laxity evinced in the swinging of vessels for the adjustment of their compasses, as I think it is highly desirable, before picking holes in the coats of other people, we should ascertain whether the Dominion Government steamers have complied with all the requirements under that particular head.

Motion agreed to.

#### DOMINION EMPLOYÉS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria), in moving for a statement showing the names, rank, pay, date of appointment of all officers, clerks, messengers, and servants employed in the various Departments of the Dominion, in the Province of British Columbia, including Dominion Government Agent and those employed under him, said: I am desirous of obtaining the necessary information under these respective heads, because, as many hon. members are doubtless aware, we are constantly importuned for increases of salaries in the various Departments, and I wish to obtain exactly the dates on which such appointments were made, and other details, so that I may be in a better position to give definite answers to my constituents and to those employed in the Province, when they make applications of the character to which I have referred.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to call the attention of the Government to a question which occurs to me in connection with this motion. It appears to me that all the information which is asked for is to be found in the blue-books of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and it is a question whether we should encumber the files and records of this House under these circumstances. I do not oppose the motion, but I think if the information can be obtained in the way I have stated, such motions would appear to be useless.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the motion should be allowed to pass, because it seeks for information about a special matter in a particular province, and it does not belong exclusively to the Marine Department. The hon. gentleman gives a reason for asking the information, and I do not think we should refuse it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not oppose the motion, but it does seem to me that my hon. friends the members of the Government, are fond of imposing work upon themselves.

Mr. BAKER. This is a matter which affects my particular constituency, and I hope the hon. gentleman will allow me to know a little more about my constituency than he does.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know I am out of order, but I may be allowed to say that while I do not interfere with the hon. gentleman's constituency, I have the right which every hon. member has, of stating his opinion, and I say I think a great deal of time is expended uselessly, and a great deal of money, too, in getting information which could as well be obtained in the blue-books.

Motion agreed to.

#### BREAKWATER AT POINT ESCUMINAC.

Mr. MITCHELL, in moving for all papers, communications and correspondence with the Government or any Department thereof, in relation to the construction of a breakwater at Point Escuminac in the Bay of Miramichi, N.B.; also, all reports, surveys and plans made by any officer of the Government in relation thereto, said: I may say that the Bay of Miramichi is one which is resorted

to by a large number of fishermen, not only from the adjacent coasts of that county, but also from the adjacent counties of Gloucester and Restigouche, and representations as to the requirements of the fishermen in the way of a breakwater at Point Escuminac have frequently been made to me. I have therefore felt it my duty to place this motion on the paper in order to get such information as may be in the hands of the Government, and any surveys and plans which have been made, in order that we may judge of the propriety of acting upon that information.

Mr. BAKER. I think the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is equally guilty with myself in taking up the time of the House needlessly. I think I must cast on the hon. gentleman, in this respect, the same reflection which he cast upon me.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. gentleman can point out any similarity between the two cases, or any inconsistency on my part, I shall be obliged to him, and I think the House will be obliged to him. My case differs in this respect from his, that this is a question of saving life and protecting an enormous and valuable and extensive industry. It is known that storms frequently rise, and that sometimes no less than 40 or 50 boats have been wrecked in a single storm, whereas, if there had been a harbour of refuge the lives of these people, and the loss of their boats would have been saved. I think there is a great difference between such a motion as that, and a mere attempt to create popularity, or a desire to make political capital. I am not saying that that is the feeling which influenced the hon. gentleman who has made this personal attack upon myself, simply because I pointed out, what is apparent to everyone, that it is necessary to curtail motions which are made merely for personal ambition, or political notoriety; but I say that I made no speech for effect upon my constituents, but simply made the motion. With regard to his motion, I ventured the suggestion to the Minister, because I believed that the information sought was to be obtained in the blue-books which are published by the Department; and because I did this, the hon. gentleman makes an attack upon me, after I have made a motion in the interest of my constituency and the adjoining constituency, as well as in the interest of human life and of the commerce and trade which surrounds our coasts. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that when a motion is made in this House every gentleman has a right to criticise or object if he thinks it necessary to do so, and a person must not be supposed to do it from captious motives because it may not suit the ambition or the desire for notoriety of certain hon. gentlemen. I tell him, as I tell every hon. gentleman, that when I think it necessary to criticise any motion, whether it comes from the Government or the Opposition, I shall be ready to do so in the exercise of my public duty and my personal right.

Mr. BAKER. If the hon. gentleman cared as little for political squibs as I do, he would say far less in the House than he does. I regret that I am called upon to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of airing his eloquence.

Motion agreed to.

#### MINING AND METALLURGY.

Mr. HALL moved that a Select Committee be appointed to obtain information as to the methods adopted by the Geological Surveys of this and other countries, in the prosecution of their work, with a view of ascertaining if additional technical and statistical records of mining and metallurgical development in the Dominion should not be procured and preserved, with power to send for persons, papers and records; and that said Committee consist of Messrs. Baker (Victoria), Dawson, Cameron (Inverness), Ferguson (Welland), Holton, Laurier, Lesage, Lister, Mulock, Wood (Westmoreland), and the mover. He said:

I only desire to say a word in reference to this motion, which is not intended as any reflection on the administration of the Geological Survey. I think, however, that there is a feeling that this Survey is not keeping pace with the geological progress of the country, though I believe the fault is rather in the system itself, than in its administration. I find that thirty years ago a motion similar to this was moved, and the Committee which was appointed upon the motion obtained some valuable information, and the survey has since been conducted on the suggestions made by that Committee. Great progress has been made in geological matters since that time, but I cannot find any evidence of any attention having been paid to this subject in the House during the thirty years which have elapsed since that time, except the desultory remarks which are made when this appropriation comes up in the House upon the Estimates. I think after the lapse of so long a period, new investigations should be made, and possibly new suggestions offered in reference to the conduct of the Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not consider this motion at all a reflection on the Geological Branch of the Department of the Interior; on the contrary, I think it will be of assistance to the Director of the Survey, and I have not the slightest objection to the Committee. I would therefore just throw out a suggestion to my hon. friend, who I suppose will be the Chairman of the Committee, to take great care not to incur any great expense in summoning witnesses, which is the chief objection to Committees of this kind. I think most of the information can be got here, without much expense in the way of paying the travelling expenses of witnesses, and the cost of keeping them here.

Mr. BLAKE. I was about to make the observation which the hon. gentleman has just made. I confess I think he has been rather late this Session in granting Committees with power to send for persons; and I was a little afraid lest this Committee might think proper to send for persons to Washington or some other places—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Or for Mr. Huxley or Mr. Tyndall.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps not so far—in order to obtain information. If the object is to examine persons engaged in the service here, there can be no objection; and if the Committee wishes to obtain information with respect to other countries, they can obtain such as is contained in the reports, without calling the persons engaged in prosecuting the different services.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right, and if the information cannot be got here, a series of questions can be sent to scientific men, who I have no doubt, will be glad to send to the Committee all the information in their power.

Motion agreed to.

#### NAVAL STATION AT ESQUIMALT.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria), in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Dominion and the Imperial Governments in reference to the continued maintenance of the naval station at Esquimalt and the continuous presence of at least one of Her Majesty's ships in British Columbia waters, said: Article 9 of the terms of Union stipulates that the influence of the Dominion Government shall be used to secure the continual maintenance of a naval station at Esquimalt. One of the members of the Administration, when I put a question on this subject the other day, desired me to bring it up in this form. I am anxious to receive this correspondence; and inasmuch as the hon. member for Northumberland—who reminds me very much of the lion on the top of Northumberland House, of whom it is said that you do not know which way his tail turns—is very

anxious to get away to the ball, I will make my remarks as brief as possible under the circumstances.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend from Victoria is determined to drag his coat-tail and have a fight. When the hon. gentleman has been as long in public life as I have been, he will find that it scarcely comes with good grace from him to twit an old member of the House with speaking frequently and making speeches for political effect, especially as I find that he has eight or nine motions on the paper, while during the whole Session I have only had one. I think in seconding the motion of the hon. gentleman, I showed my desire to support him whenever he submits a motion that has merit in it and is not mere buncombe.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will use a more parliamentary term, and say, that is merely for political effect. But my hon. friend must not think he can provoke an old dog like myself with impunity—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A lion.

Mr. MITCHELL. And if I refrain from protracting this debate and the other debates that will arise out of the motions in which the hon. gentleman is interested, it is simply because many gentlemen around me are anxious to get away to the festivities of this evening, and because I see that the hon. gentleman has got his paint and feathers on, and is anxious to display them before that galaxy of beauty which is awaiting his presence.

Mr. BLAKE. I remember also that lion to which my hon. friend has referred, and he forgets that it was made of stone instead of brass; and although it was said that if you looked at it, you would see its tail wag, I do not remember ever hearing that lion growl.

Mr. BAKER. I consider it my duty to state for the information of the House that although the hon. gentleman claimed to be an old member of the House, and although I have admitted he is old enough to be my father, I have the same right to speak in this House as he has, and I can say his attempt at modesty is only equalled, if not exceeded, by his feigned youthful appearance.

Motion agreed to.

#### DISMISSAL OF DANIEL McCOURT.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence with reference to Daniel McCourt, lately dismissed from his office as lock tender on the Cornwall Canal, and all papers in any way bearing upon the subject of his dismissal, including copy of any letters or reports of the Superintendent of the Canal, with a statement of the date of Mr. McCourt's appointment, and his age at the time of his dismissal, said: It has been represented to me that Mr. McCourt was appointed as long ago as 1862; that he was dismissed in the month of June last, after twenty-one years' service, being still in what I am now disposed to call the prime of life, namely, the age of fifty; and that he was in the full vigour of health, and an excellent servant, possessing the best character, and having received the most favourable reports of his efficiency from his local superior. Mr. McCourt has a wife and family, and has been dismissed, so far as I can ascertain, without any cause. Under these circumstances, we should know why he has been dismissed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the absence of the hon. Minister of Railways, I would say there is no objection to this motion. With respect to the statement of the hon. gentleman, I know nothing of the facts, but my knowledge of the course taken in such matters by the hon. Minister of Railways is, that in such cases he errs on the side of too much leniency, and for the sake of the persons principally interested, he is too apt to keep people in the service after their usefulness is gone.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria).

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the papers will come down early  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Motion agreed to.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for: 1st. For statement of the particulars, with dates of the expenditure of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway; 2nd. For statement in full detail of the particulars of the amount of \$473,000 or thereabouts, stated to be for sundry advances, carriers, back charges and other matters; 3rd. For a statement, in detail, with dates of the payments on account of interest on stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway; 4th. For copies of all reports and data on which the estimates of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Mr. Schreiber, as to the cost of completing the Canadian Pacific Railway, are founded. He said: These are points on which the information before us is deficient. In the absence of the hon. Minister of Railways, I will not enlarge on the subject, but will take this opportunity of saying across the floor what I have stated to the hon. Minister himself privately. Most important information which it would not take one hour to prepare has been asked for a fortnight or more ago, and has not yet been given. We have asked for information with respect to the cost of the 40 miles from Callander westward, that was built a year or two ago, before the Company let the contract to the construction company, and though asked for two or three weeks ago, the information has not yet been given. The cost of the work from Winnipeg to a point 45 miles east, where the construction company's contract began, has been asked for and not yet obtained; also, in respect to the work from that point to Calgary which was completed a considerable time ago, and from Calgary to the summit of the Rockies, the latest completed, it is true, but completed as long ago as the end of October last. There is a great deal more asked which ought to be given, but I merely signalize these four points with respect to which there really ought to be no delay. I am very anxious to have the particulars contained in this memorandum also at the earliest moment. All the information I have asked for is essential to the consideration of the measure before this House.

Motion agreed to.

#### WHARF AT CRANE ISLAND.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation), in moving for: 1. Copies of tenders received for works on the pier at Crane Island, last year; 2. A statement of the tenders made according to the scale of such tenders; 3. The name of the party tendering to whom the contract was awarded; 4. The amount expended for the work; 5. The salaries paid to the Superintendents of Works, if any, said: Mr. Speaker, the object I have in view in making this motion is to verify the statement of whatever tenders may have been received for the construction of the pier at Crane Island. I do not know whether the information I have received is correct or not, but I have been asked to move for a statement of these tenders, because it is said that the parties tendering, to whom the contract has been awarded, had not put in the lowest tender. I have been told that there was a couple of tenders put in for a lower price. If the hon. Minister of Public Works is prepared to give me at once some accurate information on this point, and to tell me whether or not the contract has actually been awarded to the lowest bidder, I shall not proceed with my motion; if not, I should desire to have the required information.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) As near as I can remember, the parties to whom the contract has been awarded were the lowest bidders; the contractors are

Messrs. Langlois & Hickman. The amount of their tender was \$10,500. The tenders were advertised for from 6th December, 1883, to 8th January, 1884.

Motion withdrawn.

#### WHARF AT ST. JEAN PORT JOLI.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation), in moving for: 1. Copies of tenders called for and made last year for the extension of the wharf at St. Jean Port-Joli; 2. Of the contract awarded to the party tendering, if such contract was awarded; 3. A statement of the amount expended last year on the said work; 4. The names of the persons, if any, who had charge of the said work, and of the salary allowed and paid to each such person; 5. A statement of the work done, showing dimensions, quantity and quality, said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion I desire to again call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the manner in which the work at this wharf has been done, either by contract or otherwise. In the first place I must congratulate the hon. Minister for having caused this work to be done, and at the same time I wish to draw his attention to the following fact: Last year when the question came up before the House, it was stated to me, as a reason for the postponement of the work, that the contract ought to be let out by tenders. I hold in my hand the report of Mr. Percy, the Chief Engineer, giving as a reason that the attention of the Minister of Public Works had been called to the fact that these works ought to be let out by contract. Here are, in a few words, the reasons given last year:

"That the amount available having been appropriated for the construction of works for extending the pier, he immediately countermanded the orders which had been given, having in view the placing of the works to be constructed under contract."

Well, in spite of the attention I have given to the subject, I have not been able to discover in the newspapers that tenders had been asked for. I do not mean to say that the work has not been as well done, but I mean to say that it was expected that the works should be done by contract. It may be that the work has been done by contract, but if that was the case, the fact was certainly unknown to me, and also unknown to the people of that locality. If I am rightly informed—and I have reason to believe that my information is correct—I think that these works ought to be done by day's work. Under those circumstances, I should desire to know what has been the cost of the work, the quantities of work which have been done, and at the same time who were the overseers, and whether or not they are the same persons whose names were mentioned last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), I must say that, in fact, the intention had been to let out this work by contract, but that after consulting the Chief Engineer, after reckoning up the amount at our disposal, and after examining the difficulties of the work, it has been decided that it would be better not to give out the work by tender, but to have it done by day's work, as had been done by the late Administration. Consequently the Department has followed the same line of conduct. As to the overseer—I think that is the information desired by the hon. member—an officer of the Department, Mr. Augustin Gagnon, has been sent there to oversee the work. This work offered great difficulties, and we intended to do it well, and under these circumstances we deemed it our duty to employ a man of great experience, and to whom the Government could safely entrust the work. Mr. Augustin Gagnon has been paid \$3 per day. There is no objection to granting the motion of the hon. member, and the information asked for will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORY.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for: 1. Copies of all Orders in Council respecting the appointment of an Administrator of the Government of the North-West Territories in the absence of Lieut. Governor Dewdney; 2. All correspondence that subject between the said Lieut. Governor and the Government, or any member thereof; 3. All correspondence respecting any mission entrusted to said Lieut. Governor, the nature of such mission, and the instructions given to said Lieut. Governor respecting his mission; 4. The name of said Administrator; 5. All correspondence, including telegrams, between said Governor and the Government, within the last month, as to his proposed visit to Ottawa. He said: I have been informed that Mr. Dewdney, Lieut. Governor of the North-West Territories, is not at his post just now, that he has been sent upon some mission to British Columbia or elsewhere by the Government, and that an Administrator has been appointed in his place to the North-West instead of Lieut. Governor Dewdney. Of course, he may be absent upon an important mission and it may be important that he should be absent, but it strikes me that it is an extremely unfortunate period for the Lieut. Governor of our Territories in the North-West to be absent. The First Minister has no doubt observed, within the last day or two, an account of a serious outbreak—it is said to be so, at all events—among some of the tribes in the North-West Territory. It is said that Pie-a-pot's band is in a state of practical rebellion, and that other tribes are generally discontented, and that there is a general row in progress in some of these tribes. Whether that is so or not, I cannot tell, except from what I see in the public press, but, whether that be so or not, it is an unfortunate thing that the head of that Department should be absent from his post just now, and that his place should be filled, as I am informed, by a young man named Hayter Reed, an assistant in the Lieut. Governor's Department. I am told that the Lieut. Governor was on his way to Ottawa, and that a telegram was sent to him from Ottawa, telling him not to come to Ottawa, and that he was sent back to the West or to British Columbia upon some mission. That he has not arrived here is quite clear. Why he was sent back, of course, I do not know, and I hope to get this information from the papers I have just asked for. I think, as I said before, that it is unfortunate he should not be there now, to look after the disaffected Indians, to protect the people up there from any results that may follow from the dissatisfaction or discontent, or from any row there may be in the Indian encampments there. It is unfortunate, too, if it is a fact, as I am informed it is, that this young man has been appointed in the absence of Lieut. Governor Dewdney, that such an appointment should have been made. There are men there who have been in the service for a very long time, and if any honour was to be conferred they were entitled to it. There is Lieut. Col. Richardson who has been administering justice there for a number of years, and no man stands higher or enjoys the public respect more than Lieut. Col. Richardson. Then there is Lieut. Col. McLeod, an efficient officer, a man who stands high; and there is Judge Rouleau, another of the officials engaged in the administration of Civil and Criminal Justice there. But all these men are passed over, and this young man, Mr. Hayter Reed, is said to have been appointed. It may be all right, but I desire to know the reasons; I desire to know why Lieut. Governor Dewdney is absent just now; I desire to know what mission he has been sent upon, and also whether the Government have any information as to this alleged outbreak among the Indians?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD Mr. Speaker, I must say I think it unfortunate that my hon. friend, when he makes his motions, generally contrives to include in the reasons a

series of rumours, most of these being altogether unfounded. In the first place, he says he hears from rumour that Mr. Dewdney was summoned down to Ottawa.

Mr. CAMERON. I knew he was.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What?

Mr. CAMERON. I know he was. He was at Winnipeg on his way down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Brought down here?

Mr. CAMERON. I know he was on his way down here; he was at Winnipeg.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that he is altogether mistaken, that Governor Dewdney never had any intention of coming here this winter; that, on the contrary, it was understood that he was not to come here this winter, that he never was summoned here. If he went to Winnipeg, it was on business as Indian Commissioner at Winnipeg, of which I know nothing. I tell the hon. gentleman it is so. He may shake his head, but it is so. The rumour is a falsehood, got up, as so many of these rumours are—not of course by the hon. gentleman—got up for some reason unknown to me, but not creditable to the parties who get them up, either to their veracity or their *bona fides*. The hon. gentleman says that he hears also that he was sent on an important mission. Sir, he is sent upon no mission. The circumstances are simply these: The winter time is the easiest time for the Indian Commissioner and Lieut.-Governor to get away. Summer is the time for business. In the winter the Indians are kept at home by the climate, and by the depth of snow, and there is no danger of their making trouble, as there is in the summer time. Mr. Dewdney has been in the employment of the Government some four years. He has never returned to his home where his property and his interests are—in British Columbia—since his appointment. As he has but little to do just now, and had got through with his North-West Council, he asked for leave of absence for two months or six weeks to go to British Columbia, and to take Mrs. Dewdney with him to see her mother. He wished to do some business of his own, and intends to be back in Regina by the 1st of April. That is the simple reason why Mr. Dewdney asked for leave and got it. Then, as to the fact of there being a rising of the Indians. In one place some hungry Indians broke into a store and took away some sacks of flour. The agent says it is of no significance whatever; of course, these things are greatly exaggerated, as all such things are. That is the statement made to the Government. Then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman claims that Mr. Hayter Reed was appointed Administrator. Mr. Hayter Reed is Assistant Commissioner, and if anything should happen to Mr. Dewdney it would be my bounden duty to recommend him to be Commissioner as being the ablest Administrator that we have among the employés there. Mr. Reed is a member of the Bar of seven or ten years' standing, I suppose, and perhaps longer. He is a gentleman who has distinguished himself there, and has a great acquaintance with the Indian character. Although a lawyer practising in Coburg, he had a military taste, and he went up there with a military force some years ago. He has been a good deal through the country and has become thoroughly acquainted with the Indian character and with the Indian languages, so that the Government were only too glad to employ Mr. Hayter Reed. He has full charge, having full acquaintance with, and cognizance of, all matters connected with Indian affairs. He was appointed to do the work because, as Assistant Commissioner, it is convenient that he should do the duty of Administrator. That is the fact with respect to Mr. Hayter Reed. All this story about this gentleman being summoned here mysteriously, and sent back mysteriously, and going off on a mys-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

terious mission to British Columbia, is all manufactured out of whole cloth.

Mr. BLAKE. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman express so much indignation at these rumors as to Mr. Dewdney visiting Ottawa, and to hear him say they are discreditable to the persons who have spread them abroad. I dare say it was not without some foundation. I had myself heard something like it, and which might, perhaps, be deemed, by persons who do not know the hon. gentleman as well as I do, pretty good foundation for a rumour of that kind. I have heard him state across the floor, in answer to an observation of mine made about the Lieut. Governor, that he had come down, that he had directed him to come down, and so long as he remained responsible for the administration of affairs he would have him down here every winter in order to advise and consult him informally about North-West affairs. Well, as I said, those who do not know the hon. gentleman might possibly have supposed that the rumour was well founded, and that the hon. gentleman's policy would last as long he remained First Minister and responsible for the administration of affairs. Therefore, when they heard that Mr. Dewdney had got as far east as Winnipeg, they might suppose, putting two and two together, that the hon. gentleman's statement held good for this Session. They knew he was First Minister and supposed his policy was continuous. It now appears that, instead of coming east to see his political god-father, the Lieut.-Governor has gone further west to see his mother-in-law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to make merry over it. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Dewdney was down here spending his time and amusing himself instead of attending to his duties. What I said across the floor, last Session and the Session before, was that whenever he was wanted here I would bring him down every Session, when business required; that is what I said. He was not wanted here this Session and therefore he did not come, but if I wanted him next Session I would bring him down notwithstanding any taunt of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I attribute the hon. gentleman's being down here to another reason altogether. Some years ago when the North-West Act was passed, the hon. gentleman said there was no occasion for any Governor. I suppose he said so with a view of keeping the position vacant for Mr. Dewdney.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is infinitely more in the remarks of my hon. friend than there was in the remark of the hon. gentleman who preceded him. I did say so, and I think when I said so it was so, and that there was no necessity for appointing Mr. Laird and giving him \$7,000 for doing nothing, for doing just what Mr. Cauchon and Mr. Morris had done before him for a salary of only \$1,000 in addition to the then salary. I said so and I think so. But when Mr. Dewdney was appointed, instead of his getting \$7,000, which Mr. Laird had got and never did anything in the world for it, he got \$2,000 in addition to his salary as Commissioner. This present year, for the first time, there is really a necessity, or a great expediency, rather, for a Lieut.-Governor being at Regina, because for the first time there has been a North-West Council, with six or seven elected members, and they had a Parliament of their own. Therefore it was this year, for the first time, nearly an absolute necessity for the Lieut.-Governor to be at Regina, instead of holding a nominal office and meeting the North-West Council once a year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is quite clear the hon. gentleman has neither read the Statutes nor the history of that country when he says that Mr. Laird did nothing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, he did not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The North-West Act was passed in 1875, before Mr. Laird went there. Duties were imposed by this Act which he knows Governor Morris never discharged. Governor Morris discharged no duties whatever, legislative or executive, in connection with the North-West Territories. He was Lieut.-Governor nominally of the whole West, but he was not Lieut.-Governor of any organized system of territory. He was Lieut. Governor of Manitoba with a sort of quasi judicial authority over the rest of the territory, but he had no fixed duties whatever to perform. The Act was passed in 1875, and under that Act the duties to be discharged were of a very onerous character, and Mr. Laird did discharge those duties infinitely better than they have been discharged since he left.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I say the hon. gentleman has utterly forgotten the facts of the case; he has utterly forgotten the law; he has utterly forgotten the duties that were thrown upon Mr. Laird, and he has utterly forgotten the fact that Mr. Laird never did anything as Lieut.-Governor, except as Commissioner, that Mr. Morris had not done before him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the hon. gentleman will consult the Statutes of the North-West he will see what Mr. Laird had to do in connection with making treaties with the Indians, and in many other things.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, I know it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No, the hon. gentleman is not willing to say anything but what suits himself. The hon. gentleman is not ashamed to do a gross injustice to a man who is not present to defend himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is Mr. Dewdney here to defend himself?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think he is. Where the hon. gentleman is, he is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Ditto.

Motion agreed to.

#### HARBOUR OF REFUGE ON NORTH SHORE OF LAKE ERIE.

Mr. WILSON, in moving for a return of all reports of Government engineers respecting the construction of a harbour of refuge at Port Stanley or Port Burwell, on the north shore of Lake Erie, together with the estimated cost of each, said: I wish briefly to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to the condition of these harbours, and I would also like to direct his attention to the condition in which the greater portion of the harbours on the north shore of Lake Erie really are. It is well known that these harbours are at the present time, to a very great extent, neglected. True, several years ago a considerable amount of money was expended on one of them, namely, Port Burwell; but the only amount expended at Port Stanley was \$4,000 for a lighthouse. Unfortunately, from some cause or other, I do not know the reason why, we have been totally unable to get a single dollar expended on either of these harbours by the present Administration. Unfortunately for me, and unfortunately for the people along the coast, we have not been so successful as the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) in inducing the Government, after making an examination of the harbour, and deciding not to vote money to make it a harbour of refuge, to expend a reasonable amount of money on them to make them safe for the unfortunate mariners who are compelled to sail up and down that coast. That hon. gentleman succeeded in getting a certain amount applied to Kingsville harbour, although there was close at hand a very fine harbour, Rondeau; and I believe a very large amount of money has been appropriated and will be expended in

making that harbour more useful to shipping. It must be borne in mind that the section of country to the north of Port Stanley and Port Burwell, and all the smaller ports along the north coast of Lake Erie, would afford very large trade, if the Government would only take into consideration the necessity of keeping them in a proper state of repair. But we find that after a vessel leaves Rondeau, coming down, she cannot find any port of safety in case of a storm unless she passes Long Point. Thus she has to traverse about 100 miles of coast, where no provision has been made by the Government for the safety of vessels during storms. It is not a very unfrequent circumstance, in fact it occurs year after year, that we find lamentable loss of life taking place, owing to, what I am not afraid to call, criminal negligence on the part of the present Administration. I believe they might have done something; I believe a small expenditure would have placed those ports in a good position and have enabled the lives of mariners to be protected, and the Government is bound to protect those unfortunate individuals sailing up and down that coast. When a vessel was unable to enter a port on account of the lack of expenditure by the Government, it would be supposed that the Government, which talked a great deal about protection, would have placed a life-boat at one or other of those ports to which I have referred. They have failed, for some reason or other, to do this, and they have done everything in their power to divert the large traffic that took place across the lake to the railways. It may be that the railway is a very important factor, and that we should do our utmost to drive the traffic off the lakes; but if that is the Government's policy, it is their duty, in the interests of the mariners on Lake Erie, to make some provision whereby those men would have an opportunity of having their lives saved in case of storm. I therefore urge on hon. gentlemen opposite that, if they will not appropriate a sixpence, and there is no sum down in the Estimates, for either of those ports, they might make a provision whereby life-boats would be provided for those ports, and the lives of mariners be thereby protected. If the Government will provide for life-boats to be placed there, I will guarantee to get willing and ready hands to man them and endanger their own lives for the sake of preserving the lives of mariners. I move this resolution in order to call the attention of the Government to this matter; I hope they will consider it, and see that it is their duty to make the provision I have suggested.

Motion agreed to.

#### UNITED STATES CUSTOMS DUTIES ON HAY.

Mr. IRVINE, in moving for copies of all despatches or correspondence between the Government of Canada, and that of the United States, or between the Government of Canada and the British Minister at Washington, having reference to excessive Customs duties on hay grown in and exported from Canada to the United States, and the refunding of the same, said: The motion of which I have given notice relates to a subject of very considerable pecuniary interest to a number of farmers and others who have been engaged in the exportation of hay to United States markets. The rate of duty exacted by United States Customs has been 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, and very often shippers were compelled, rather than incur the danger of a penalty, to invoice the article higher than the actual first cost, so that \$2 per ton has generally been paid on New Brunswick shipments. Under the United States Statutes, the only way to bring hay within the 20 per cent. list was to consider it a manufactured article. American importers at length objected and appealed to the courts, which decided that it should not have been placed in the manufactured list and that 10 per cent. only was the proper duty. Canadian exporters now claim their rights and naturally

demand a refund, but they have been told by their Boston agents, in some cases, that no refund will be obtained except where the duty was paid under protest. It is inconceivable that the Government of the United States would take such a position as this in order to evade payment, and as it is highly important to get all the information on the subject calculated to aid the parties concerned to get their rights, I trust the Government of Canada will promptly supply all the information in their power. When the correspondence becomes public, the individuals can then better determine how to formulate their claims and press for their speedy adjustment.

**Mr. SCRIVER.** As the hon. gentleman has stated, this matter involves pecuniary interests of a considerable amount, as a very large quantity of hay has been exported, not from the county which I represent, but from the adjoining county during the period when the United States Customs authority exacted 20 per cent. duty. As the hon. member for Carleton, N. B. (Irvine) has stated, this duty was exacted upon the supposition, or upon the principle, that hay was a manufactured article; and suit was commenced by one of the importers of hay in the United States, founded on the statement that hay was not a manufactured article. The courts decided in favour of this latter contention, and upon that principle the surplus was refunded in a number of cases. It appears, however, to be a matter of Statute or a regulation of the Customs Department in the United States, that in no instance will the duties be refunded, even if it should afterwards appear from the decisions of the courts to have been improperly exacted, unless a protest was entered when the duty was paid. I suppose from statements I have seen in the newspapers, that representations have been made to the Government here, and they have been asked to interfere, so far as they could legitimately do so, for the relief of those who feel that they have been unjustly treated in this matter. I can hardly see how, with propriety, the Government could directly interfere in a matter which comes within the jurisdiction of the courts and the Government of the United States; but if such interference could properly be made, there is no doubt that, in view of the important interests involved, and the large sum of money which has been paid and which has come out of the pockets of the exporters, or, more properly speaking, out of the pockets of the producers of the hay in Canada, it would be very desirable that some representations should be made by the Government here to the authorities at Washington.

**Mr. ORTON.** I may say that the subject which has been introduced by the hon. gentleman, is one which interests me, as a large quantity of hay has been exported from my section of the country. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the subject, have described the difficulties which have occurred. It seems that those who entered a protest when the duties were paid have, by the decision of the courts of the United States, a claim to have the money refunded, but it seems rather hard that all those who have paid should not have refunded to them the amount which was improperly taken. It doubtless is a delicate question to interfere with the affairs of a foreign country, but it is just possible that some representations might be made by the Government of this country which would not seem at all improper, and by means of which justice might be done to our exporters, or as the hon. gentleman has said, more properly speaking the producers of hay in Canada, who have exported largely to the United States. I suppose that this question involves a sum of at least \$1,000,000.

**Mr. SCRIVER.** No, about \$500,000, I believe.

**Mr. BOWELL.** The statement made by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) is, so far as my recollection serves me, substantially correct; but I have no recollection of any objection being taken by the United States

**Mr. IRVINE.**

authorities at Washington to the payment of drawbacks on the duties paid on hay, because it was not paid under protest. In July or August last, a despatch was received from the British Minister at Washington—I am speaking entirely from memory—stating that all moneys which had been paid in excess of the proper amount of duty, as established by the judgment of the courts, would be repaid to the parties who had paid them, on proof being furnished of the duty having been so paid. That is my recollection of the despatch which was published at that time in all the newspapers of the country, as we considered it of such importance, that it was at once given to the press. However, the despatch will show what the conditions of repayment were when it is brought down. This is the first time I have heard—perhaps I have not watched the case so closely as my hon. friend—but though it has been brought under the notice of the Department, as well as under the notice of the Finance Minister a number of times, this is the first time I have heard that objection was taken by the United States authorities on the ground that these duties had not been paid under protest. I may be in error, but I think it will be found that the despatch from the British Minister simply states, that on proof of the duty having been paid, the amount of money improperly paid will be refunded. The Government, however, have done what they could in bringing this matter to the attention of the authorities in the United States, in order to obtain from a friendly Government, repayments of money which have been paid by subjects of this country, improperly. I am sure that, as has been stated by my hon. friend behind me. (Mr. Orton) there can be no objection to calling the attention of the United States authorities to any improper conduct, whether intentional or unintentional, on the part of the Customs officers of the United States, for I can assure the House that if any of their merchants or importers get into any trouble of that sort, representations are promptly made, and they are attended to in the manner they should be attended to. I am quite sure the United States Government will accord the same consideration to any representations of that sort which may be made to them by this Government. All the papers we have will be brought down as early as possible.

**Mr. SCRIVER.** The statement I have made as to the position taken by the United States Treasury Department in this matter, has been made so often by the parties interested, and so recently, that I can hardly believe the facts to be otherwise.

**Mr. BOWELL.** It is possible my hon. friend is correct, for I am only speaking from recollection of the despatch to which allusion has been made.

**Mr. ORTON.** Some of the exporters in my county have employed counsel in Washington, and the reply they received from them was exactly the same as my hon. friend's statement.

**Mr. CATUDAL.** (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I fully concur in all that has just been said by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), and I may say that not only has the American Government requested that the duties should be paid under protest, but that in a case in which I was myself personally interested, and in which I myself paid duties under protest, because I had not appealed from the decision of the Collector of Customs to the Secretary of the Treasury, and then sued the American Government, I was refused a remittal of a duty of 10 per cent. which I had overpaid, and such refusal was based on that principle. I think that the hon. Minister of Customs is certainly in error in saying what he has just said; at least, his memory is at fault, for I am certain that the facts stated by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) are strictly correct.

Motion agreed to.

## PORT ROWAN LIFESAVING STATION.

Mr. JACKSON, in moving for copies of correspondence in reference to a charge against the captain of the life-saving crew at Port Rowan, in the county of Norfolk, Province of Ontario, in not saving the lives of the crew of the barque *Fitzgerald* in November, 1883, said: I desire to call your attention to an article that appeared in a Buffalo paper, called the *Evening News*, charging the captain of the life-saving crew at Port Rowan, in the county of Norfolk, in the Province of Ontario, with gross negligence, in not saving the lives of the crew of the barque *Fitzgerald*, who lost their lives in attempting to make the shore in their yawl-boat on or about the 14th of November last. I have taken some pains to ascertain the facts in this matter, and in my opinion there was a mistake made, or an error in judgment, on the part of the captain; but that was not the cause of the loss of those valuable lives, nor was the captain in any way responsible for it. Port Rowan village is situated on the west side of Long Point, on the mainland, about three miles across the bay from the shore of Lake Erie. On the 14th of November last, the barque *Fitzgerald* was driven ashore about six miles in a south-westerly direction from the village of Port Rowan. In order to get to the wreck, the captain would have to travel about seven miles in a south-westerly direction, and go around the head of a marsh, and then one mile down the beach to the wreck. A farmer living on the mainland, about two miles across the marsh from the wreck, saw this vessel when she went ashore. He got into his buggy and drove to Port Rowan, a distance of five miles, and notified the captain that the vessel was ashore opposite his place. Now, here comes the mistake, in my opinion. The captain instead of taking his crew and boat, jumped into a buggy and started off to reconnoitre. The crew heard of the vessel being ashore and went to look for the captain, and found that he was gone. They asked for the key of the boat-house and found that that was gone. They then went to the Deputy Custom House Officer, who was in charge of the station, and asked him for permission to open the boat-house. He gave them permission, and the crew took out the boat, put it on the trucks, and followed the captain with all haste. Before they reached the wreck with the boat, they met the captain returning, who told them to turn about and take the boat home, as the crew had been drowned an hour or two before he had reached the wreck. These are the facts of the case, and therefore I claim that the captain was not in any way responsible for the loss of those lives. However, some of the sailors with whom I conversed in the village asserted that the captain was not competent to manage the boat in a high sea, and they therefore objected to serve under him. In support of that, I have only to state some of the captain's own acts on a former occasion. A few days prior to this vessel going ashore, the *Siberia* was wrecked near the same point, and the crew were obliged to remain on the vessel nearly the whole of one day and one night. The next morning the captain tried to rescue the crew, and in doing so he asked one of the sailors to take the helm, and he would take the stroke oar. The sailor did so, and they succeeded in rescuing the crew from the wreck. Now, I think the conduct of the captain on that occasion fully justified the sailors in refusing to serve under him as captain. Now, I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine to the inefficient state in which I found the service at that point. The captain took me to his boat-house and showed me his boat, which he says is a very good one; but there is nothing else. They have no life preservers, no life jackets, no lines or mortars of any kind—in fact nothing but the boat. They are, therefore, left without anything to protect themselves in a heavy storm. I think that the service requires a good deal of replenishing; and in

connection with this matter, I might call your attention to the fact, if there is any point on our inland waters where a permanent life-saving station is required, it is at this point. There were no less than five vessels wrecked there last fall, and eight valuable lives lost; and scarcely a fall passes without wrecks at this particular point. Therefore, if the hon. Minister could see his way to erect a permanent life-saving station there, it would be a great boon, not only to the sailors of our own country, but to American sailors. There is no doubt that those valuable lives were lost because the sailors did not know there was a life station there. Had there been a permanent life station there, they would have known it, and perhaps valuable lives would have been saved. I hope the hon. Minister will look into this matter, and see that the service is supplied in future.

Mr. McLELAN. I must thank the hon. gentleman for having stated publicly that the charge against the captain of having neglected his duty, and of having thereby allowed the lives of the crew of that vessel to be lost, is unfounded. I made enquiry into the matter at the time, and the fact is, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that the crew took to their boats before any one could have reached them, and the boat was immediately swamped. I am aware that the boat at that station does not possess all the improvements of the life-boats of the present day. I have, however, had two of the most approved life-boats made in Buffalo; and I have had specifications of those made, and they are now ready. I intend to have a number of life-boats of the most approved pattern in use manufactured as early as possible; and if the hon. gentleman's statement is correct, that that is the most exposed position in the west, we shall place one of the improved life-boats at that station.

Motion agreed to.

## GOVERNOR GENERAL'S COMMISSION, &amp;c.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved for copies: 1st. Of the Commission appointing His Excellency the Governor General of Canada; 2nd. Of the oath and oaths required by law, and under what law to be taken, and taken before assuming the duties of his office; 3rd. Of such instructions accompanying the Commission of His Excellency, as may, under the rules and regulations of the Colonial Office, be communicated to this House. He said: I desire to bring before the House the Commission of the Governor General, because the Commission does not run as it ran formerly. Since 1875 and 1876, owing to different communications to the Colonial Office, it was understood that the future Commissions would be altered, and I understand that accordingly the Commission of the late Governor General, the Marquis of Lorne, was made in conformity with some suggestions that were then put before the Colonial Office by the present leader of the Opposition. I am anxious we should be made aware as to the tenor of the changes made in former Commissions. As to the second part of the motion, the oath required to be taken, I will not say much, because I may refer to it in the motion that follows this. The third part is to have such particular instructions as may be put on the Table of the House, according to the regulations of the Colonial Office, if any of such instructions may be put before the House. During my absence the hon. member for Montmagny made a motion similar to this second part. That motion has been granted, but it is only granted as to a part of this. What I desire to know is, under what particular law the oath taken by the Governor General is taken.

Mr. AMYOT. I think this motion should be granted. It is very important for every part of Confederation that we should understand exactly what is meant by the oath of the Governor General. If that oath has been faithfully reported by the press, a part of it declares as follows:—

"I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, State or potentate, hath, or has a right, to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm, and I make this declaration upon the true faith of a Christian; so Help me God."

This is a matter of fact. If, in the Province of Quebec, by our Statutes, by our laws, by treaties, Catholics recognize the Bishop of Rome as their ecclesiastical prelate, they are entitled to do so by law, and we should not take the Governor General by surprise and make him swear to such a statement. At the same time, I declare my highest respect for the Governor General, the most popular and respected and worthy representative of Her Majesty, but it is important there should be no possible misunderstanding upon such an important point. I know there is no bad will anywhere; everybody is disposed to recognize the rights of every member of the Confederation; everybody is disposed to recognize the force and value of treaties; but it is important, that in such a matter as this, we should not shrink from any responsibility.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to granting this motion. With respect to the oath, that is fixed by Imperial Statute, and of course we cannot, except by an Address to Her Majesty, ask Her Majesty to get an Imperial Act passed altering the tenor of the oath. As to the instructions, there can be no objection to bringing them down.

Motion agreed to.

#### QUEBEC LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS' COMMISSIONS, &c.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved for copies: 1st. Of the Commission appointing the several Lieutenant-Governors of the Province of Quebec, to wit: Sir Narcisse Fortunat Belleau, René Edouard Caron, Luc Letellier de St. Just and His Honour Théodore Robitaille; 2nd. Of the oath and oaths required by law, and under what law to be taken, and taken by them before assuming the duties of such office respectively; 3rd. Of such instructions accompanying the respective Commissions, and such other instructions as may, from time to time, have been communicated to them respectively. He said: In relation to this, I do not suppose there will be any objections to giving copies of the Commissions to the several Lieutenant-Governors. The point which I think this Government may remedy, is felt to be, to a certain extent, rather difficult, and renders rather difficult the position of certain parties who do not belong to the Church of England, in taking the oath of the office of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. There have been, at any rate, four different oaths assigned in the Province of Quebec, or in the realm generally. First, there was the oath which is to be found in the Act of 1774, by which no person professing the Roman Catholic religion is required to take the oath of Elizabeth, but the following oath instead:—

"I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George, and Him will defend to the utmost of my power against all traitorous conspiracies and attempts whatsoever which shall be made against His person, Crown and dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known, to His Majesty, His heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies and attempts, which I shall know to be against Him or any of them; and all this I do swear without any equivocation, mental evasion, or secret reservation, and renouncing all pardons and dispensations, from any power and person whomsoever, to the contrary, so Help me God."

That was the form of the oath to be taken in the Province of Québec, which replaced the "I, Elizabeth." In 1829, under the Emancipation Act, another form of oath was adopted to meet the views of the Roman Catholics at the time. I need not read it, because everybody knows it. Before that, in the interval between this Act of 1829 and the "I, Elizabeth," there was another formula prescribed by the 8 and 9 William III., chapter 3. That formula again contained an oath to the same effect, but different. Now, since that again,  
M. AMYOT.

in 1858, the last formula was adopted by the Act 21 and 22 Victoria, chapter 48, and this is the oath that is now taken by the Governor General and by the Lieutenant-Governors. I do not see that the Governor General, in his present position, can have any objection whatever to taking this oath. Not belonging to the Roman Catholic faith, he cannot possibly object to it; but, in reading the oath as it is at the present time, for my part, I see the greatest difficulty in asserting what this oath asserts; first, as a matter of fact, and secondly, as a matter of opinion. In reading the last part of this oath attentively, it is a declaration of a fact which, I think, cannot be asserted here under the actual circumstances of the country. Nobody can deny that in this country, at the present moment, not only under the treaty but under the general tolerance, if there was no treaty at all, of all denominations, there is a recognition of the different denominations and different religions in this country. Therefore, upon this point alone, as a matter of fact, independently of any treaty stipulations, there is an authority somewhere, outside of the supremacy of the Crown of England, existing in this country, not only for the Roman Church, but for all other denominations also, which are not the Church of England. In reading the oath as it is, it may be properly worded otherwise. I would not make this motion if I did not feel that it is entirely within the competency of the Federal Government, if I did not feel that, in appointing the Lieutenant-Governor, this Government may make the formula of an oath which may be required under the circumstances, and which, in my opinion, ought to be nothing else than the one I cited in the first instance under the Quebec Act of 1774, or that to all intents and purposes. I do not know for what reason this old formula has not been adopted, especially for the Province of Quebec, which I understand is the only Province in which there are Roman Catholic Lieutenant-Governors.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Manitoba.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I know there was D. A. Macdonald, in the Province of Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Cauchon.

Mr. BOWELL. Sir Edward Kenny.

Mr. CASGRAIN. At any rate, I speak more particularly for the Province of Quebec, as hon. members understand. I will read the last part of the present oath.

"I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, State or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm; and I make this declaration upon the true faith of a Christian."

I contend that the formula, as it stands to-day, in my interpretation of it as a lawyer, would go so far as to say that, as a matter of fact, there is no recognition whatever of any authority, preeminence or power whatsoever exercised, say for instance, by the Bishop of Quebec, from which place I hail. As a matter of fact, as I see with my own eyes, I do not see the possibility of asserting what is contained in this oath. The oath goes on and gives a matter of opinion, and says, "or ought to have any jurisdiction."

An hon. MEMBER. That is so.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is a matter of opinion. Everybody may have a very distinct opinion of what such a person ought to have or ought not to have. There is a great conflict of opinion to day all over the world on this subject. It is a mere matter of opinion. It is not a form of oath which is simple and clear, which sets the thing plainly and clearly. Under the Supremacy Act, it was plain and clear. You could take that oath or you could not take it. But this oath is intended to be given as a relief. Under the circum-

stances in which the Province of Quebec is situated, I do not think it is a relief at all, and I think this oath may be so amended as to meet all the requirements of the position of the present Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec for instance, in taking the oath. I submit this because I know we can settle any difficulty that may exist in that formula. As to the oath taken by the Governor General, I know it must be done by reference to Great Britain, and by some *entente* with the Home Government; but this particular oath, I think, is under our control, and, I think we may safely adopt a certain formula which would meet the requirements of existing circumstances. I need not even go further than this: the wording of the Statute would go against our own legislation, the recognition of the status of the Roman clergy. They have a position of precedence here to a certain extent. They are recognized by law. They are a corporation also recognized by Statute, so that they exercise, not only the spiritual powers, but in certain cases in the Province of Quebec, they exercise to a certain extent judicial powers and temporal powers, as regards the construction, for instance, of their churches. They can order their churches to be made, or to be placed at a certain locality. They exercise there a judicial power which is granted and recognized by law, which is granted them by Statute. That, therefore, would be another reason why the wording of that oath is so general that certainly it must be with the greatest difficulty that it can be taken at the present moment by Roman Catholics in the Province of Quebec. As to the third part of the motion, it will also be desirable to have any instructions which may have accompanied the respective Commissions. It is also proper to know whether, when they leave the limits of the several Provinces assigned to the different Lieutenant-Governors, they are obliged to have these instructions from the Federal Government, as the Governors General receive when they leave the limits of the Dominion of Canada. I think, if I am not mistaken, they require to have formal authorization in order to be able to leave the limits of their respective Provinces. I suppose that also forms part of the instructions. It is not contained in the general law. I hope this motion will be carried, and when the papers are brought before the House we may move in another direction.

Mr. VALIN. Does the hon. gentleman intend to find any fault with any of the votes given by the Lieutenant-Governors? Perhaps the hon. gentleman for l'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) desires to find some error in the nomination of the Governors. I think there was an error committed at one time, and the hon. member ought to have made his motion then.

Mr. HESSON. In view of the circumstances this evening, I think my hon. friend ought to apologize for having wasted, to some extent, the time of the House in this matter, in detaining you, Mr. Speaker, and so many other hon. gentlemen here. I deem this one the least important of all the motions that have been made. If my recollection serves me at all, we have had the services of some very able Governors General and Lieutenant-Governors, during the past, in this country. All discharged their duties with equal conscientiousness and fidelity to the Crown, and they have all found it possible to take that oath. But, Sir, as it is just possible that the country may lose the services of the hon. gentleman when it is his turn to be appointed Lieutenant-Governor, because he cannot take that oath, because he may find it too severe for him to take, it might be worth while to have it changed in order to suit his convenience.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, there can be no objection to sending down copies of the Commissions to the several Lieutenant-Governors. They are all of similar tenor, I presume. Then, as regards the oath required by law. As my hon. friend has just said, the oath as now administered has not been found very difficult in the Province of

Quebec, because all the Lieutenant-Governors since Confederation have been very good Catholics, and they have found no difficulty in taking the oath. Still, if there is any real, or any semblance of an objection, I do not see why it should not be removed. I presume the oath has been framed for Lieutenant-Governors since Confederation on the models of the oaths taken by Governors before Confederation. The practice, I presume, has not been changed. Speaking now from first impression, and without looking into the matter at all, I do not see why the oath may not be simply for the performance of duty, and an oath of allegiance—an oath stating that the party will perform the duty of his office during his incumbency, and the usual oath of allegiance. That is my present impression. There is just this thing that occurs to me. The Governor-General is pledged to take the oath as representative of the Sovereign; Lieutenant-Governors are supposed to be representatives immediately of the Governor General, and immediately of the Sovereign, and it might be held by some legal minds that the same necessity which governs the oath of the Governor General might govern the oath of the Lieutenant-Governor. That is a question that might arise; that is to be looked into. But I scarcely think that it ought to prevail if it were thought of any importance to make it a simple oath for the performance of duty and an oath of allegiance. I know that not very long ago it was felt in some quarters that the oath ought not to be asked from Roman Catholics. I know that was held in some influential quarters, and of course, that feeling ought to be consulted. The Minister of Justice and myself will take the opportunity of considering the subject, and of seeing whether that objection—if it be an objection, and I think it is, to some extent, an objection—could be removed. We will take occasion to look into it.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Statement of dates at which:—

1. West	$\frac{1}{2}$	Section 31,	Township 5,	Range 14 West,
East	$\frac{1}{2}$	"	31	" 5 " 14 "
North	$\frac{1}{2}$	"	23	" 5 " 14 "
2. South	$\frac{1}{2}$	"	25	" 5 " 13 "
North	$\frac{1}{2}$	"	25	" 5 " 13 "

were purchased, and the names of the purchasers and the price of each section at the time of purchase.—(Mr. Livingstone.)

Statement of the rebates made in respect of parcels (1) and of parcels (2), with copies of all correspondence on the subject of the sales, purchase money and rebates, and statement of the reasons why rebates were granted in some cases, and refused in others.—(Mr. Livingstone.)

Copy of a memorial to His Excellency in Council, signed by Frank Moberly and W. A. McCallum, on behalf of the inhabitants of Neebing, praying for relief with reference to their bonuses to the Prince Arthur's Landing and Kaministiquia Railway Company.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all accounts and vouchers, including transport requisitions, rendered by the Canadian Express Company to the Department of Militia and Defence, for transport during the months of May, June, July, August and September, of 1883.—(Mr. Somerville, Brant.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 10:03 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 26th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## ADJOURNMENT FOR ASHWEDNESDAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when this House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Thursday next at three o'clock, in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

## BOTHWELL CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada a certified copy of the judgment of the said Court in the election appeal, relating to the electoral district of Bothwell, in which appeal John Joseph Hawkins, Esq., was appellant, and William Thomas Smith and Robert Perry Wright were respondents, by which judgment the Hon. David Mills is declared to be the duly elected member to represent the said electoral district.

## AGRICULTURAL BANKING BILL.

Mr. ORTON introduced Bill (No. 105) to provide banking and loaning facilities for those engaged in agricultural pursuits.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to enquire, Mr. Speaker, whether this is in order; whether this should be introduced by Bill, or should not be initiated in Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, I cannot tell what the nature of the Bill is, but, if it relates to banks and trade, it will have to originate in Committee, but the hon. member, in introducing his Bill in this way, takes his risk that it may be stopped at a subsequent stage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the Bill is to incorporate a bank, it need not be introduced in Committee, but, if it is a general Bill, affecting trade and commerce, of course it must be.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not a Bill to incorporate a bank, for the hon. gentleman introduced it as a public Bill. I am not objecting to his procedure, but I only suggest that he may find himself at a subsequent stage in a position where he will not be able to get on at all, and, therefore, he should consider at this stage whether the Bill, which none of us has seen, is not one which must originate in Committee of the Whole.

Bill read the first time.

## FACTORIES BILL.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 106) to define certain offences against persons employed in factories.

Mr. BLAKE. The introduction of this Bill has been delayed for a long time. It was announced that it was to be the Bill, as I understood, which was brought forward last Session, with certain amendments which were printed and distributed to members before the close of the Session. I do not know whether this Bill, as now introduced, is in the condition of the Bill we received at a late stage of last Session, or whether further amendments have been introduced. If the latter is the case, the hon. gentleman might briefly explain what those amendments are. Furthermore, I have called attention, by motion, in the ordinary way, to the existence of some representations on the subject of the Bill which have not been brought down,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

and I observe, by the ordinary sources of information, that further representations have since been made upon the subject. I think it is expedient that these should be brought down early, so that we may see what those on both sides, whether manufacturers or employés, think in reference to it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Bill was delayed for two reasons. First, we understood that representations were to be made to the Government by the body referred to by the hon. member. Those representations were made and the Government took them into consideration before deciding upon the Bill finally. Then the Bill was delayed until the papers could be brought down. The papers have been laid before the House, or will be to-day, and they included the suggestions made by this organization. There is very little change in the Bill. I think the only change is one reducing the hours, for which children of 12 or 14 years of age can be employed in a week.

Bill read the first time.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that all the stages of the Bill founded on the Resolutions moved by Sir Charles Tupper respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway shall have precedence every day, after Routine Proceedings, until the House otherwise orders.

Mr. BLAKE. We are now arrived at the second stage of the proceedings of the hon. gentleman's proposed legislation on this subject. I have, until we are all wearied of it, reiterated demands for information which have not been complied with, and now it is proposed to press this measure on from day to day without supplying this information, or allowing the time, when it is supplied, which I believe to be essential to a sound decision. It is proposed to-day to proceed even more rigorously than by the hon. gentleman's former Resolution, for we are now not even to have an opportunity of making enquiries, of asking questions on those points with reference to which we would much prefer to have information otherwise. Even that opportunity is to be taken from us, and the Bill is to be pressed on without any further information. I do not doubt that the hon. gentleman will be sustained, but I desire to take the sense of the House upon this motion, and I therefore call for the yeas and nays upon it.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:  
Messieurs.

Allison (Hants),	Dupont,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Farrow,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Méthot,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Foster,	Moffat,
Beaty,	Fréchette,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Gagné,	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Orton,
Benson,	Girouard,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essx),
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bolduc,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Ross,
Bowell,	Hay,	Royal,
Brecken,	Hesson,	Scott,
Burns,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hilliard,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Spruile,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Carling,	Ives,	Tasé,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Kaubach,	Temple,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tilley,
Costigan,	Kinney,	Tupper (Pictou),
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Tyrwhitt,
Coursol,	Labrosse,	Valin,

Curran, Outhbert, Daly, Dacost, Dawson, Desaulniers, Desjardins, Dickinson, Dodd, Dundas,	Landry (Kent), Langevin, Lesage, Macdonald (Sir John), Macdonald (Cape Breton), Mackintosh, McMillan (Vaudreuil), McCallum, McDongald, McGreery,	Wallace (Albert), Wallace (York), White (Cardwell), Wigle, Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland), Woodworth, Wright.—112.
--	---	---

## NAYS:

## Messieurs.

Allen, Allison (Lennox), Armstrong, Auger, Blake, Burpee (Sunbury), Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Middlesex), Campbell (Renfrew), Casey, Catudal, Charlton, Cockburn, Cook, Fleming, Forbes,	Gillmor, Gunn, Harley, Holton, Innes, Irvine, Jackson, King, Kira, Lister, Mackenzie, McCraney, McIntyre, McIsaac, McMullen, Mulock,	Paterson (Brant), Platt, Ray, Rinfret, Robertson (Shelburne), Scriver, Somerville (Brant), Somerville (Bruce), Springer, Sutherland (Oxford), Trow, Vail, Watson, Wilson, and Yeo.—47.
---	---	--

## MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to know if the right hon. gentleman has any explanations to give with reference to the resignation and withdrawal of the resignation of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have twice answered that, and I do not intend to answer it again.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not answered it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have.

Mr. BLAKE. He answered me yesterday by giving certain dates, which he calls particulars, in reference to this matter. On a former occasion the hon. gentleman volunteered some statement with reference to it, but he made no explanation of the causes of the resignation of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. He did not state what the cause of that resignation was, nor did he state the circumstances under which that cause, whatever it was, had been removed. The hon. gentleman has given us no information on both those points, which are, however, of great public interest. Therefore, I cannot agree with the statement that he has answered the usual demand in a manner that the circumstances require.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman and I cannot agree upon that point. I do not know whether he heard my answer the other night—my statement. I took occasion to state—although I said I would not answer it again, I will repeat what I said—I stated that my hon. friend and colleague had tendered his resignation for matters personal to himself, but matters not affecting the general policy of the Government, and which had not the most remote connection with the measure in the hands of my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways; that I refused to present the resignation to His Excellency for his acceptance; that my hon. friend withdrew his resignation for reasons which I have given, and which are of no interest to anybody in the world, and can have no political significance, and can be of no constitutional significance. My hon. friend withdrew his resignation. I was very glad of it, and I hope he may long remain my colleague.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman still refuses to give us the reason of the resignation. He said, on a former occasion, that there had been an explanation between him and the hon. gentleman, and after that explanation it was that the withdrawal took place. The hon. gentleman says that

the resignation had nothing whatever to do, either with the general policy of the Government or with the particular question, which was then, and has been before this House ever since the Session commenced. It was, however, some matter or other in respect of which an explanation of the First Minister was essential to remove the difficulty, whatever it was, and it was consequent upon that explanation of the First Minister that the hon. gentleman withdrew his resignation, and remained a member of the Government. We are to have no explanation therefore, of the conduct of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman left his office, left his seat here, was ostentatiously, or otherwise, in the back benches conducting his correspondence, carrying on his business, just under the clock. A critical moment arrived in the discussions which had been engaging our attention, and the hon. gentleman announced his intention to speak before the division upon the question that was then before us—the division upon the motion to go into Committee. The First Minister begged him to postpone his remarks until concurrence. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue—at that time, I presume, only holding office until his successor was appointed, and more properly to be called the member for Victoria (N. B.)—declined; he declined to comply with the request of the First Minister; he declared his desire not to speak at that moment for personal reasons, that he was not in a fit condition to speak; but he declared that, if necessary, he would speak, and upon that the First Minister, who had declared that he would take the division that night, yielded to his late colleague—as he was at that time—he yielded to the hon. gentleman whose position was so ambiguous, who insisted that this was a very important question upon which his sentiments must be delivered before that vote was taken—I say he yielded to his request, and the debate was adjourned upon the motion of the hon. member. On the following day the hon. member intimated once again that he would not make his speech on account of the state of his voice; he felt that he could not deliver his sentiments with justice to himself in the condition of his voice at that time, and, therefore, he wished that these remarks which were to be delivered before the House came to its decision on the motion to go into Committee, should be postponed until concurrence. Well, concurrence came, and the hon. gentleman was silent. It is true, he spoke in a way which the Minister of Railways does not speak—he spoke by his vote, but by his voice he spake not, and he spoke by his vote in a manner which certainly we had no reason to expect, after the statement of the hon. gentleman that he must speak before this question was disposed of, as it was a very important question and was being pressed too fast. As the right hon. gentleman will not tell us what the cause of the resignation was we are left to conjecture.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN BILL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 101) to amend the Act intituled: An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. It is by no means my intention—

Mr. MITCHELL. Carried.

Mr. BLAKE. I know how eager my hon. friend from Northumberland is that this measure should be carried, but I hope he will permit me to intercept its passage for a few moments. It is not my intention to enter into many of the points of the long discussions which have engaged our attention; but there are a few points which, notwithstanding the very imperfect state of the information before us, it may be convenient should be noticed and restated in the light of the information which we have to-day. In the first place I observe that this measure of the hon. gentleman contradicts very largely his statement that it was not pro-

posed in any respect whatever to alter the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. In contradiction of that statement the 11th clause reads thus :

"So much of the act and contract hereinabove cited and referred to as is inconsistent with the provisions of this Act is hereby repealed."

This, is indeed, rather an awkward phrase—to talk of repealing a contract—and I suppose the hon. gentleman is under the impression that the contract was made the law of the land by a former Act of Parliament, and, therefore, he uses this phrase of repealing the contract. But the clause is either useless and unnecessary so far as the contract is concerned, or it contradicts his argument; because, either the contract is altered or it is not. If it is not altered, it is unnecessary to declare that any part of it is repealed or altered; if it is altered, the hon. gentleman's arguments that he was not altering the contract falls to the ground. Now, Sir, with that criticism only upon the Bill before us at this stage—because I quite recognize the propriety of dealing with the details of this Bill at a later stage—I proceed simply to state my view of some of the figures which have been gathered in the course of the discussion, and in the briefest manner to indicate their pertinence upon what, I think, ought to be the decision of the House. I want, then, to restate my view of the cost of construction of the contracted line, in the light of the figures which the hon. gentleman from time to time has given us. I divide the contracted line into three sections, which seem to me to be most convenient for the understanding of that point. On the section from Callander to Port Arthur, there has been spent, according to the first statement of the hon. Minister, \$5,550,000; on work done but not yet paid for on that part, \$3,000,000, making a total of work done of \$8,550,000; and the hon. gentleman's estimate to complete it is \$13,250,000; making a total of the cost from Callander to Port Arthur of \$21,800,000. From Winnipeg to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, his estimate to complete it is \$17,500,000; and from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, the hon. gentleman estimates the cost to complete, at \$12,000,000, while the manager of the Railway Company has estimated it at \$10,100,000. These three sets of figures give us a total of the cost of the contracted line, \$51,300,000, according to the Minister of Railways, and \$50,000,000, according to the manager of the road. For constructing this work, costing this \$50,000,000 or \$51,000,000, the Company is to receive Government subsidy, \$25,000,000; Government sections, \$28,000,000; Government lands, town sites, and bonuses already received in cash, \$9,000,000, or a total of \$62,000,000. The value of the 21,250,000 acres of choice land yet unsold at \$2.36 per acre, the price already received for that sold, is \$51,300,000, and the cost of the Government surveys, &c., which fall into the work as I have always contended, \$5,000,000, making a total of \$118,300,000, or an excess, I do not say in value, but an excess in cost, of \$67,000,000 or \$68,000,000 beyond the expenditure which is to be made by the Company itself. To that it is now proposed to add as a further benefit to the Company a guarantee of which the present value is \$7,400,000 and a loan of \$22,500,000. These statements indicate in the clearest way in which it is possible to deduce a proposition that the loan is not needed for the contracted work, and that either incapacity or outside operations or both, have proved the trouble which has necessitated this application. They indicate something more. The cash assets received from the public, and to be received, are \$25,000,000 of subsidy, \$9,000,000 of lands, and \$22,500,000 of a loan, making \$56,500,000 received and to be received from public resources, exclusive of what may be obtained from future land sales. The Government, therefore, is to

Mr. BLAKE.

provide every shilling to construct the contracted line, because I have shown that the contracted line has cost \$50,000,000 or \$51,000,000, while I have shown that the Government cash and proceeds of land already received amount to \$56,500,000, so that there is an excess of \$5,000,000 odd or \$6,000,000 odd, according as you take the estimate of the manager of the railway or the Government estimate of the cost of the completed work, which excess is equal to the equipment for the contracted line. Under these calculations we obtain this result: that the cash received and to be received, exclusive of future land sales, is enough to build the whole contracted line and hand it over, properly equipped, into the hands of the Company, besides 21,000,000 acres of land and Government work to the value of \$28,000,000, independent of surveys. That result would be a very extraordinary one if it stood alone; but we could measure it, if that was all, what the public loss was to be. There is, however, an additional difficulty, for besides providing the whole funds to complete and equip the contracted line, and besides providing as much more, or more than as much more, in assets as a free gift, a great capital stock has been created, a great capital stock mostly water, and thus charges have been created in favour of individuals on that road, the whole cost of which is provided and more than provided by the public money. So that besides building the railway and giving those handsome bonuses, we have arranged by the powers we have given and the application of those powers for a mortgage on the North-West and the Dominion of Canada in favour of the Company in respect of this inflated capital stock in the future. What does that mean? If I rightly read the statement of the Company in one of their organs, the other day, they state that they expect the production of wheat in the North-West to be 27 bushels to the acre. Five cents a bushel on the charge upon the carriage of that grain in excess of what a fair rate would be, in excess of a fair cost of transport and a fair profit, when you remember that the capital is provided by the public, and not by the Company—I say, 5 cents per bushel excess would be equivalent to \$1.35 per acre rent. But that is not all. Because it is not only on the outgoing wheat that the extra rate is to be charged, but on the incoming goods which are to be purchased by the wheat of the farmers, and those goods are higher in point of value, and higher rates proportionately are well known to be exacted by railway companies on such goods. So that practically the rent charge upon the wheat land of the farmer in the North-West, assuming an extra charge of 5 cents per bushel being required in order to meet the system of financing and construction adopted, instead of being only \$1.35 per acre, will be more than double that rate, being in fact from \$3 to \$3.50 per acre. The practical result then is, that the road is built by the public and is to be charged for as if constructed at a very expensive rate by a private company. But so far I have assumed the figures of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I want to point out that the expenditure itself appears to be very much inflated; and here I come to considerations in respect of which, as I have repeatedly pointed out, further information is necessary in order that we may reach an absolute conclusion. That further information is so essential with respect to the eastern section, that I do not intend to complicate the discussion at this stage with arguments in the absence of that information. But the central and western sections are, for certain reasons, in a somewhat different position, and I wish to restate certain figures and my conclusions from those figures with respect to those sections. The hon. gentleman has given the House as the expenditure to complete the central and western sections, from Winnipeg to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, \$17,500,000. How is that divided? I have asked for the information, by motion, by private enquiry, by question,

and I have asked across the floor, but I have been unable, so far, to obtain a statement as to how it is divided, and therefore, to some extent I have to deal in conjecture. What shall be the basis of my conjecture? I wish to reach a conclusion, as to how that amount of \$17,500,000 is divided between those two sections; first, 615 miles from Winnipeg to a point 45 miles east of the Saskatchewan, where the construction company's contract commenced; and second, the line from that point to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, which is as far as the construction company's contract extended. My information is derived from the return of the railway company as to the expenditures on the construction company's contract, which gives three different items specifically: the western section, exceeding \$2,500,000, and two general items, one, materials and supplies, \$1,790,000, and another, transportation, \$1,380,000, making an aggregate, for the general items, of \$3,170,000, as to which we have no information as to how much applies to the western, and how much to the Lake Superior and Nipissing, or eastern division. I conjecture that by far the larger portion of the transportation charges applies to the western division; I conjecture that by far the larger portion of materials and supplies, by all odds, if not the whole of them, applies to the eastern section; and I assume, in the absence of that information for which I have called so often, and which has been, up to this time, denied, that out of the aggregate of \$3,170,000 no less than \$2,500,000 is to be applied to the western section. Add that to the \$2,500,000 specifically applied, according to the Company's return, and you get as the true cost of the line from the point 45 miles east of the Saskatchewan to the summit of the Rockies, \$5,000,000 for 345 miles of railway. If you deduct that sum of \$5,000,000 from the total of \$17,500,000, you will find \$12,500,000 as the cost of 615 miles running west from Winnipeg. Now, Sir, we have two elements, one positive, and the other, to some extent, conjectural, from which we may draw some inferences as to what the fair cost of the prairie section would be. The first, as I said, is positive. The hon. gentleman has given as the cost of 169 miles of branches in the North-West, \$1,830,000, or \$10,700 a mile for branches constructed by this company in the prairie section. Upon the assumption which I have made as to the cost of the 345 miles to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, that portion would cost only \$14,500 a mile. Now, this latter section is an expensive section. It is a section which embraces the heavy bridge over the Saskatchewan River, which the newspapers tell us will cost about \$500,000. It embraces some heavy rock work—some pretty heavy mountain work. This section also embraces by far the largest and most expensive part of the transportation charges; there is the geographical position, the stuff has to be carried further, and, therefore, it is a very expensive section in this sense. Yet we cannot find, under our present dearth of information, ground for believing that it costs more than \$14,500 per mile. Now, if the branches in the prairie cost \$10,700 per mile, and if the heavier and more expensive work on the 345 miles from the Rockies to the Summit, cost \$14,500 per mile, what shall we say is a fair charge for the 615 miles from Winnipeg to the point already indicated? I suppose about \$12,000 per mile would be deemed, under such circumstances, a fair charge for the intermediate part. Now that would give for the 615 miles \$7,380,000; but, so far as we can learn in the present defective state of the information, it has cost \$12,500,000; or \$20,300 per mile—an excess of \$3,300 per mile, or an excess of \$5,120,000 over what I assumed to be a fair aggregate price. If you say \$14,000 per mile, there would still be an excess of \$4,000,000 on that central section. Now, Sir, these or similar figures have, from time to time, been given on this side of the House, in the course of this debate, and hon.

gentlemen opposite have been challenged to give us the information which would correct our error, if there be an error, to point out to us where we were wrong, and to show what the facts were, and if the facts be such, or substantially such, as I have stated, to give the explanations which those facts imperatively demand. But we have had no contradiction, no explanation, no information, no argument, upon this point. What inferences are we to draw from the absence of this information; from the fact that the contracts are refused to us, from the fact that we cannot get the contracts for the construction of this part of the work; that we are told that they are only contracts for part of the work, that Langdon, Sheppard & Co. contracted only for sub-grading, that they did not contract to buy steel rails and put them on, and, therefore, that we are not to hear what they were paid. We get the contract of Langdon, Sheppard & Co., with the construction company, but we do not get the earlier contracts on the central section. Now, Sir, what inferences are we to draw when these facts are brought before the House for many days, and remain up to this moment unchallenged; when we point out that to a considerable extent we are acting upon inference and conjecture; when we point out how that inference and conjecture may be displaced if erroneous; when we show that it is the easiest thing in the world to get us full information on these subjects? What inferences are we to draw from the pressure to have this Bill read and to get it through all its stages under these circumstances? Why we must draw this inference and this only: that work has been done, and transactions accomplished with reference to the construction of this road, which will not bear investigation; that there has either been over expenditure of an enormous character—incomprehensible, unless speed at all cost was the object, or that the Company has been, by its contractors or others, defrauded in some monstrous way. One thing or the other, or both combined, would be alone adequate to produce the results we have indicated, if those results stand. And what I complain of is, that the results are allowed to stand, that the information, the explanation, the argument which would throw light on these subjects, in spite of all requests for information, is not forthcoming, and that we are left to these disagreeable inferences besides. Now, Sir, we are about to lend this Company \$22,500,000 more money; we are to enlarge the sphere of their operations, to enable them to proceed with great activity, the hon. gentleman says, to enable them to proceed with great activity in the building of branch lines as well. I maintain that it is of the last consequence before we give those powers, that, now that we perceive that under the guise of a private company it is this corporation which is to administer the public funds, we should have a full, thorough and perfect account of the stewardship of that Company; and that if transactions which, it will be admitted I think by everybody, demand explanation, remain unexplained, we ought not, if we are to discharge our duty conscientiously, to go further and to give added power which may be abused as we are obliged to infer at this moment, and under these circumstances, the powers already granted have been abused. Now, Sir, I wish to take one other point, and to refer partially to the operations with the contracting company. I omit for the same reason which I gave before—namely, that the condition of the operations and the condition of the figures render a statement of the transactions as to the eastern section more complicated and confused, though I believe it is easy to draw extraordinary conclusions from that statement and from those figures, but I throw it to one side for a moment, and I deal exclusively with the western section. For the western section the price to be given to the construction company was \$17,880,000 in cash, and \$25,000,000 in stock of the Company. I have already indicated that the cost to the summit of the Rockies, as nearly as I can make out in the absence of

information, was \$5,000,000. The manager has publicly stated that the cost to complete would be \$10,100,000, which would make the aggregate cost of that section, \$15,100,000. The Government declares that it will cost \$12,000,000 to complete, which would be an addition of \$1,900,000, and would make the aggregate cost to complete \$17,000,000. There is the statement as we have it. The Company says \$15,100,000 is the cost from the 345 miles east of the Rockies to Kamloops, and the Government says \$17,000,000 is the cost. Of course, in each case, the legitimate profits of the contractors are included. Now, Sir, you find, that according to the statement of the manager, the contracting company's contract gave \$2,880,000 more cash than the fair cost of the section, and \$25,000,000 of the stock of the Company thrown in—that, according to the Government statement, the contracting company's contract gave \$980,000 more cash than the fair cost of the work, and \$25,000,000 of stock thrown in also. It is quite clear, therefore, that this contract was not based upon commercial principles. It is just such a contract as would be made if both the parties to it were on the same side. If a man were contracting with himself, and some one else was to pay the piper, then such a contract would be made, but not otherwise; and this is just what was the condition of this case. It was the condition of this case that a *Credit Mobilier* had been formed—that a contracting company had been formed to the extent of more than four-fifths of the stockholders of the Company itself, and that the Company was contracting with itself to build this section, and to build it at a price and under circumstances wholly indefensible. Now, what was the object of absorbing into the western section \$25,000,000 of the common stock, and into the eastern section \$20,000,000 of the common stock, being all the stock that was to remain unissued—\$45,000,000? The object was that the shareholders might obtain, without paying for it, a further large proportion of the capital stock which should form a mortgage on the North-West and the Dominion, to be paid off by the tolls on this railway later on. That was the object, and that has been the result; for a contract, made as this was, in which the stock was not rated at so much on the dollar, but in which the price paid was so much money and so much stock, would be treated for that purpose as if the stock was dollar for dollar, representing the cost of the road according to the tolls that would have to be paid upon it. The result on the western section of the line would be that the power of the Company to insist on the non-interference of Parliament and of the Government to diminish the tolls, would have arisen to the extent of \$2,500,000 a year, irrespective of the \$25,000,000 to be issued to the contracting company for this western section, without one dollar of valuable consideration having gone into the road, or having been paid for it by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. This may not be so. It may be that this contract was a wholly reasonable one, that it represents the real value of the work; but if it be so, what are we to say of the estimates of the manager of the Company and of the engineer of the Government as to the real cost of the work? I have been simply contrasting the contract of the contracting company with the estimates of the Government, those estimates are either right or wrong. If right, the results which I have indicated follow; if wrong, where are we to-day with reference to our loan of \$22,500,000, and with reference to the calculations that have been made as to the repayment of that money? But, Sir, that was not all. It was said by the Company in their explanations, that they themselves carried on those works which the contracting company agreed to carry on—that they did the work through their own manager, and made the arrangements through sub-contractors, and paid the value of the work—that that was a temporary arrangement made with the contracting company under

Mr. BLAKE.

which the work proceeded; and thus it happened that they paid for the supplies and for the work done directly to those who were doing the work. But if this was so, how does it happen that \$500,000 is paid directly to the contracting company, which turns out to be still in the contracting company's hands, and which is now spoken of as an asset of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—a debt due to it from the contracting company? The contracting company, it is said, did nothing—did not let the contracts and did not do the work; but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company supervised it through their own officers, and paid for it directly; but \$600,000, for some purpose unstated, at some time ungiven, on some conditions unknown, was handed over to this contracting company, and remains in their hands. Now, when we remember that more than four-fifths of that contracting company are the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves, you will see that these applicants to us for further assistance have, to the extent of \$450,000 or \$500,000 in this single transaction, taken the moneys of the Company and put them into their own pockets, and they claim indulgence and assistance from us, because they will not pay those moneys back to us. There is the situation. Now, I have asked for information about that—when, why, for what purpose and on what conditions \$600,000 was paid to the contracting company, and for what reason it has not been repaid; and no information is vouchsafed. And yet we are told that we are to pass a Bill giving further large powers to this Company, which does not deign to give us information as to those matters which surely are of a character that deserve, nay, demand explanation. Well, Sir, one further bit of information has been elicited from the hon. gentleman's papers. We were told that it was in the interest of the Government that no longer should that unjust method of payment be continued which involved a fixed mileage payment, and that it was necessary to resort to sounder business principles, and to adjust the payment to the relative values of the different kinds of work done—otherwise the Government might be without the necessary funds to cause the Company to complete the heavy section. Well, we find where they have stopped, where they are blocked, where they are at. They are at the 95 mile section, the heavy section on the eastern part, which the manager of the Company estimates will cost \$7,400,000 or about \$78,000 a mile; and it is because they are there and they already anticipate and forestall the excess of payments on the lighter sections, that we are now called on to draw from the public resources a greater amount, in order that they may go on accordingly to the new and confessedly heavy section. Under these circumstances, I do not intend to enter into a vast number of other topics which have been discussed more or less fully, and in respect to which I believe our position remains as strong as it was on the first day. I do not want to complicate the discussion by reverting to them at present. Nor do I go into those minuter details on which at a subsequent stage I shall offer an observation or two and an amendment or two; but I have pointed out what I think are the reasons why this House, even now, should pause and decline to assent to the second reading of this Bill, because of the information we have, and because of the information we have not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a personal explanation in reference to some remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. When the question was put from the Chair as to whether the Bill should be read the second time, I assented, as it is a common practice for hon. gentlemen, as they may favour a Bill or object to it, to say "carried, carried," or "lost, lost." The hon. gentleman chose to select me out, and to use these words: "I know why the hon. member for Northumberland is so anxious to have the Bill passed —"

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. These are the very words the hon. gentleman used; I took them down at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. I certainly did not say that, for I have for a long time wondered very much why the hon. gentleman has been so anxious, and I never have been able to learn. What I said was that I knew very well that the hon. gentleman was anxious that the Bill should pass.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like very much if the hon. gentleman will state definitely what he meant. I, too, have wondered very much at the opposition of the hon. gentleman to this measure, and what motives have inspired him. It would be wrong for me to impute any motives to him; but if he will explain what he meant by that remark, I will thank him very much. If the hon. gentleman has any desire to attack my motives or the principles that inspired me in the course I have taken in reference to this Bill, I challenge him before this House to state them now.

Mr. BLAKE. I have already said that it has been a matter of great curiosity to me to know why the hon. gentleman was so anxious, and that being the case it is impossible I should say I knew his motives, for I do not, nor, as far as I know, does anybody else. I did say, when the hon. gentleman called out very loudly, "carried," as I was in the act of rising, without waiting to ascertain whether it was proposed to indicate from this side of the House any suggestion with reference to the measure proposed by the Government, without giving me the ordinary opportunity of rising to indicate what my course would be, the hon. gentleman cried, "carried," "carried"—I thought in that he did exhibit great anxiety that the Bill should be carried. I said that I saw and knew he was very anxious, but I thought he should give me a little opportunity of stating my views, and not allow himself to be carried away by his anxiety.

Mr. MITCHELL. I had no objection to the hon. gentleman stating his views. I desired to hear them, for I, too, had some anxiety to know, watching the course of the hon. gentleman in relation to this Bill, what were the motives that inspired him in relation to it. I must confess, when I took up the *Debates* the other day and saw the discussion that had arisen from the remark of the hon. member for King's as to the fact that Mr. Tyler, President of the Grand Trunk Railway, had stated—

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not impute any motives.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not going to.

Mr. SPEAKER. You spoke of the motives.

Mr. MITCHELL. I said if I was allowed to impute motives, but I am not going to impute motives. I said if I had any desire to find out the cause which lay behind this antagonism, to a measure which the country desires, and which prompts this protracted opposition, this fighting it stage after stage, asking, even at this remote time after a discussion of three weeks, for further delay, and endeavouring to make capital out of these Resolutions by placing them on the Table of the House, and, for aught I know, when he goes to the country he will make them the subject of platform attacks and speeches against the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have no motive in anything I have done except a desire to serve my country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen opposite may greet this with derisive cheers, but I challenge any hon. member in this House, or anyone in the whole country, to state the contrary. I am not beholden to the Canadian Pacific Railway; I never was counsel to the Canadian Pacific Railway, as some other hon. gentlemen have been to the Grand Trunk Railway, and if I have supported this measure I have

done so because the country requires the construction of that railway, because the men who have undertaken its construction are men who can claim from this country the credit of having undertaken an enterprise which few men of their high standing and their large means would have risked their standing and means in undertaking. I feel that the hon. gentleman unjustly assailed myself, who have said scarcely anything about this Bill—nothing except when the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon) chose, the other night, to propose a Resolution which was liable to mislead some of my fellow members from the Maritime Provinces in reference to the winter port, I felt called on to make a five minute speech. Does the hon. gentleman propose to muzzle me? Does he think that because of his great talents and assumption and perhaps that assurance for which he is rather celebrated, he can throw out a sneer against me and have it spread broadcast through the country? I challenge him and those who say derisively "hear, hear," to point out one statement that bears out the hon. gentleman's reflection on the motives which induced me to support this Bill. I challenge them to do so.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman has chosen, under the guise of not imputing motives, to impute them again, although it is extremely painful—

Mr. MITCHELL. Better learn manners yourself.

Mr. BLAKE—to me to say anything about personal matters, I will say that everybody knows, were I to pursue my profession, I could be earning to-day \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year, and I receive from it in consequence of my political duties the sum of \$2,500.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was not my intention to trouble the House with any further remarks, as I felt it would be better to deal in Committee, with any observations and criticisms on the measure at present. I will, however, make a few remarks on some points which the hon. gentleman has raised in the observations he addressed to the House. He says that in the first instance I had stated there would be no alterations, and that it was not proposed to make any alterations in the original contract. Having explained very fully to the House, in the course of my remarks when introducing the Resolutions, the points in which the text of the Resolutions differed with the text of the contract, I think it is rather futile criticism for the hon. gentleman to indulge in, to draw the attention of the House to the fact, that of course there are modifications, not substantial, in the contract. The contract, however, in all its vital details, remains precisely as it was. The amount of work to be performed by the Company is the same; the amount of subsidy for the work performed is the same. There is no substantial alterations proposed to be made. The alterations are rather verbal than otherwise. The last point to which the hon. gentleman objected refers to one of these alterations, and that is as to the mode of payment. The hon. gentleman has not undertaken to say that the proposal contained in the Resolutions and the modifications of the contract as to the mode in which the payments are to be made—from being a mileage subsidy to being a subsidy according to the work performed and to the relation it bears to the whole contract—the hon. gentleman has not undertaken to say that this proposal is not a practicable and perfectly just method of applying the public money proposed to be put into the work as the work proceeds; and not having questioned that, it is not necessary for me to say further than to say that in the early part of the work, the payment according to mileage subsidy, was a convenient and practicable and accurate mode of adjusting the payment of the work done, whereas at the present stage of the work, it would not be found a practicable or just mode, as regards either the Government or the Company. I do not intend to say much about the hon. gentleman's demand for further

information. All I can say is this, that the hon. gentleman has placed before the House a vast number of demands for information, and in every case I have stated to the officers of my Department that every particle of information the hon. gentleman has asked for and which it is in the power of the Government to lay on the Table of the House should be prepared and laid on the Table as promptly as possible. With reference to the information asked for which had relation to matters not in the possession of the Government, I have requested that these motions made by the hon. gentleman should be immediately communicated to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that they should be informed that it was my desire that as promptly as possible all the information asked for should be furnished. I will say more, that after a very long parliamentary experience, I have never, on any occasion, seen a larger amount of information laid before the House in regard to any question under consideration by the House. I have never, either in this House or any other Legislature, where I have had the honour of sitting, found in any single instance information more full, more exhaustive or more complete, than has been submitted on the present occasion. I am in the judgment of this House when I ask whether this House has not been furnished, not only with full information, but whether the hon. gentleman himself, with all his ability, is able to show a single point upon which he can say that, for a full, a fair and candid consideration and judgment of this question by the House, it is necessary to have one particle of information that is not before the House. I say there is not, Sir, and I say it boldly and unhesitatingly. I say that the hon. gentleman cannot show, I say that no hon. member of this House can show, can put his finger upon one particle of information that has been sought from the Government, that is necessary to the consideration of the question that is not now on the Table of the House, and in the possession of hon. members. It is impossible to comply with the marvellous ingenuity of the hon. gentleman in devising and framing motions for information. He asks you what is the cost of a certain section of the road, and very properly asks. He asks what money has been expended between Callander and Port Arthur; we give him the information. And then he wants to know how much of that particular money has been applied to some particular half mile of that 550 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman has exactly come down to half a mile, but I give that as an illustration. He selects some small segment of a work which is in progress, of a work which is being constructed, and everyone who is at all acquainted with railway construction knows that it is impossible, from day to day, in a remote section of the country, to learn how much money has been expended upon five miles here or ten miles there. I say it has no bearing upon the question. Having given the hon. gentleman the information as to the amount of money expended between two given points, covering the entire works of the Company, and having given that section by section, dealing with the different sections as provided by Parliament, the hon. gentleman and every hon. gentleman in this House has all the information that is required in order to a careful consideration and a just decision in regard to the question. Then, the hon. gentleman, not satisfied with expenditures, asks me what are the estimates, what are the Government engineer's estimates of the cost of this work? and I tell him. I did not wait to be asked; I gave the Government engineer's estimate of the cost of this work. Then he asks how much of that estimate is to be applied to this section and how much to that section? and I give that to him. I give him the most exhaustive and the most complete information,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

not only of everything within the knowledge of the Government, but I give him the estimates, I give him the calculations, I place the figures in his hands; and yet he is not satisfied. He says: I find the manager of the road and the president of the road, in some statement addressed to the shareholders and to the general public, have differed in their opinion with your engineer as to the cost of the work. I cannot help that. I have no control over the statements which the president or the manager of the Company may make from day to day as to their estimate of the result here or the result there. I have furnished the hon. gentleman with the most accurate calculations of the Department, and I have drawn his attention to the fact that the calculations submitted by the Department and by the same engineer to the House three years ago, compared with the position in which the question stands to-day is the best evidence of the reliance to be placed on those calculations. I have seen calculations made by very high authority that differ with these results quite as largely as anything to which the hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the House to-day. I do not intend to do that which would be impossible, to follow the hon. gentleman through the maze of figures which he has thrown over this subject, I will not say for the purpose of mystifying it, but the hon. gentleman knows how impossible it is for any person, even one familiar with the subject, to take up a page of figures that are thrown down in this way hurriedly before the House. But the hon. gentleman makes a great point of the expenditure of \$17,500,000 in this western section, and has great difficulty to find how it is possible that the \$17,500,000 that we have stated to the House we have the evidence has been expended upon the main line from the Red River to the crest of the Rocky Mountains—he cannot understand how it is possible that such an extravagant estimate as that can be justified or maintained. Why, the hon. gentleman knows that he made an estimate, he knows that he took the high authority of my hon. predecessor, he knows that that hon. gentleman had made a most careful estimate, taking section by section, from the Red River to the crest of the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not on that line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He says not on that line, but I suppose he got the best line he could get, and, if we have been able, if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been able, to get a better line, so much the better for the country. But, as I said before, the hon. gentleman, with all the aid—and invaluable aid it was—of my hon. predecessor, made a calculation covering this same distance from the Red River to the crest of the Rocky Mountains, and he gave the House the benefit of those calculations. What were they? Was it \$17,500,000, which now he cannot understand it possible to have been expended there? Why, it was \$42,000,000 for that same distance. There it stands, after all the attention my hon. predecessor had given to this question; and he had examined it closely and minutely. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that the road that has been constructed is not as good a road as he proposed to construct? He will not say so. He will not find a gentleman in this House, or in the country, who knows anything about railway construction, who will not admit that the road which has been constructed for \$17,500,000 is infinitely superior to the road which he estimated to cost \$42,000,000. I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to be in any great difficulty as to where this \$17,500,000 has gone, as it has covered a work superior to anything contemplated by the hon. gentleman, superior to anything which it was contemplated in this House would be done. And more than that, that \$17,500,000 embraces the most magnificent provision for shops, machine shops, engine houses, and everything that enters into the management of a great line of railway communication, in the city of Winnipeg. The hon.

gentleman wants to know why there is the discrepancy between the amount they spent on the branches, and that which they spent on the main line. There is a great discrepancy, but the one was the main line of railway and the other were branch lines of railway, which would not need the great expenditure provided for the main line, for bearing the whole of the great volume of traffic through this country. So you have not only the fact that the road did not require to be so expensively constructed, but you have the whole magnificent equipment—as everyone will know who looks at the figures, an enormous equipment—provided for this distance on the main line which is covered by the \$17,500,000, while on the branches there is no equipment, there are neither shops nor engine houses, there is none of this enormous expenditure which has been made for the great central depot of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Winnipeg. The branches get all the benefit of it, but they are not charged with a dollar of it. It is charged to the trunk line which required it, which required this enormous and costly equipment. And all this station equipment which is required in connection with it is charged to the main line and not to the branches, though they get the benefit of it. So, whether you take it in connection with the work itself, or take the figures presented in connection with any estimates that have ever been made, you will find that, instead of the amount being so unreasonable as to excite the hon. gentleman's suspicion that the money has not been put in the road, that there is some dishonesty of the Company, in the statements they have made, the hon. gentleman ought to find, in his own estimate, a different declaration. Was the hon. gentleman making an exaggerated estimate at the time he was endeavouring to block this Government in going on with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway at all, at the time he was declaring that the Government was going to plunge the country into an enormous and unjustifiable expenditure in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway? Was he exaggerating purposely the cost of this road when he put it at \$42,000,000? I will not do the hon. gentleman the discredit to believe that any such idea influenced him. I believe he made a fair and careful calculation, with the assistance of my hon. predecessor, of what the road would actually cost, and he stated frankly to the House the facts. Having done so, having put himself on record, having given it as a deliberate opinion, based on that of the former Minister of Public Works, who had examined this question for years, that that road from Red River to the crest of the Rocky Mountains could not be built for less than \$42,000,000—I say it does not lie in the hon. gentleman's mouth to come down here to-day and to cavil over the expenditure of this sum for a better road than was contemplated, with magnificent equipment and rolling stock, machine shops, engine houses, and everything on a magnificent scale—to endeavour to raise an imputation in this House that there is something dishonest, because all this has been accomplished for \$17,500,000, that he himself declared would cost this country, if we went on and did it ourselves, \$42,000,000. Now, Sir, it will not be necessary for me, I think, to say any more on that point. The hon. gentleman says that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company contracted with itself in respect to this construction company. Well, Sir, he shifted his ground. What was his charge the first night that he spoke on this subject? Why, Sir, his charge was this, and there was a great deal in it: he complained that certain members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had been making money out of the construction company—that was the charge of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. I had not the facts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well, I will admit that.

Mr. BLAKE. I stated it from the hon. gentleman's own statements.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will admit that the hon. gentleman had not the facts, and I will admit that if he believed, as he undoubtedly did believe, that certain members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were making money out of the construction company, it was his duty to the House, and his duty to the country to bring such a fact forward for consideration, because it was a very important one. The result is that the hon. gentleman finds that he was entirely mistaken, finds that no such thing occurred, finds that this fear he had was totally unfounded, finds in fact that every dollar that was made in connection with the construction company was made for and on behalf of the humblest shareholder if he had only one dollar of stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The ground was cut from under the hon. gentleman's feet. But he is equal to the emergency. What he supposed was a great wrong to the Company appears altogether to be unfounded; the Company all share alike. But still he is not satisfied because the Company associated themselves with the construction company. Well, Sir, there is nothing very new in that. The hon. gentleman knows that this Company found that it required, independent and outside of all the money they could get from Government sources, a large sum of money to go on with this railway—if they went on with it promptly—and what did they do? Why, Sir, they did what is not unusual in such cases; they endeavoured to enlist, and they did enlist, as the hon. gentleman will see by looking at the shareholders, the associates of the whole Company; they associated with a number of leading influential firms, such as Morgan, Drexel & Co., and a number of other large financial establishments in the City of New York, by which a large outside influence was induced to come in and buy stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—a number of gentlemen who could not be induced to come into this enterprise by any other means, and in that way the Company was rendered stronger and their own capital rendered greater for the purpose of the construction of this railway. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman need not go into any minute calculations of the amount of stock and the amount of payment that that construction company were to receive, because he knows that it has been dissolved; he knows that they have not received a dollar of stock; he knows that when the time came that it was found necessary to get the stock guaranteed, the effect of which would be to give greater value to the stock of these outside parties that they were to receive as a construction company, than the stock would have borne independently of the guarantee furnished by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it then became necessary to dissolve that arrangement. In the settlement it appears that there was a certain amount—I believe an unsettled amount—that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company claim the construction company as such owes the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. But that was nothing that ought to excite any suspicion in the mind of the hon. gentleman or of anybody else. The operation itself of uniting with the construction company to endeavour in that way to bring a greater amount of capital into the enterprise, and to widen the basis of the operation of the parties interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway, had in it nothing whatever calculated to excite any suspicion on the part of any person. It was a natural proceeding, it was a course usually pursued by great companies in connection with great enterprises, and the very fact that it had been dissolved shows that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not to suffer, has lost nothing by the operation, and that no person in fact will suffer with relation to it, because these outside members of the construction company will not

derive any profit from the guarantee given to stock to which they were not entitled, as the stock that it was proposed should be given to them had no guarantee. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman talks again about a mortgage on the North-West; again, Sir, he brings up this question of the sufferings of the North-West, and the mortgage on that country. I think, Sir, the hon. gentleman has had his answer. He has not had it from me; he has had it from the fact that notwithstanding that the party opposite, notwithstanding that the press representing hon. gentlemen opposite, have done all that lay in their power to foment a spirit of bitter discontent in the North-West; notwithstanding that the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite have been willing to discredit Canada if they could damage the success of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; notwithstanding that measures have been resorted to that I regard as the most utterly discreditable that ever can attach to any party in the world, notwithstanding all this, I say the very people themselves on behalf of whom they pretend to speak, disclaim and repudiate their utterances. I say that the Canadian who can justly be charged, in view of the position in which Canada stands to-day in relation to that great North-West, with endeavouring to foment discontent, with endeavouring to get extracts from newspapers to show that the country is in a state of revolt—that are calculated in fact to inspire that revolt, with falsely stating to the country and all over the world that the people were ripe for revolt in that great North-West—I say there is nothing that in my judgment ought so to damn the reputation of any public man, or of any part of the press of this country, as to be justly charged with a crime so heinous against the best interests of Canada itself. Sir, from the hour this Canadian Pacific Railway contract was laid on the Table, on every possible occasion, the hon. gentleman opposite has exhausted all his great powers for the purpose of exciting discontent and hostility against this Government in the minds of the people of the North-West. And yet, Sir, what is the result? Why, Sir, when the House comes to the consideration of this great measure that he is now opposing with all the bitterness, with all the hostility, and all the ability of which he is master, in struggling against the contract itself, the hon. gentleman gets his answer. And from where? Not from me; it would be a feeble answer I could give the hon. gentleman in comparison. He gets it in the fact that the measure has the solid and united support of the representatives of the North-West with the exception of one single man, who has to be dragged reluctantly to the front—one man alone out of all the representatives of the North-West, stands like a criminal in the box, trembling while he gives a reluctant support to the proposition of the hon. gentleman opposite—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a question of order. I think the Minister of Railways in designating any hon. gentleman on this side of the House as a criminal is out of order—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not.

Mr. CHARLTON—and I desire him to withdraw the words.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no such words to withdraw, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say. I should be very sorry to make such reference to any hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You did, all the same.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You said he is like a criminal in the box.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated that he stood trembling like a criminal in the box. I am in the judgment of Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the House as to whether that was not a correct description.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is a great pity that such an allusion should have been made to an hon. gentleman. The speaker hardly said he was a criminal; still it is a pity the word criminal was used.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nothing is further from my thoughts than to intimate criminality on the part of the hon. gentleman. I will say that without any hesitation. But, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has received his answer on that point more fully and more conclusively than any answer I could give. I do not think it is necessary to prolong this discussion, a discussion which is not called for by the position in which the question stood. I propose to draw the attention of the House, when it resolves itself into Committee, to the points in which the Bill differs from the Resolutions which I had the honour to submit to the House. I may say that the leader of the Opposition has not thought it beneath him, on two or three occasions, to refer to the fact that I have not voted in relation to this question. I am in the judgment of the House when I say, if there is any hon. gentleman in this House who has the courage of his opinions, it is myself; no hon. gentleman whom I have ever met on the floor of the House will say that I have not the courage of my opinions, and hon. gentlemen will at a very early period, probably in the course of to-day or to-morrow, have an opportunity of ascertaining exactly what has prevented me from doing that which I regret most deeply. Not having had the opportunity of doing that which I shall be most proud to do, and which I trust before this Bill becomes law, I will have the opportunity of doing, backing, as I am accustomed to back, my opinions by my vote.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Railways has told the House that it is impossible to follow the vast amount of figures thrown at his head by the leader of the Opposition at very short notice. The leader of the Opposition has not given him many figures to consider, not many figures to explain to-day. I think it was quite within his power to note down the figures brought before him and give the information, if he was pleased to do so, with respect to the points which have been suggested. The hon. Minister claims that all the information necessary to a consideration of this case has been given to the House. Yet the hon. gentleman has not told us now, as he has not told us in the past, where the \$600,000 overpaid to the construction company has gone. He has failed to give us the items as to the comparative cost of the different sections of the railway; and it is on this very point that the leader of the Opposition has pointed out to him that if the information that has been conveyed to the House is correct, it involves one of two things; either that there has been a grossly extravagant expenditure on the construction of the 615 miles of prairie section, or that the figures reported to this House as having been paid to the construction company are not and cannot be correct. With respect to the return giving the amounts paid to the construction company, I ask the Minister of Railways if he will say that the House is in a position rightly to understand that construction company; if it is in a position rightly to comprehend the state of affairs from the manner in which that report has been made to the House? Here you have the amounts given in bulk sum,—the cost for transportation charges, for labour furnished before the date of taking the contract, &c. These are not divided between the different sections, and hon. members are called upon to judge of this large financial transaction, involving the interests of the country and its well being, and are left to work out the figures in such manner as they may, without the slightest help being furnished by the Minister of Railways or information given that ought to be placed in its possession,

before hon. members are asked to give a decision on this question. I again call the hon. Minister's attention to the statement which has been furnished to the House, and to the manner in which the amounts were paid to the construction company. The statement of account with the North American Railway Contracting Company is as follows:—

<i>Cash Advances—Western Division.</i>		
Sundry small vouchers for supplies and labour.....	\$ 127,340	
Langdon, Shepard & Co.....	1,118,528	
Jas. Ross, Manager.....	1,280,831	
		\$2,506,700
<i>Nipissing Division.</i>		
Payment of labour and small supplies.....	\$1,389,127	1,389,127
<i>Lake Superior Division.</i>		
Payment of labour and small supplies.....	\$2,014,608	2,014,608
		\$5,910,436
Material and supplies furnished.....	\$4,164,511	
Less material and supplies, net.....	2,373,820	1,790,691
Labour furnished before date of construction contract.....	\$78,482	78,482
<i>Transportation Charges.</i>		
Amounts paid out for back charges on freight.....	\$ 103,315	
Canadian Pacific Railway Company's charges .....	1,274,970	
		\$1,378,286
Cash advanced.....		600,000
		\$9,758,096
Value of work done estimated at actual cost.....		9,158,096
Balance due.....		\$600,000

The amounts, I repeat, are not divided. We are not in a position to say how much of the transportation charges is to be added to the western and how much to the eastern section, and it is absolutely necessary in order to make a definite calculation we should have that information. But as we are not in that position, I made a calculation which I submitted to the House the other night, and which I think is very much in the same line as that which the leader of the Opposition has given to-day, and I again submit that further information should be laid before the House before the Bill is read the second time. We have the total cost of the western section placed at \$2,506,700; but, as I said before, we do not know what proportion of the other items should be added. In order to be sure, I add all materials and supplies to the amount of \$1,790,891; then I add the labour furnished before the date of the construction contract, whether on the eastern or western division, and I add all the transportation charges, I do not care whether they belong to the eastern or western divisions; in order that there may be no loophole for the Minister, I add every dollar included in these items, except specific items and amounts expended on Nipissing and Lake Superior division. Adding these amounts, what is the result? The construction company obtained for building 345 miles of railway \$5,754,359, or at the rate of \$16,680 per mile. As the leader of the Opposition has said, the Minister of Railways has given the House the total cost of the western division as \$17,529,175. Deduct the amount paid the construction company for the part of the work they executed, \$5,754,590, and we find that 615 miles of line over the prairie cost \$11,774,816, or \$19,143 per mile. That was the cost of building the prairie road, while the construction of 345 miles, including the half million dollar bridge over the Saskatchewan, and the 100 miles of mountain work, cost little over \$16,000 per mile. Will the hon. Minister tell us that, with these figures, which he has been challenged to take up, and place a different construction on them, there is not need for more information?

Either the figures given as the amounts paid to the construction company are incorrect, or the amount expended on the 615 miles of prairie road is a grossly extravagant one and needs explanation. Let us look at the matter from another point of view. What were the construction company to receive for constructing the western division? We have the contract. The leader of the Opposition has already told us what the contract was. They were to get \$17,830,000 in cash, and they were to get \$25,000,000 of the stock of the Company in addition. Now, let us take those figures and work them out. We have already ascertained that the amount paid the construction company, adding everything except the two specific amounts for the Nipissing and Lake Superior divisions, was \$5,754,359. The general manager of the Company says they can construct the balance of the work remaining to be done, for \$10,100,000, and therefore the whole cost, paid and to be paid, for the construction of the part as to which they entered into a contract with the construction company would be \$15,854,359. To complete that portion of the road they gave the construction company \$17,880,000 in cash, or \$2,025,641 more in cash than the total amount paid for it, and necessary to be paid on it, in order to complete; and mark, that in addition to that amount they were to pay or hand over to them, \$25,000,000 of the capital stock of the Company. And yet the Minister will sit in his place and say that we are in possession of all the information necessary to form a judgment upon this matter. He will sit there asking independent members, men who feel the responsibility resting upon them in entering into an engagement so large as this contract, an engagement so important as the one we are now about to make—he asks them to vote this enormous amount of money, and in the face of these figures, without attempting a refutation or an explanation of them, he contents himself with rising in his place in the House, and saying that he cannot carry these few figures in his head, that he has not time to jot them down, that he will not attempt to answer them, but that he is convinced that a more unpatriotic and disloyal lot of men than the men who would dare to question those figures, does not exist. Well, Sir, we need not talk sentiment upon a matter like this; it is not necessary that we should abuse one another in considering a large and important transaction of this kind. I venture to say that the Minister of Railways, and those who vote with him on this question, have no reason at all to find fault with the tenor of this debate, so far as it has been conducted from this side of the House. I do not think the Minister of Railways will charge hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that they have unduly pressed considerations which might be pressed in regard to this matter. We have been very careful during this discussion not to impute any motives, as has been done by the Minister of Railways himself, I am sorry to say—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON—yes, yes—and I think it was due to the hon. gentleman, after he had done so, to have made a full retraction of what he said. It would have been more creditable on his part than it was to attempt to maintain a statement which was unparliamentary in its nature, and one which it was not creditable for him to make. The Minister knows that he should be in a position to give the information we require; he knows we are arguing from figures furnished by himself—not trumped up by ourselves, but his own figures, and we have worked these figures out, and we can arrive at no other conclusion than the one we have arrived at; and we say we will be obliged if he could show us that they point to any other conclusion. He does not do so; but he rises in his place and he is content with abusing us, with playing the part of a scold, with trying to evoke the party enthusiasm of hon. gentlemen behind him,

by making remarks which are not creditable to him about an hon. gentleman on this side of the House. He says we have received his answer, and received it from a man who is infinitely his superior. Well, if that is his candid conviction with regard to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) I will not argue that point with him, but I say that if the hon. gentleman will take *Hansard* and read the speech of the hon. member for Lisgar, he will find that there is not a single argument in that speech in favour of granting this money, or for the early completion of the Lake Superior section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the interests of the North-West or of Manitoba. His whole argument is based in the idea that it is in the interests of eastern Canada; but so far as his own country is concerned, so far as Manitoba and the North-West are concerned, there is not a single argument in that whole speech which points in that direction. I challenge the hon. Minister to produce a single argument in that speech tending to show that the payment of this money is necessary in the interests of Manitoba and the North-West. And that is where the whole argument of the Minister of Railways lay. We were told that we must have the road completed in order that the North-West may be settled and the country developed. But what does the hon. member for Lisgar say? Port Arthur is the point which he lays stress upon. When he speaks of wheat being carried from Winnipeg to Montreal for 25 cents per bushel, how does he propose to do it? By rail north of Lake Superior? Not at all, but he says that the railway Company will build elevators at Port Arthur, that the wheat will be stored there during winter, and then sent down by the mixed water and land route to Montreal, and there is not a line in his speech which says that the completion of the road north of Lake Superior is at all necessary in that respect in the interests of Manitoba and the North-West. The Minister of Railways is welcome to any comfort he can draw from that speech in the shape of an argument that we should spend this money to settle the plains of the North-West, because the hon. member for Lisgar says if it is of value at all it is valuable for eastern Canada. Let me say to the Minister of Railways, as he endeavoured to throw contempt on one of the members of the Opposition, in language that was unbecoming to him as a gentleman, that the hon. member whom he attacked stands in this House, and in the country, as honourable a man, as bold and as brave a man, as any gentleman who dares to attack him in this House; and if he thinks, as his language implies, that the other members from that Province were seduced from their party allegiance because of personal or provincial advantage, I say that if there has been a member in this House who has been strong enough in his convictions as to right and wrong, to take a position rendering him liable to the taunts which the Minister threw out, acting from a sense of duty—for certainly no one has anything to gain in a pecuniary point of view for acting in opposition in such a case—if a man is found determined to do the right under such circumstances, I say it ill becomes any member of this House to rise and charge that man with having acted as if he were a criminal in the dock. We have had many votes upon this question, and sometimes it has been difficult, I have no doubt, for hon. members with provincial interests clashing, to rise and do their whole duty; but I say the character of the hon. gentleman, whom he has attacked, stands out as that of an honest and a brave man, and that such a charge may not be levelled against him—I say that if such a charge be leveled against that man, we, on this side of the House will rise and protest. I do not propose to go into this matter further. It is about to be considered in Committee, and we will try to elicit more information while it is before the Committee. There have been no speeches made here for the purpose of protracting this debate.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. There have been no speeches made, I repeat, for the mere purpose of prolonging the discussion, and I think I speak within the knowledge of hon. gentlemen opposite, when I say that when it was determined to close the discussion at a previous stage, it closed too soon for some hon. gentlemen opposite. Now we have asked the hon. gentleman for information which will enable us to determine the nature of this transaction. The Minister of Railways has had pointed out to him the particular points as to which, at this particular moment, we require information. The figures are before him where he can see them; and we should like to know whether that was the whole amount paid to the construction company for constructing that western part, and if it was, how it came that they built the road in the mountainous region, with a half-million dollar bridge in their work, at \$16,000 per mile, while it cost over \$19,000 per mile to construct the road on the prairie section on the figures the hon. Minister himself has given. I say that the figures which the leader of the Opposition has given, the points he has brought before the House, ought to have some explanation before this Bill is pressed to a second reading.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I desire, if my voice will sustain me, to say a very few words about the calculation which the hon. Minister of Railways has several times during this discussion brought against myself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not against.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, practically so. I am given as the authority used by the hon. member for West Durham, and I acknowledge to have been the authority; but the hon. gentleman must remember that the summit in the one case was a very different distance from Winnipeg from what the summit was in the other case. If he looks at the matter, he will find that the summit referred to in the previous calculation was at least 150 miles farther west. He must also know, if he knows the route taken, that after crossing the North Saskatchewan, the country is exceedingly rough nearly the whole way to the Yellow Head Pass, and that we would have had to ascend the slope south of the Pembina River, and traverse several branches of the McLeod River and the Athabasca River, so that the bridging would have been excessive on the whole of that line. He must also remember that the calculation embraced eastward, that country along which he took the line one time, after his abortive attempt to engage some company. The hon. gentleman will remember that the country was so rough that he gave up all idea of retaining the grades east of Selkirk, and attempted to make merely a colonization road instead of a traffic road. In the calculation I made, I endeavoured to sustain the entire grades, from end to end of the line, and it is one of the advantages of the line I selected, that in no part, from the Ottawa River to the Pacific Ocean, was there a single grade exceeding 52·80 feet to the mile. I know nothing of the road constructed through the prairie, but I have no doubt it is a uniformly excellent one. But whatever the quality of the road may be, the circumstances are wholly different, and the hon. gentleman cannot make any fair comparison between the cost as estimated by myself, on the other route, and the cost of the road constructed on the southern route. I am exceedingly sorry that I am utterly unable to manage my voice so as to give utterance to all that I desire to say on this subject; but I wish, at all events, to correct a misapprehension under which the hon. gentleman seems to have laboured on several occasions, as I consider it rather unfair to impugn the calculations I made, and to attempt to show that they are inconsistent with the facts of the case as stated by myself.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say that the hon. gentleman opposite has, perhaps unintentionally, entirely misrepresented the nature of my speech, and the calculation to which he referred. In order to show what the calculation was, it is only necessary for me to read:

"The road from Fort William to Selkirk was estimated at \$18,000,000; the Pembina Branch cost \$1,500,000, and adding \$100,000 for the Red River bridge, we reach a little over \$25,000,000. From Selkirk to Edmonton, according to the old grades and style of construction, the hon. member for Lambton estimated at \$17,650,000, which, added to the \$25,000,000 makes a total of over \$42,500,000 as the amount, including what has been spent for surveys, which it will have cost the country, irrespective of interest and construction, to reach the point which I suggest as the reasonable terminus for the prairie section of the road."

It was therefore a road from Fort William to Edmonton, including the Pembina branch, which was estimated to cost \$42,500,000. I take this from my speech on page 1,440 of *Hansard* of 1880.

Motion for second reading agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Dupont,	McDougald,
Amyot,	Farrow,	McLelan,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	McNeill,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	Mitchell,
Beaty,	Foster,	Moffat,
Bell,	Fréchette,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gagné,	O'Brien,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Orton,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Paint,
Billy,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bolduc,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Reid,
Bourbeau,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Brecken,	Hay,	Ross,
Burns,	Hesson,	Royal,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Scott,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Small,
Carling,	Ives,	Sproule,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Tassé,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Temple,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Tupper (Picton),
Coursol,	Langevin,	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers,	Mackintosh,	Williams,
Desjardins,	Macmaster,	Wood (Brookville),
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth,
Dundas,	McOallum,	Wright—111.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Lennox),	Forbes,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Auger,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bécharé,	Harley,	Platt,
Blake,	Holton,	Ray,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Benfrew),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Catual,	Laurier,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Charlton,	Lister,	Trow,
Cockburn,	Livingstone,	Vail,
Cook,	Mackenzie,	Watson,
Davies,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Fisher,	McIsaac,	Yeo.—52.
Fleming,		

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I beg respectfully to call the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Sutherland) has not voted.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Bruce). The hon. member did not come into the House until the vote was being counted.

Bill read the second time.

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

#### After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before moving, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair, I would like to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to a correction which the hon. the leader of the Opposition made, and for which I am obliged to him, because, of course, I am anxious that everything should be as accurate as possible. The hon. gentleman drew my attention to the fact, that the central section which he had estimated at \$42,500,000 covered the whole distance from Port Arthur to Edmonton. The mistake arose from the fact that we have in the Bill and in the contract termed the central section that portion from the Red River to the crest of the Rocky Mountains; and it was in applying the term "central section" which appeared, at all events, in the hon. gentleman's calculation, to have embraced the distance from Port Arthur to Edmonton that led me into the inaccuracy, and I am glad the hon. gentleman called my attention to it, although I think my illustration is quite strong enough, even under the correction. The distance from Port Arthur to Selkirk is 407 miles, and the cost of that section is \$14,705,000; deduct that from the distance that the hon. gentleman refers to and it will leave the distance between Red River and Edmonton, 811 miles, to cost \$27,295,000. The hon. gentleman's estimate covers, he says, the distance from Port Arthur to Edmonton \$42,500,000; deduct the cost of the line from Port Arthur to the Red River from it, and that leaves \$27,295,000 for the 811 miles between Red River and Edmonton, the prairie section, or \$33,656 per mile. That, I think, is a sufficiently strong contrast between the amount that is charged and stated in these papers to have been expended by the Company and to which the hon. gentleman takes such grave exception, and the amount estimated by him. Instead of this amount the hon. gentleman himself stated—I will take at his own estimate—the cost from Red River to Edmonton at \$17,500,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I read from my speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You did; but take the \$17,500,000 which the hon. gentleman read from his speech as his deliberate estimate of the cost from Red River to Edmonton 811 miles, and I want to know why the hon. gentleman should think the amount expended extravagant, when \$17,592,175 is put down as the amount covering the cost of 964 miles. If the hon. gentleman was making a fair and legitimate estimate when he estimated, according to his own statement, 811 miles of the road to cost \$17,500,000, surely he cannot complain if 964 miles, or 153 miles more than the hon. gentleman estimated for, and that running into the crest of the Rocky Mountains, embracing the heavier work, cost only the same amount as that which he estimated only for 153 miles less. I trust my hon. friend will see that it is not competent for him, under those circumstances, to complain. Now, let me draw the attention of the House to the fact that, according to the hon. gentleman, the estimate of \$17,500,000, he estimates that road to cost \$21,568 per mile. Take the distance from Winnipeg to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, 964 miles, which cost \$17,529,175, according to the statement of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, instead of being \$21,568 per mile, according to the hon. gentleman's least estimate for the prairie region, it is only \$18,153 per mile actual expenditure, yet the hon. gentleman is driven to the conclusion that I am sure he would be very reluctant to arrive at, that there has been a dishonest

statement made to the House by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say so, but I cannot see how the thing can be surrounded by suspicion, as I understood the hon. gentleman to insinuate, if the cost per mile of the road is over \$3,000 a mile less than he himself estimated, and the road is admitted, by every person who has had any opportunity to judge, to be of the very best character. Then we have the actual expenditure of the Pembina branch. No one who knows the condition of these roads, will say that the Pembina branch is anything like so good a road as has been constructed from the Red River to the crest of the Rocky Mountains by the Canadian Pacific Railway, yet that road cost us \$17,495 per mile; and that without any of this enormous expenditure in shops, engine houses and everything of that kind connected with the service at Winnipeg. The House will, therefore, see that whether you take the hon. gentleman's estimate for the cost of the Pembina branch, the figures of the amount stated to have been expended by the Canadian Pacific Railway are amply borne out, and the work performed 964 miles from the Red River to the crest of the Rocky Mountains executed for a sum no larger than the hon. gentleman estimated it would cost to complete the road from the Red River to Edmonton, a distance of 153 miles less. I do not think that it is necessary for me to say more in reference to that. But I wish, before sitting down, to express to the House the great regret at the way in which I found my reference to the hon. member for Marquette was received by the House. I wish to state in the most distinct terms—it is due to myself, to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, that I should say so—nothing was further from my mind than to cast the slightest imputation upon the character of the hon. member for Marquette, and I regret very much that in the heat of debate I should have used an illustration which led hon. gentlemen on that side to suppose, for a single moment, anything of the kind was in my mind. What I wished to convey and what, perhaps, I hardly had a right to convey, was my impression that the hon. gentleman had given a reluctant support to the leader of his party. That was all I intended to convey, and if the language I used was capable of any other construction, I wish to withdraw it in the most full and unqualified manner.

Mr. BLAKE. We have heard with great pleasure the hon. gentleman's last statement, and when we learn that the language which we heard the hon. gentleman use was simply intended to convey what was an entirely erroneous impression, that the vote of the hon. member for Marquette was reluctantly given, we shall know how to estimate other expressions of the hon. gentleman, of equally great strength, in the debates in future. The hon. gentleman and his followers have frequently charged me and my hon. friend with having made an estimate of \$42,500,000 for the work from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains, and I waited, while the hon. gentleman's followers were indulging in these extravagances, to see whether it was going, on an ascending scale, to come from the lips of their leader in this question, the Minister of Railways; and in good time it came, and the hon. gentleman answered my argument with reference to estimates and expenditures of to-day by repeating, himself, the statement we have heard several times in this House this Session, that I had made an estimate, and my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had made an estimate, of \$42,500,000, as the cost of that which was now costing only \$17,500,000, and I was told that was an adequate answer. If anybody will take the trouble to refer to the speech in which the figures which have been misquoted are contained, he will find that I stated that my hon. friend from East York, then representing the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

county of Lambton, had taken up the estimates of the engineers, Mr. Fleming and Mr. Smith, and had collated those estimates, had applied them to the country and to all the information he possessed, and had deduced from that, as their estimate of the cost of construction at the time that estimate was made, which was in the year preceding the year 1880—I think as long before as 1877 and 1878, and perhaps earlier—the figures which I gave. We all know that the circumstances as to railway building were very different then from what they are to-day. I gave those as the estimates of those engineers. They were not my figures—I have stated so repeatedly. They were not the figures of my hon. friend from East York in any other sense than this, that he declared them to be his view of what the engineers stated was the cost.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. And the hon. gentleman assents to that, and he assents to the view that that was the engineers' estimate of the cost at that time. That engineers' estimate of the cost at that time—for we have got it down to that, that here was an accurate statement of what the engineers, prior to that time, I think, in 1876, 1877, and 1878, had estimated for the cost of that work—the engineers' estimate I gave for the whole line, as deduced by my hon. friend from East York. The first point I took this afternoon, and the only point, was that the hon. gentleman's whole statement was founded upon a very gross blunder, upon an allegation that I had said that that portion of the line which had now been constructed for \$17,500,000 would cost, according to these old estimates, \$42,500,000. Well, the hon. gentleman took time to consider, and he had the recess to do it in, and I presume he has the speech before him here, because I had the *Hansard* for that year and sent it back to the library, and when I sent for it again I could not get it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Shall I send it back?

Mr. BLAKE. No, I have got one now, I am happy to say, from another quarter. With that before him and with plenty of time while he took his dinner to consider it, he now comes back and brings forward another statement, which could not be as inaccurate as his statement of the afternoon, but which is as inaccurate as it is possible to be under the circumstances, which is as inaccurate as it was left to him to be. What did he say? With my speech before him, convicted of having made a very gross misstatement of that speech, and having had two hours' time in which to consider the matter, he goes into figures, and says I have made an error in the statement of \$17,500,000, and that the truesum, from my own statement, for this distance from the Red River to Edmonton, is \$27,500,000, and he enters into figures to prove it. He says: "From Fort William to Selkirk you say cost so much; I deduct that from \$42,500,000 and get \$27,500,000, and therefore you ought to have put the \$27,500,000 instead of the \$42,500,000; you do not know your business; I correct you; I amend your \$10,000,000, and I charge you with having really intended to say, four years ago, that this piece of the line cost \$27,500,000." What are we to say, either of the hon. gentleman's fairness or of his capacity to understand facts in print before him, in view of the portion of my speech which I am about to read:

"The Canada Central Railway subsidy reaches \$1,440,000; the surveys, including those location surveys, which, after all, come out of the pockets of the people, whether called exploratory surveys or location surveys, amount to \$4,000,000."

There you see, Sir, is \$5,440,000.

"The road from Fort William to Selkirk was estimated at \$18,000,000—"

That is \$23,440,000.

"The Pembina Branch cost \$1,500,000—"

That is \$24,940,000—

"And, adding \$100,000 for the Red River bridge, we reach a little over \$25,000,000."

There are my figures. I have simply interpolated, in reading my speech, the additions of each calculation, in order to reach, if possible, the hon. gentleman's capacity for figures.

"From Selkirk to Edmonton, according to the old grades and style of construction, the hon. member for Lambton estimates at \$17,650,000, which, added to the \$25,000,000, makes a total of over \$42,500,000 as the amount, including what has been spent for surveys, which it will have cost the country, irrespective of interest and construction, to reach the point which I suggest as the reasonable terminus for the prairie section of the road."

Now, Sir, ought I to have made it \$27,500,000? Where will the hon. gentleman find the \$25,000,000 which, I trust, I have now proved to him is in the calculations? Whatever fantastic tricks he may play with his own figures, I ask him not to try them on mine, but just to leave them where they are standing. So much for that. The hon. gentleman will perceive, I trust, that he is not on sound ground when he proposes to add \$10,000,000 to my estimate of \$7,500,000. But the hon. gentleman says: "I am all right, even so." First, he wanted to make it \$42,500,000, and then \$27,500,000. He is beaten out of the \$42,500,000, and now he is beaten out of the \$27,500,000, and he comes down to \$17,650,000 and he is perfectly happy. What difference does it make to him that this afternoon he declared, with all the weight attached to his position, that I had estimated a piece of road analagous—the same piece of road, at \$42,500,000, and that he is now beaten down to the \$17,650,000 in his estimate? Nothing at all. He is quite imperturbable, and says it is all the same. The country is a very different country, as my hon. friend from East York said. We have lately declared that the railway Company was running over a much better country to the southward, a much better country for railway construction, than the country over which my hon. friend's line went. My hon. friend did not propose to choose the very easiest line for railway construction, but the best line in the national interest, the line which he thought would do most good, even though it might cost a little more money, and it was that line from the Red River to Edmonton of which my hon. friend from Lambton was speaking, and with reference to which the estimates were made. But the hon. gentleman says: "I will apply the estimates for a line from the Red River to Edmonton to a line from the Red River to the Rocky Mountains, by a southern route, and what the one cost the other must cost." Then there is a great deal more bridging in the old projected road, and lastly, the rails are well known to have been estimated at a much higher rate in reference to those old estimates, than the low prices at which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were able to obtain the rails which they laid down on the prairie section. An hon. gentleman the other day, in the course of this debate, setting off certain incidental advantages from rapid construction, against the cost of rapid construction, pointed out that rails had been purchased at a very cheap rate indeed, and it is true that they were purchased at a very cheap rate. These three elements I mention at the moment, but it is out of the question to say that, under any circumstances, even the hon. gentleman's application of \$17,650,000 instead of \$42,500,000 to a road which is not the same, on an estimate made some seven or eight years ago—I do not mean made by my hon. friend from Lambton, but that the data on which it was based were made some seven or eight years ago—is now admissible. If the hon. gentleman will look at the other estimates he will see that they were over-estimates; he will see that, as I said the other day, the engineers seemed to conclude that the building of the railway by the Yellow Head Pass would cost altogether about \$120,000,000. I gave the details, which the hon. gentleman agrees were an accurate representation

of their estimates. But if you look at each section you will find that these were over-estimates of the engineers. When we take the British Columbia section from the Tête Jaune Cache to the shore and find what my estimate was, and take his present estimate from the Rockies to the shore, and compare them, the hon. Minister might as well say: "You have nothing to say, because you thought from the Tête Jaune Cache to the shore, Mr. Schrieber's, Mr. Fleming's and Mr. Marcus Smith's views would have led to such an amount—you have nothing to say now that we were able to construct this road for so much less." That has nothing to do with it. My argument was based upon the present estimates, not upon those old estimates of the engineers with reference to another line; it was based upon an intelligible proposition. I showed what the branches in the North-West had cost this country; I showed what, as nearly as I could show, the expensive western portion of the work, partly prairie and partly mountain, with a heavy grade leading to the summit of the Rockies, had cost this Company, according to their own figures; I showed that in one case it was \$10,700 per mile, and in the other case \$14,500 per mile, with expensive bridging, with some heavy rock work, with some mountain work, and with the longest distance for transportation of materials which existed over the whole constructed line. And I asked, when I had the branches at the east costing \$10,700, when I had the mountain and western section costing, as far as I could make out, \$14,500—I asked what figures you could fairly put for the section in the middle, the 615 miles of level prairie section? That was the question I asked. And the answer I gave myself was, that I supposed about \$12,000 per mile, being something like a mean between those two figures, and I suggested a calculation upon that basis, and also upon the basis of \$14,000 per mile. I think that was a practical, sensible, reasonable and business-like way of dealing with the question in the premises. Now, I claim that my argument remains wholly unanswered. After the hon. gentleman's explanation of the meaning of the words used by himself, I suppose it is hardly necessary for me to say that I did not say or imply that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had made dishonest statements to Parliament; on the contrary, when the hon. gentleman told us that he had sent down auditors to look into their books, I said that I did not doubt that their books were accurately kept, and correctly represented the transactions of the Company. I have no idea of such a thing as the contrary. But, Sir, I did point out that the Company had been subjected to some extraordinary conditions, either of being defrauded by these contractors, or of there being an over-expenditure in the contracts—unless the figures I gave could be explained. What I asked for was that explanation, and I have not received it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understood the hon. Minister of Railways to convey the impression that the cost of the section from Red River to the mountains, \$17,500,000, included the cost of the equipment, and if he did intend to make that statement, I think it well to have it corrected now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; that includes the cost of the shops, stations, and expenses of terminus at Winnipeg.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very likely the hon. gentleman made use of language without thinking, but the impression left upon my mind—and, I am sure, upon the mind of the House—was that he intended to include the cost of equipment. The hon. gentleman also made a statement, that, taken in connection with any estimate that has ever been made, the road was cheap. Now, I think the hon. gentleman himself made an estimate of the cost of the road, from Red River to Jasper House, of \$13,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; that was for a tramway

Mr. CHARLTON—an estimate of \$4,500,000 less than the alleged cost of this section of the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will remember that I said that was only for a tramway.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, it was a road which was proposed to be a railway—a colonization road, as the hon. gentleman termed it—a road passing over a much more difficult section of country, with heavy bridges to construct, and a road that could not by any possibility have been constructed as cheap as the road now in existence; yet the hon. gentleman said this road was cheap in comparison with any estimate that had ever been made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For a road of that character.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is certainly rather reckless in his statements of figures, as has been shown to-night. I wish to reiterate the statement that has been made that we certainly do require more information in reference to this matter, before this House is in a position to judge as to whether this Company is entitled to receive from us a loan of \$22,500,000. Sir, we are dealing with the public interests, we are dealing with public funds, in the most reckless and the most unwarrantable manner. And I protest now, as I have done before, against the Government committing this country to undertakings in the dark—the country being in ignorance, and Parliament being in ignorance, of the condition of that Company and the manner in which that Company has carried on its operations. We know that the Company has received more than twice the sum of money it has expended upon the line it contracted to build; and there is something monstrous in the proposition made by these gentlemen, that the country should commit itself to this expenditure without Parliament being permitted to know all the facts in connection with the affairs of this Company. I believe there is no other country in the world where an attempt of this kind would be made, that there is no other country in the world that has a Government feeling itself so strong as to set at defiance all principles of prudence, all principles of honesty in the administration of affairs, in demanding that Parliament should commit the country to an expenditure of this extent in the absence of vital information, of information that we certainly ought to be possessed of, in order that we may know the full scope and possibilities of this measure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I want to make one or two observations in answer to the reply of the Minister of Railways to my hon. friend for North Norfolk, who has just taken his seat, in reference to his estimates, in 1880, of the prairie section being for a cheaper road. The hon. gentleman has told us at different times since that statement was made in the House, that it was for that class of road. He did not tell us at the time he was submitting the returns that such was the case. But the point I call his attention to is this: that in 1880, when he gave his estimate of \$10,000 a mile or, with equipment, \$13,000 a mile, for the prairie section, he also gave his estimate for the cost of the Lake Superior division and an estimate of the western division in the mountains. I presume if he was giving estimates for a certain class of road over the prairie at that time, he was giving an estimate for a like road on the other portion. And the figures show that, in that estimate he then gave, the 335 miles from Jasper to Kamloops was to cost \$43,660 per mile. Now, then, we have ascertained from statements he has made, and from statements of the general manager, that the Company proposed to construct this first-class road from the Rockies to Kamloops, through a similar country, for the sum of \$10,100 per mile; that is, if we take the 300 miles which the hon. Minister gives as the distance, in the detailed statement he made to the House. I know he has varied that statement a few

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

miles at different times, but the detailed statement of the distance, as I took it from his own very able speech, is 300 miles. The 300 miles, estimated at a cost of \$10,000 to complete, gives a cost of \$3,000,000. The estimate of 1880 for that road that was to be an inferior road, was \$43,660 per mile; therefore, in that particular, his estimate of 1880 was above the actual cost of construction by some \$10,000 per mile. Now, take the Lake Superior division. His estimated cost of 800 miles at that time was \$20,000,000, or \$33,333 per mile. Now, this, we gather from the general manager's estimate, will be sufficient to complete it. As for the 447 miles remaining to be completed, the figures given to us by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), are to the effect that they will be completed for \$14,000,000, or \$31,320 per mile. On the Lake Superior section, the estimate of the Minister in 1880 is reduced by the actual estimate. While that is the fact, that the hon. gentleman over-estimated in 1880 the cost by \$10,000 per mile on the western section, and \$2,000 per mile on the Lake Superior section, we find this with respect to the prairie section: That the portion which he estimated to cost \$10,000 per mile, without equipment—and we are speaking without equipment in all these cases—has actually cost, according to the figures he himself furnished, by my strongest calculation, when I put in all the transportation charges, cost of supplies, &c., into the cost of construction, no less than \$19,143 per mile for 515 miles. I do not understand how the hon. gentleman can say that he was talking about a different class of road. I just mention this point, as the hon. gentleman stated in his observation in connection with the remarks made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that his estimate of 1880 might not be considered, because he was estimating on an entirely different class of road.

Mr. WATSON. I desire to occupy the attention of the House for a few moments. During the afternoon, in my absence, I believe, the Minister of Railways attacked me, and used some very strong and unparliamentary language, abusing me for voting as I did upon the Resolutions; but he subsequently apologized to the House. I wish this House to understand that I will never vote for party and sacrifice the interests of my constituents. I will give my vote independently, as I think best in the interests of the constituency I represent, in the interest of the Province, and for the good of the whole Dominion; and whenever I bring up a motion or move an amendment, I will state my reasons for so doing. I will not only give my reasons, but I will remain in my seat in the House and vote. In moving this amendment, I was only formulating the opinions of my constituents, and carrying out a pledge made to them during the election, that, at the first opportunity, I would move that this obnoxious monopoly clause be struck out of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter. I have done so, and notwithstanding the threats held out by the Minister of Agriculture, that I dare not present myself to my constituents after voting as I had done on these Resolutions, I would inform the hon. gentleman that I am prepared to answer to my constituents for every vote I have polled in the House, and not to the Minister of Agriculture; and I believe all I have stated in the House, on this question, will be endorsed by my constituents, and I will go back to that country with, probably, a cleaner sheet than the hon. members from that Province who voted for the Resolutions.

Motion agreed to; and Bill considered in Committee and reported.

#### SELF-GOVERNMENT BY INDIANS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 22) for conferring certain privileges on the more

advanced bands of the Indians of Canada, with the view of training them for the exercise of municipal powers.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman explain the Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that I did, to a certain extent, explain the Bill when it was introduced. The Bill is for the purpose of encouraging the Indians of various bands to elect councillors, who will have powers analogous, to a certain extent, to those powers which are given to members of municipal councils. The measure is tentative to a certain extent, and the powers are limited, but it is hoped that the larger and more advanced bands will work upon this system, and as they prove themselves worthy and capable of carrying out the intention of this Act, Parliament will, by degrees, grant them more powers. It provides for the election of six councillors, and the elections are to be annual. The powers mentioned in the Act, to be exercised by the council, are as follows:—

“The council shall have power to make by-laws, rules and regulations, which, if approved and confirmed by the Superintendent-General, shall have force as law within and with respect to the reserve, and the Indians residing thereon, upon all or any of the following subjects, that is to say: The religious denomination to which the teacher or teachers of the school or schools established on the reserve shall belong, as being that of the majority of the Indians resident on the reserve; provided that the Roman Catholic or Protestant minority on the reserve may also have a separate school or schools with the approval of and under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council; the care of the public health; the observance of order and decorum at elections of councillors, meetings of the council, and assemblies of Indians on other occasions or generally on the reserve, by appointing constables and erecting lock ups or by the adoption of other legitimate means; the repression of intemperance and profligacy; the subdivision of the land in the reserve, and the distribution of the same among the members of the band; also, the setting apart for common use, wood land and land for other purposes.”

There are also powers as to trespass by animals, the construction and repair of school houses and other buildings, roads and bridges, water courses, &c. These are the purposes of the Act, and the clauses are the mere machinery for carrying them out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As nearly as I can understand, from a brief perusal of the Act, it, in fact, provides for the election of a council who shall discharge the duties, as nearly as may be, which have been discharged by the chiefs in the past.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. But the powers are much more extensive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; much the same.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I understand that the Bill makes provision for the collection of taxes on the reserves. This is a matter which will seriously affect the county of Hastings, for at present the Indians occupying the reserve in Tyendenaga pay no taxes, but the tenants residing on the Indian reserve pay taxes to the county. That county has spent a large sum of money in constructing gravel roads and building bridges; and if these taxes are to be paid to the Indians, and not to the county, it will be a serious injustice to other portions of the county, as Indians and whites alike, are allowed to use these roads and bridges. We have a number of bridges, as well as a large number of roads, which have been built entirely by the county, and as the Indians have a right to use them, I think, unless they are to be assumed by the Indians, it is only fair that they should contribute to the county funds. I would also like to ask, if the white settlers on the reserve are to be deprived of their right to the franchise?

Bill read the second time;

And the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Though I am not in order, I may be allowed to say, with reference to what has been stated by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. White), that this Act is merely an experimental one, for the purpose of enabling the Indians to do by an elective council what the chiefs, by the Statute of 1880, have already the power to do. In some of the tribes or bands, those chiefs are elected now, in others the office is hereditary, and in other bands there is a mixture of both systems. This Bill is to provide that in those larger reserves where the Indians are more advanced in education, and feel more self-confident, more willing to undertake power and self-government, they shall elect their councils much the same as the whites do in the neighbouring townships. My hon. friend asks me if there is any provision for the Mohawk band, in the township of Tyendenaga, contributing towards keeping up the roads. That, I think, must be an arrangement between the band and the county. At all events, under this Act, the Indians have power to tax themselves for the construction, and maintenance, and improvement of the roads. As regards the franchise of the white men on the reserve, this Act does not deal with that at all. In the Franchise Bill, which is on the Order paper, some means may, perhaps, be taken to give votes to those white men on the Indian reserves, as well as, perhaps, to the Indians themselves who have habitations and have assumed the responsibilities of white men.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The explanation is, of course, all I want. I only wanted to protect the county and the white men on the Indian reserve. If the Franchise Bill does it, of course that is satisfactory.

On section 2,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This clause states that the term “reserve” includes two or more reserves, and the term “band” includes two or more bands, united for the purposes of this Act by the Order in Council applying it. Do I understand that it will be necessary for two bands to co-operate in each case? What is the meaning of this clause?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The word “reserve,” in ordinary parlance, means a single reserve; but should there be two reserves of the same tribe of Indians near each other who wish to unite for the purposes of this Act, they may unite into one band, and have one elective council. That is merely enlarging the meaning of the word “reserve.”

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If they are of different tribes, may they be united?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Different bands of the same tribe.

On section 3,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the hon. First Minister will favour the Committee by stating whether representations have been made to him with reference to this Act, by persons more directly interested, whether he thinks some of the more advanced bands will avail themselves of this Act, and what provision will be made for satisfying the honour—I suppose I may use the term—of the chiefs who will be dispossessed of power by this Act. Many of them are very tenacious of their power on the reserve, and I think, that unless some provision is made, their feeling of pride will prevent some of them from embracing the Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In some of the tribes there are hereditary, in others elective chiefs, in others hereditary and elective chiefs combined. There are great varieties of organizations in the different bands. It is not proposed in any way to affect the status or the rank of the chiefs; but, as in the Act of 1880, where an elective system

of chiefs has been adopted, the hereditary chiefs retain their rank, but lose their power. I will say to my hon. friend that I have received a good many suggestions from different bands of Indians—from educated men, who are quite capable of judging of the effect of this law. On the whole, the Bill has been favourably received by the more advanced bands. There is to be no force exercised on the Indians; this measure is only intended to give them the opportunity of adapting themselves to the white system as much as possible. Some of them are very anxious to stand on an equality with, and to have the same responsibilities and duties as the whites. Only a day or two ago, I received a very valuable paper from an educated professional man, who is an Indian, with respect to this Bill—from a gentleman whose opinion I value. I have only been able to look over it cursorily, and I shall not ask concurrence until I read this paper carefully, and see if any necessary amendments are suggested by it.

On section 5,

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** I think the hon. First Minister proposes to confer the franchise on the male Indians. He seems to have lost part of his gallantry, and draws the distinction in the case of the Indians, I suppose, because this Act is for municipal purposes. Of course, it may be that there are widows residing on the reserves who may be interested in the system of assessment which may be resorted to, and may have to pay taxes. I know that in some of the tribes the women have occupied a very prominent place. In the kingly tribe of the Mohawks, I think the right to nominate the successor is vested in the women.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** I am glad to learn from my hon. friend that he is interested in extending the franchise. By slow degrees, the idea of placing woman on an equality with man has grown in the civilized world, but I do not know whether, among Indian tribes, the idea has reached that stage that it has in the Canadian Parliament. Perhaps my hon. friend, when he considers the matter, will move an amendment to extend the right of voting to the ladies of the Indians in his constituency, in whom he takes so fraternal and paternal an interest.

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** Will the hon. gentleman not take the responsibility?

On section 10,

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** The hon. First Minister is aware that in the largest reserve in Ontario there is a fund which was raised many years ago in England, and which was originally to be applied for the benefit of the Indians of British North America.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** Through the New England Society.

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** Through the means of that society they, I think, maintain on this reserve some six or eight schools, and an industrial institute, also wholly, I believe, out of their funds. I presume there is nothing in this clause or Act that will affect the working of that in any way whatever.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** Nothing whatever.

**Mr. MITCHELL.** Do the provisions of this Bill extend so as to include the Indian tribes in all parts of the Dominion—for instance, in the Maritime Provinces?

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** Yes.

On sub-section 3, section 10,

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. First Minister whether there would be any objection to giving further powers under that sub-section. They have the power to make laws:

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.**

“For the observance of order and decorum at elections of councillors, meetings of the council, and assemblies of Indians on other occasions, or generally on the reserve, by appointing constables and erecting lock-ups, or by the adoption of other legitimate means.”

The question is, whether there would be any objections, in a large reserve numbering some thousands, to having a stipendiary magistrate live upon the reserve, with power to deal with questions coming up. We have found in times past that a great deal of litigation went on, which, instead of being discountenanced, was rather encouraged by the magistrates, so that a great deal of time was lost in trivial cases. In a large reserve it might be well to give the local commissioners the powers of stipendiary magistrate.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** The hon. gentleman is quite right. In the last amended Indian Act, there is a provision by which the local agent or Indian agent may have the power of a stipendiary or police magistrate. I cannot, however, speak positively, as I do not expect this to come up to-night. The suggestion is well worthy of all consideration.

On sub-section 5, section 10,

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** One of the most difficult questions in the advancement of the Indian and in fitting him to assume the duties of citizenship and manhood, is to be found in the sub-division of these reserves. The Government of the hon. gentleman many years ago tried to advance the law in this respect, but there has been no progress made, and I think the sub-division of a reserve a great difficulty. The intelligent Indian will, by thrift and industry, acquire the possession of 100 to 200 acres, while others will lose their land. Those frugal Indians are the class fitted to assume the duties of manhood, so they reply: we do not want the privileges of citizenship, which simply mean the power to tax us and involve a surrender of more than half the possessions that we have. I certainly cannot find fault with the Minister for anything he has done, for, if he asked me how the remedy was to be brought about, I could not tell him, and I should not like to find fault with him unless I could suggest a remedy. But here is the difficulty of dealing with the matter. Whether this will remedy it or not I do not know. If the Indians can do it among themselves, that would be desirable; but, on the other hand, it would have to be guarded so that any rights which might have been acquired, whether legally or not, but rights recognized on the reserve for years and years, should be protected. It would never do to give any six men the power to go and arbitrarily change the bounds, although, I presume, the safety of that will be found in the fact that it will have to have the sanction of the Superintendent in Council before it is done, and that they would see that no injustice was done to any one.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** The hon. gentleman is quite right. The old Enfranchisement Act, passed in old Canada, when Sir Edmund Head was Governor General, and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, as well—and he took a great interest in that matter—was passed with a good intention, to encourage by degrees the Indians to enfranchise themselves, to become freeholders, and to assume the responsibilities of citizenship. But, in the first place, the machinery was rather cumbersome. By way of protecting the Indians from the consequences of their own improvidence, they were surrounded with so many safeguards that really it became rather a complicated system for them to obtain enfranchisement; and then there has been, as the hon. gentleman says, considerable reluctance among the Indians to adopt the Enfranchisement Act. They have great advantages as they are now. They have their reserves, they have their land in common, they deal with the land, after their own fashion, they do not pay any taxes, they are not obliged to serve in the militia or to serve on juries, and they really have all the advantages of the protection and

order maintained by the Government of the country; and yet, except by the purchase of dutiable goods, whether of Excise, like whisky, or imported goods, they contribute nothing to the public revenue. The Indians are quite well aware of that, and they resist the attempts of the Department of Indian Affairs to make them responsible fellow-subjects of ours. I know a case in Lower Canada, of an Indian who was a large merchant, worth, they say, from \$50,000 to \$100,000. When he was asked: "Why do you not become a white man and be elected to Parliament?" he would shrug his shoulders and say: "No; I am only a poor Indian." He did not wish to pay any contribution to the State. It is very difficult to get them to adopt the Enfranchisement Act. However, it had not been altogether a dead letter. In some instances it has been accepted to a very small degree, and I am not at all sure that, even in those instances, it has been altogether successful. The enfranchised father, who has proved himself worthy of it, occupies the estate, but too often it happens that the estate is dissipated by the children. They return to the semi-wild habits of the tribe, and the property is lost. Still, there must be an end to that sometime. The Indians are being now very well educated. I think the hon. gentleman would say that the Indians in his vicinity are an educated people on the whole, and there must be some time when they will cease to be in a state of tutelage, and will be obliged to assume the responsibilities of civilized men. This measure, however, does not affect that. The clause about the division of the estate is simply to introduce a system among the Council. If we can get the Council to pass some general law under this Bill, which is now before the Committee, by which the houses and improvements of individual Indians are recognized and protected, it will be a great step. There will be no forced rules, and, if the Indians in any given tribe have immemorably some arbitrary mode of sub-division, or a termination of the occupancy, we cannot help that. It would be very unwise to try to force white ideas on the red men prematurely. This is merely to make an attempt to encourage them to do it, if they will.

Mr. DAWSON. I think very few Indians have become enfranchised under the old Act, and it is highly desirable that there should be some provision made by which they could become enfranchised with greater facility than they can at present. There are a great many people treated as Indians who are really not Indians; they are only part Indians—less than half Indians. In the district I represent, there are a great many Indians and half Indians, and the half Indians are equal, in many cases, to their white neighbours, and just as fit to exercise the franchise. At West Bay, on the island of Manitoulin, for instance, there is a French settlement. They are more French than they are Indians; they are well educated, and they are very intelligent; they farm a little, and are well advanced. It is very hard that such of these people as desire to become enfranchised cannot do so without adhering to the very cumbersome and difficult provisions of the Act that now exists. I believe that very few indeed have become enfranchised under that Act, and if something could be introduced in some of these Acts which would simplify it, it would be a great benefit. Taking this case, where the Indians are to have separate holdings within the reserve, to have their own farms, but still the property to be, to a certain extent in common, under the Government, so that they are not to have the right to dispose of it, I think that at the same time they should be allowed the franchise, or the more intelligent of them might. Some standard should be established by which the intelligent Indians might be allowed to have the same privilege as their white neighbours. If they understood that they had that, it would tend to elevate them in their own estimation. Let them know that they

were equal to the white man when they conducted themselves like a white man and it would tend to their improvement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with my hon. friend, and I have given notice of a Bill for the amendment of the Indian Act of 1880. I have kept the two subjects separate. This is merely a tentative Bill to introduce *quasi* municipal institutions among the Indians themselves. It is that alone, and has nothing to do with any other subject. The other Bill, which stands for the second reading, is a Bill which I prepared for last Session, but other matters crowded it out, so that I could not lay it before the House. It is in type now, and the hon. gentleman will see that there is an attempt in that Bill to meet his views.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I suppose this Bill is not intended to have any effect on the Indians of Oka? They are not in the reserves, and I suppose they are not on the same terms as the Indians in other parts of the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it will not have anything to do with the Indians of Oka. They are on the Seignior, owned by the gentlemen of St. Sulpice. They are occupants on the estate of another party. That is not an Indian reserve in any sense.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to ask whether this clause, as to the prevention of trespass, is intended to prevent trespass exclusively by animals belonging to the reserve, or to apply generally to animals owned by persons outside of the reserve coming upon the reserve and trespassing. If the latter, it seems to me that it will be extremely convenient that the Bill should be the general law of the locality. Whatever is good enough on the subject of trespass, impounding, &c., for the white people, ought to be good enough as regards trespasses on the Indian lands, of the cattle of white people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it that the Superintendent General will see that the law is applied, in all cases, equitably.

On the sub-section 10, section 10,

Mr. BLAKE. That is a serious thing—"the removal and punishment of persons trespassing upon the reserve, or frequenting it for improper purposes." That establishes a sort of criminal law. What is it proposed to make the maximum punishment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In no case to exceed \$30 fine, and in no case to exceed thirty days' imprisonment. That is the Act of 1880.

On the sub-section 11, section 10,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think that is a new provision. I think there has been no officer similar to a treasurer appointed for any of the bands before. I would just ask the First Minister, if this treasurer will have any moneys coming to his hands, other than the money that may be raised by levying and assessment upon property? Supposing the bands do not assess themselves, and expenses are incurred by the Council, said expenses would be defrayed out of the money that the bands receive from the Government. Will that money pass through the hands of the treasurer, or be disbursed by him?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; but by the Superintendent, as heretofore.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The treasurer will have charge of no moneys except such as may be raised by tax levied on their lands?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is one of the difficulties which my friend objects to. He suggests that there should be no treasurer, but that the local agent of each band should be in fact the treasurer of the band. I shall fully consider that point before concurrence.

On sub section 12, section 10,

Mr PATERSON. I see there is no provision made for the appointment of an assessor. The council of chiefs will act as assessors, I suppose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; they pass a by-law for raising money, and the by-law will provide for that. They will appoint the machinery, of course. It will be an annual assessment. This is really to encourage them to tax themselves. Sometimes they do subscribe very liberally, especially for educational purposes.

On section 11,

Mr. BLAKE. Why should not this be extended to the whites? It is an admirable clause: "Any member of a council elected under the provisions of this Act who shall be proved to be a habitual drunkard, or to be living in immorality, or to have accepted a bribe, or to have been guilty of dishonesty, or of malfeasance of office, shall be disqualified from acting as a member of the council."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would be a very good clause for the whites.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should we be more moral with our Indian friends than with ourselves?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It might diminish the members of the Opposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will risk it.  
Bill reported.

#### SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee, and reported:—

Bill (No. 36) to authorize a further advance to the Province of Manitoba, in aid of the Public Schools therein.—(Sir Leonard Tilley).

Bill (No. 37) to provide for the salary and travelling allowances of the Judge of the County Court of Cariboo, in the Province of British Columbia.—(Sir John A. Macdonald).

The following Bills were read the second time and referred to their respective Committees:—

Bill (No. 63) to consolidate certain railway companies therein mentioned under the name of the Eastern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macmaster).

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Innes).

Bill (No. 94) to empower the Sovereign Fire Insurance Company to relinquish their charter, and to provide for the winding up of their affairs.—(Mr. Mackenzie).

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 28th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND THE HIGH COMMISSIONERSHIP.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to a question of privilege. Yesterday, in looking over the proceedings of this House for the

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

previous day, and also over some returns, I discovered that, under the law, Sir Charles Tupper had forfeited his seat in the Canadian Parliament, and I felt it to be my duty, having received that information, to apprise the hon. the Minister of Railways that I would take the earliest opportunity of bringing the matter before the House, and I wrote him the following letter:—

"Wednesday, 27th February, 1884.

"DEAR SIR,—I have this afternoon had an opportunity to examine the papers laid on the Table last night, and, being of opinion that the seat for Cumberland is, on the facts disclosed, vacant, I beg to apprise you that I shall bring the question before the House to-morrow.

"Yours faithfully,

"EDWARD BLAKE."

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is imperative not to lose an instant, in the situation in which we are at present, in laying the facts before the House and asking for its judgment upon them. If it be the case that, many months ago, a Minister of the Crown in Canada has, at the request of his colleagues, accepted an office which not only vacates his seat, but renders him ineligible for a seat in the House of Commons, if that be the case and that Minister has, since that time, retained his place in the Cabinet, I think you will agree with me that, if we pause there, the situation is grave enough. It is not necessary to elaborate the constitutional doctrine upon that point. I shall trouble the House with two brief extracts from our standard work on the subject, one the opinion of the writer, the other a citation in support of that opinion:—

"While, as we have seen, there is no absolute necessity for every member of the Cabinet to hold a Departmental office under the Crown, the spirit of the constitution requires that every one occupying a seat in the Cabinet should also be a member of one or other of the Houses of Parliament, and no one should be introduced into the Cabinet, or be permitted to continue therein, who is out of Parliament; unless he is likely to be returned by some constituency within a reasonable period."

One of the cases cited is that—

"In 1835, when Sir Robert Peel's Ministry was being constructed, it was determined to confer a seat in the Cabinet upon Sir George Murray, the Master-General of the Ordnance. He accordingly became a candidate for a seat in the House of Commons, but was defeated in the County of Perth. It was then agreed, between Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington, that it was inexpedient, and would establish an inconvenient precedent, were he to continue in the Cabinet. After his rejection at Perth, Sir George Murray volunteered to resign his Departmental office, but Sir Richard Peel wrote and urged him to retain it. He added, however, 'I have more difficulty about the Cabinet, and I need not say solely and exclusively on the score of constitutional precedent. The holding of a seat in the Cabinet by a responsible adviser of the Crown—that adviser being neither in the House of Lords nor Commons—is, I fear, extremely unusual, if not unprecedented, in modern times \* \* \*. Of course, if there were any immediate prospect of your return, the objection could not apply.' After this Sir George ceased to attend the Cabinet councils, although he continued at the head of the Ordnance Department until a change of Ministry occurred."

I say that, if it be the case that a Minister of the Crown has accepted, and has for some months held, an office which not merely vacates his seat, but renders him ineligible for a seat in this House, the situation, if we went no further, is grave. But, if public attention, at the time of that appointment, being directed to the circumstances and to the difficulties with reference to the seat in Parliament, which apparently grew out of it, were diverted from those difficulties by a statement in the Ministerial organs, obviously and necessarily, from the nature of the case, inspired, a statement that these difficulties did not exist, because no emolument was attached to the office, under the terms of the arrangement with the Minister, if the public was deceived, if the Parliament was deceived, if the people were deceived, by a statement of that description, and we were permitted to go on as long as we have gone on, on these terms, the situation would be still more grave. If, Sir, you find that a Minister has been sitting in this House when his seat is vacant and his election void, the situation is still graver. If you find that a Minister has been moving Resolutions, proposing Bills, pressing upon the con-

sideration of the House important measures, sustaining the policy of an Administration, fulminating diatribes against members of the House of Commons who may be opposed to his views, telling them that they are giving reluctant votes, and using language with reference to them which, as it was withdrawn, I shall not allude to further, if you find such language used by a Minister who, although a Minister of the Crown, had at the moment he used it no more—not so much—right to be on the floor of the House as the page or the messenger I see before me, and had no more right to address the House or to take part in its deliberations than that page or that messenger, then I think you will agree with me that the situation is of the gravest character. And, if that Minister was so far conscious of his situation that, although he sat here from day to day, although he spoke here from day to day, although he moved here from day to day, yet, when the time came to take a division upon the motions he moved, the Bills he introduced, and the Resolutions he propounded, he presented the ignominious spectacle of flying the division list, and declining to appear and record his vote as a member of the House of Commons, what words shall I use to describe such a situation as that? I think, if this be the state of the case, you will agree with me that I am not merely entitled to call attention, but that I am bound not to lose an instant, after this condition of things has been revealed, in calling the attention of the House to it, and asking it to apply, as far as it is possible at this moment to apply, the proper remedy. The law in reference to qualifications or disqualifications for seats in Parliament, has been from time to time varied in the direction of greater stringency, and, as it stands to-day, it is to be found on our Statute Book in the Act assented to in the year 1878, which provides, with certain exceptions which are not applicable to the present case, that:

“No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance or emolument, or profit of any kind is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote therein.”

That being the state of the law, the office of High Commissioner for Canada—[The hon. DAVID MILLS, member elect to represent the Electoral District of Bothwell, here entered the House and took his seat.] I rejoice, Sir, that I have been interrupted. I rejoice to know that the gross injustice perpetrated by the late Parliament has been found, by the event which has just taken place, not to have accomplished its object, and that justice, though long delayed, has not been wholly denied to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat beside me. I trust that the justice which the people of Bothwell in the first instance, and the courts of the land in the second place, did in the case of the hon. member for Bothwell, will be done by this House to-day in the case of the late member for Cumberland. Now, Sir, the Act establishing the appointment of High Commissioner, provides that:

“The Governor may, under the Great Seal of Canada, from time to time appoint an officer to be called the High Commissioner of Canada, who shall hold office during pleasure.”

And it provides:

“That the High Commissioner shall receive a salary of not more than \$10,000 per annum, and the same shall be payable out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.”

It is quite clear from this reading of the Statutes that you have here a salaried office, at the nomination of the Crown, within the meaning of the Act of Parliament. Besides this salary an allowance was voted by Parliament of \$4,000 a year for certain contingencies, making a total of \$14,000 a year as the allowance and salary of the office. Sir Alexander Galt was appointed forthwith—indeed

his appointment, in some sort, preceded the passage of the Act—but after the passage of the Act, he was appointed a High Commissioner formally, and paid the salary; and for a period of a little over a year the Government paid, out of the allowance of \$4,000 a year, his house rent his light account, his fuel account and his taxes, besides, I believe, some other charges. But in March, 1881, as appears by the papers laid on the Table, an Order in Council was passed providing that, in lieu of payment of house rent, fuel, light and taxes, an allowance of \$3,500 be made to Sir Alexander Galt, High Commissioner, to be taken from the annual vote for his personal contingencies, to commence from the 1st day of April, 1881; so that what the Government had up to that time done themselves, directly out of the vote, in the way of paying this portion of Sir Alexander Galt's living expenses, was thereafter done by Sir Alexander Galt himself, by means of his own expenditure of this allowance of \$3,500 a year, which he used as he pleased, and which, therefore, was more a salary, nominally, than an allowance. Upon this subject there were debates in Parliament in two successive years. The first year, when the allowance was proposed in the discussion in Supply, in the vote of the amount required to provide for contingent expenses of the High Commissioner of Canada, in London—\$4,000—I said:

“I have a particular suggestion with reference to the Supplementary Estimates. We have various headings, as, for instance, ‘Harbours and Rivers,’ ‘Quebec,’ ‘Nova Scotia,’ &c. I propose we should have a separate heading, ‘Galt,’ with different sub-headings.

“In reply to Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,  
“Sir SAMUEL L. TILLEY said this item was to pay the rent of his house and other contingencies. If there be travelling expenses they would fall under that item.

“Mr. BLAKE. So the office is to cost \$14,000?

“Sir SAMUEL L. TILLEY. Yes.”

Subsequently, upon concurrence upon the item, on the 4th of May, 1880, I said:—

“Mr. BLAKE. I think the proposal to pay \$14,000 in all to the High Commissioner of Canada is excessive. I do not think that expenditure is commensurate with the resources of the country. The American Minister, at the Court of St. James', only receives \$17,500, and the proposal to pay our London agent \$14,000 seems to me to be entirely disproportionate. I move in amendment:

“That the said resolution be not concurred in, but that it be resolved, that the proposal to pay the London agent \$10,000 a year for salary, and in addition \$4,000 a year for rent for a dwelling house and allowances, in all \$14,000, is excessive.”

“Sir SAMUEL L. TILLEY. It was stated very clearly and distinctly I think, that this arrangement is calculated to save a very large sum of money to the Dominion. With regard to this vote, I would say the Lieut.-Governor of Ontario has a salary of \$10,000 a year, and he has his house rent, fuel and various other contingencies, amounting to far in excess of \$4,000 allowed him. I think it could scarcely be expected that the representative of the people of Canada, living in London, should not receive something like an equivalent to the sum appropriated for the expenses and salary of the Lieut.-Governor of Ontario.

“Mr. BLAKE. I am not disposed to admit that he is worth twice as much as you are.

“Sir SAMUEL L. TILLEY. That is no test at all, because we are supposed to be here on patriotic principles, and not for mercenary considerations. When I state what is a fact, that some managers of banking institutions receive \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year, I think the amount proposed to be voted is comparatively small. I think the House will not sustain my hon. friend's proposition.”

And there, if nowhere else, the hon. gentleman was right, for my proposition was voted down. In the following year a further discussion took place upon the subject, in March, 1881, when the vote again came before the House:

“Amount required to provide for contingent expenses of the High Commissioner of Canada in London. . . . . \$4,000.

“Mr. BLAKE. It was very natural that a bulk sum should have been asked last year, as the arrangement was a new one, and it was necessary to make proper provision, but it was said, I think, that the amount was properly an allowance. I would like to know if it is now voted simply as an allowance or an amount to be accounted for?

“Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is practically an allowance.

“Mr. BLAKE. That being the case, I think it would be better to call it an allowance not accountable, rather than a contingency.”

The then hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) made a speech on the subject, in which he said :

"He is liberally paid, for, besides his salary and \$4,000 of an allowance, I think there will be found somewhere in the Estimates a further sum of \$14,000 for other expenses said to have been incurred by him. We paid the expenses of himself and family to England."

Then Sir Leonard Tilley said :

"If you allow 2 per cent. for that operation——"

That was an operation with reference to the purchase of the cable——

'you have another saving of \$3,000, which with the other two items, would more than cover the \$14,000 expended during the year, to say nothing of the other services he has rendered. So that, although we have as yet been unable to transfer to our High Commissioner certain duties that are performed by our agent at the present time, during the current year there will have been saved in these operations alone a sum equivalent to his salary and the contingent expenses that have been referred to. I am sure that the hon. member from West Durham will be glad to know that there has been a shilling, that there has been a pound, that there is a certain sum of money saved as compensation for the \$14,000 expended."

I read these passages to remind the House of what the understood situation of the whole business was in 1880 and 1881. You find it agreed and acknowledged that the practical emoluments and profits of this office are \$14,000 a year. You find it assimilated in argument to the position of a Lieutenant-Governor of a Province—say, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario—who receives, besides his salary of \$10,000 a year, as the Finance Minister stated, his house rent, fuel and other contingencies, making allowances for more than \$4,000 a year. You find it acknowledged by the Finance Minister that this is practically an allowance in addition to the salary; and you find an Order in Council providing that \$3,500 of it is to be payable to the High Commissioner himself in lieu of payments by the Government, so that he can spend it as he pleases, and if he chooses to live at an hotel, or in lodgings, he may live at either place, and he may save his house rent and certain other incidental expenses. Nobody can doubt that this is an addition to the emoluments; if anybody doubts it let me ask him how much worse off he thinks the Commissioner would have been if the allowance or contingent provision had not been made? He would have had, in that event, to pay for his house rent and other contingencies out of his salary of \$10,000 a year, so he would have had just so much less than he has by means of the allowance. How are salaries, how is income, spent? Why, they are spent in paying for house rent, fuel, light, taxes, and other living expenses. How does the Minister spend his salary? A portion of it goes in paying rent of his house, or the interest of the purchase money, and in paying for his light, fuel and taxes. If we were to agree to provide a contingent allowance for these, that would be enlarging his salary by just so much; and by whatever name you call it this is practically an addition to his salary. But the Statute which, as I have said, has been made stronger from year to year, and which has been directed to avoiding the possibility of the receipt of emoluments of any kind consistently with holding a seat in Parliament—excepting the excepted cases—the Statute, I say, does not confine itself to the salary; it says "the salary, wages, with allowance, emoluments, or profits of any kind, permanent or temporary;" and that, of course, covers this allowance, emolument, or profit. Take the case of His Excellency the Governor General, which I may be allowed to refer to, as the Finance Minister referred to the case of a Lieutenant Governor. The salary is \$48,000 odd this year, and we know the Public Accounts show what a very large sum in addition we provide each year, which is practically an addition to the salary in various personal expenses and the expense connected for the maintenance of Rideau Hall, which is also provided for him. Another way to look at this is to reverse the figures and

Mr. BLAKE.

suppose for an instant that the salary was \$4,000, and the allowance for expenses \$10,000, instead of the salary being \$10,000 and the allowance for expenses \$4,000. Who can doubt, whichever way you look at it, that we are dealing here with an office of which the emoluments, profits, allowances and salary amount to \$14,000 a year. That was the condition of things during the tenure of that office by Sir Alexander Galt; the Opposition criticising the amount of the salary and allowance, condemning them, and proposing that the amount should be reduced, stating that \$14,000 was too much, the Government not insisting that the amount paid was not \$14,000, but insisting that \$14,000 was just enough and not at all too much. And the matter went on until Sir Alexander Galt resigned and Sir Charles Tupper was appointed. Amongst the papers brought down is an Order in Council, dated 13th May, 1883, which is as follows:—

"CERTIFIED COPY of a report of a Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 30th May, 1883.

"On a report dated 30th May, 1883, from the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, stating that it will be necessary to appoint a successor as High Commissioner for Canada in London in the place of Sir Alexander Galt whose resignation takes effect on the 1st June, 1883, and that Sir Charles Tupper has kindly consented to proceed to England and perform the duties of the office for the present without salary,

"Sir John Macdonald recommends that a commission do issue to Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner.

"The Right Honourable the First Minister also states that the expenses of the High Commissioner will be paid in the same manner as the expenses of Sir Alexander Galt.

"The Committee concur in the recommendation of the Right Honourable the Premier and submit the same for your Excellency's approval.

(Signed) "Jno. J. McGEE,  
"Clerk Privy Council."

And approved it was. So there you find the appointment of Sir Charles Tupper; and the Order deals with two parts, the salary and the allowances. As to the salary, there is no absolute renunciation of the salary in this Order in Council. It is merely for the present that the salary is renounced, and consistent with that, arrangements might be made for the obtaining of the salary at any time. And it is exceedingly likely, I think it is the better opinion, that under such circumstances, an office with a salary attached to it, accepted under such a provision as I have referred to in this Order in Council—if there were no more—that would be a disqualifying office in the hands of the man who had accepted it. The view which prevails in England has been so rigorous as to be applied to cases even where no such provision as to profit existed, and no question of allowances was involved; and one of the latest cases which has occurred was in 1879, when Mr. Herbert Gladstone, son of the Prime Minister, accepted a lordship of the treasury expressly without salary; but it was an office of emolument, and although he accepted it without salary, a new writ was issued and he went back to his constituents and was re-elected, that being an office which he could not hold without vacating his seat, but which did not disqualify him from sitting in the House after reelection. Whatever may be said as to the question of salary being conditional and there being an arrangement for the renunciation of the salary temporarily by the hon. gentleman, who was to receive the salary of the Minister of Railways all the time—I say whatever may be said as to that, it is clear upon the question of allowances. I have shown you how the question of allowances stood at the time; I have shown you the votes upon it; I have shown you the Order in Council upon it, and the practice upon it, and the mode in which the matters were carried out: That Sir Alexander Galt received the allowances for two or three years, and after the arrangement had been made with Sir Charles Tupper, you find the Order in Council expressly stating that the expenses are to be paid in the same manner as in the case of Sir Alexander Galt. So that

it is perfectly clear that this portion of the emoluments or allowances connected with the office was, at the time the office was offered to and accepted by Sir Charles Tupper, to be payable to him. The facts follow, for I find from the papers that, on 27th August, 1883, very shortly after his appointment—he was appointed in May and sailed in June—this memorandum:

*For the Auditor-General.*

Dr.  
Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner, in account with Bank of Montreal, London.

*Credits granted by Finance Department.*

1883.  
Aug. 27—To Cheque ..... £800  
£800

E. O. E.

—LONDON, Sept. 5, 1883.

This is in the return of the payments made to Sir Charles Tupper for allowances. He thus received on the 27th August, 1883, £800 sterling, being equivalent to \$4,000 which was the amount of the allowances voted for the whole financial year now current, and which terminates on 30th June next. He received, I say, within two months of the commencement of the financial year the allowance which was to last for the whole of the year, and it has been held by him ever since. Amongst the papers I find the following:—

FINANCE DEPARTMENT in account with Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner for Canada.

Cr.  
By amount of notes for expenses of High Commissioner placed at my credit in Bank Montreal, London..... £300 0 0

Dr.  
To paid expenses..... £795 2 4  
" balance in my hands..... 4 17 8  
£800 0 0

It shows that the hon. gentleman not merely received the money but spent it. Though I asked for the details, no details are given, and very properly so. Because Sir Charles Tupper did not give any details, and he did not give any details very properly, because the Government had no right to call on him for details; they made this allowance to him in a bulk sum which he had the right to spend as he pleased, and therefore he gives no details, but simply says, I have spent the money. It was not spent in removal expenses; it was not spent in travelling expenses. It was spent absolutely for the purpose for which it was granted no doubt; but it was not spent for those other purposes to which I have referred, which is made quite apparent from the fact that an Order in Council was passed on 21st September, 1883, or a month after the allowance was received, to this effect:

“THE COUNCIL,  
“21st September, 1883.

“On a memorandum dated 15th September 1883, from the Minister of Finance submitting a communication from Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner for Canada in London, in which is stated that his removal expenses amount to the sum of \$836, and recommending that as there are no funds out of which the same can be paid that a special warrant of His Excellency the Governor General do issue for that amount, the same to be taken in addition to the \$4,000 voted for ‘contingencies of the office of the High Commissioner in London.’

“The Committee advise that a special warrant do issue accordingly.

(Signed) “J. J. McGEE,  
“C. P. O.”

So you find \$836 in addition were paid for removal expenses to London. And the return also shows other considerable sums paid to Sir Charles Tupper for travelling expenses during the period of his stay on the other side of the water. For instance, I find an account here on page

5 for £162 13s. 6d., and another account for £65 sterling. I think, Sir, I have now established clearly that Sir Charles Tupper has occupied and held this office, receiving at any rate, part of its emoluments; and as I have pointed out the office, being a salaried office, and an office of profit, the arrangement as to undertaking it, the salary being only renounced for the present, and the arrangement as to the other part of the emoluments being distinct and clear. As to the agreement, as to the understanding and as to the action, the emoluments being not merely due but actually received, the case is perfectly clear. It is perfectly clear that the office, as held, is an office of emolument. He was the Minister of Railways with a salary of \$7,000 a year. The duties of both the offices could not be simultaneously discharged; and while acting as High Commissioner he gets his salary as Minister of Railways, and \$4,000 a year of these allowances. While acting as Minister of Railways here, he gets his salary as Minister of Railways, and also these allowances of \$4,000 a year, for the period he is here. Now, Sir, the English Statute law is not so rigid as our own in terms, but the constitutional application of it to analogous cases is clear as day. The office of Warden of the Cinque Ports was formerly an office of substantial emolument—a very considerable salary was attached to it; it was not a disqualifying office, but it was an office the acceptance of which vacated the seat. The salary was taken away, but there remained the substantial perquisite of the right to occupy Wardour Castle, and some nominal perquisites in the shape of wrecks and others of a kind, which, I believe, were purely nominal. But the office was granted and with these various perquisites, and when Lord Palmerston accepted that office, it was held that a new writ should issue, that his seat was vacated by the acceptance of it, and he went for reelection to his borough of Tiverton. So that if you take the ordinary mode of vacating seats in the English House of Commons, they had not the power, and I believe they have not now the power, of resignation; they must get out by accepting a disqualifying office. When a member of the House of Commons of England accepts the Stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds, or the Escheatorship of Munster, which are offices that have no fees really pertaining to them—nobody gets a shilling out of them—but still they have the effect of vacating the seat. Such is the construction of the law, the seat is inevitably vacated when the office is accepted, although the emolument is in the shape of a perquisite, and a nominal perquisite at that. The law has been construed in fact, as being so extensive as to include the case of a member of Parliament accepting the office of Attorney General in a British colony; for when Sir Bryan O’Loghlen accepted the office of Attorney General in one of the Australian colonies, his salary being paid by the Crown in Australia, and out of the public moneys of Australia, it was held, and held by the very decisive vote of 180 to 11 in the House of Commons, that by the acceptance of that office he vacated his seat in Parliament. The principles of the construction of a Statute of this description are well stated in a citation, which is made in one of the cases, from that great constitutional writer, Hallam, who says:

“These restrictions ought to be rigorously and jealously maintained, and to receive a construction in doubtful cases according to the constitutional spirit, not as if they were of a penal nature toward individuals, an absurdity in which the careless and indulgent temper of modern times might sometimes acquiesce.”

That observation is of the weightiest character. It is of a character so weighty that it cannot be too pointedly impressed on the mind of the House. It is not a penal Statute against an individual; it is a most beneficial Statute in furtherance of the public weal in the preservation of the great principle of the purity and independence of Parliament; and it has been construed with reference to that circum-

stance, and with a view to further that result. Sir, this subject has been the subject of discussion, in times past, more than once, and Sir Charles Tupper himself has given vent to his views with the vehemence, not to say the violence, with which he generally speaks when he is moved. In 1877 he used this language :

"It was inexpedient and improper, unless the Parliament of Canada was to become a by-word, and the independence of the Parliament of Canada a by-word, in the mouths of the people of the country, that while that law stood on the Statute Book the Public Exchequer should be used for the purposes of pouring money out of its coffers into the pockets of members of the Parliament of Canada."

Then he says :

"These hon. gentleman, however, must go back to meet the various faces of their intelligent constituents, who knew and felt that whatever the necessities of the Government might be——"

Mark these words and apply them to the case in hand :

"who knew and felt that whatever the necessities of the Government might be, public principles were of vastly higher and of vastly greater importance than the exigencies of a Government, however deserving they might be of confidence in other respects. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) said he was opposed to the views of his right hon. friend with reference to the independence of the Senate, and he voted and proclaimed the necessity of passing a law that would operate on that body of the Legislature in the same way as the law existing in reference to this House. He believed that the hon. gentleman had undergone, not only a conversion, but a backsliding on this point. Having got on the Treasury Benches, the hon. gentleman found it necessary and desirable to use the members of the Senate on important public services, and to place in the hands of members of the Senate large sums of public money to disburse for their expenses."

The hon. gentleman said that I had tried, but unsuccessfully, to put the Senate in point of constitutional disqualification on a par with the House, and that not having been done when my friends attained power, use had been made of that power to use the hon. members of the Senate on important public services, and to place in the hands of members of the Senate large sums of public money to disburse for their expenses. He goes on :

"The hon. gentleman had found no danger to the independence of the Senate, provided that the hon. gentlemen were able to keep their seats on the Treasury Benches, and he did not further interfere with it."

"When they desired to send some one on the most important mission that any gentleman could be selected from Canada to perform—to deal with the question of reciprocity—these hon. gentlemen selected a senator from the other end of the building, and as far as the Public Accounts showed he was not left without an ample supply of public money, directly or indirectly, to meet all the necessities, and to-day what did the hon. gentlemen find or consider it necessary to do on a still more recent occasion, in connection with the great Centennial Exhibition? When these hon. gentlemen wanted to secure the services of able, efficient and talented representatives for Canada, at a most important crisis, they again went back to the Senate and chose hon. gentlemen, and supplied them with the public money they required in order to fully, and vigorously, and efficiently represent the Government of the country."

So you see that the Minister of Railways complained that the law not having been amended, the Senate not having been put on a par with members of this House in this regard, the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was not acting rightly, in that senators had been appointed, as he stated, to offices and commissions and employments, and given large sums of money liberally to pay their expenses. He thought that would not be according to law if applied to a member of Parliament, and that as he succeeded in preventing it being the law with reference to the Senate, my hon. friend was blameable because he had acted upon the law as it applied to the Senate, though I have reason to believe that the late Senator Brown did not accept anything in connection with his mission to Washington at all. Now, Sir, this subject also came up in the following year upon the occasion of the passage of the Act to which I have referred as the present Act for securing the independence of Parliament; and much discussion took place with reference to that Act. The hon. the present First Minister said :

Mr. BLAKE.

"It was a doctrine which was propounded for the first time, that the rights of Parliament were superior to the rights of the people, and that, whenever they did come into collision, the right of the people must yield. He thought they were the representatives of the people; that they were sent here to represent them; that they were the servants of the people; and that when the rights of the people and the rights of Parliament—the rights of their representatives—came into collision, the rights of their representatives must yield to the rights of the people. This was a cardinal principle of the British constitution, and this was the cardinal principle that must obtain in all free countries, and all Parliaments. But the object of this Bill was to secure the independence of Parliament, not the independence of the rights of the people."

The hon. member at this time was arguing for an amendment to the Bill in the direction of greater freedom from disqualification. He was arguing that the mischief to be guarded against did not apply to certain sections by which it was proposed to disqualify persons in the service of the Local Governments. He continued :

"What was the danger, the hazard, that the independence of Parliament was running? The independence of Parliament had to be guarded against the improper influence of the Crown; in other words, had got to be guarded against the influence, direct or indirect, of the Government of the day. That was the object of this measure, and the object of a measure of a similar kind passed in England. The object was, that members of Parliament should be true and faithful representatives of the people, quite independent in their positions of all influence from the Crown; quite free from any chance of the Crown putting on any screw, or using any influence or power or authority over them; and so soon as that principle is obtained, so soon as a member of Parliament was free from the chances, or suspicion, or opportunity of the Crown appealing to his personal interest—so soon as this was obtained, then the Act could go no further. Then came the great question that the choice of the people should be as much as possible unlimited. Now, if they would look at this Act and at the old Act, they would find that the object of the first clause was to prevent any person holding an office of emolument under the Crown from becoming a member of that House. These officers were at the mercy of the Crown; they might be dismissed, they might be removed to positions more advantageous or less advantageous, their promotion or increase of salary or rank depended on the Crown, and no member of Parliament ought to be so dependent."

Once again :

"They should always keep before them the grand principle of the independence of Parliament, and that no man should be eligible for Parliament who could be held to be dependent upon the Crown and liable to be influenced by the Crown."

Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman adverted to the penalty. As the House knows, the penalty at that time was \$2,000 a day. It was proposed to reduce it to \$200 a day, upon the ground that so enormous a penalty was self-destructive—was destructive of its object; that it would not be enforced; that it excited feelings of compassion; and that a smaller penalty would be more likely to be really efficient. The hon. gentleman raised doubts which I agree in thinking that his present action has done much to give weight to. He said :

"The fifth clause was reasonable enough, that the penalty of \$2,000 a day should be considered too large, and \$200 inserted in its place. The law undoubtedly looked reasonable enough at the first blush, and if the proposed amendment were carried, it would prevent such a pathetic appeal as that made last Session by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in favour of Mr. Speaker in respect to the penalty of £60,000. But a penalty, in order to be effectual, must be efficient for a purpose. A division might be taken in which the administration might be supported by one vote, and a man who knew he had forfeited his seat, might run the risk of giving his vote and paying \$200. He would not, however, be so ready to do so if he had to pay \$4,000. That consideration should be taken into account in settling the amount of penalty, and, personally, he was not wedded to \$2,000."

"Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland). He is liable to expulsion.  
"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the view of the law was that that punishment was not sufficient, and that the offender's purse as well as his person must pay the penalty."

Here, Sir, we have as I conceive, the case of a Minister of the Crown, not voting, it is true, as I have said, but sitting here, arguing here, declaiming here, pressing forward measures here, since the beginning of the Session in defiance of the reduced penalty of \$200 a day, which applies to sitting as well as voting. Then, Mr. Plumb said :

"He admitted that the penalty of the present Act was excessive, but at the same time it might be said there was no excuse for any violation of the Act, and no reason why the penalty should be incurred, and it was certainly a false step to reduce the penalty so that a man with a fat contract in his pocket could afford to pay it. On some very important measure, a man holding such a contract could afford to pay the

proposed penalty and vote upon it. The reduction of the penalty from \$2,000 to \$200 per day was a great wrong, and it showed at what price the hon. member who had introduced the Bill valued the independence of Parliament. They had set a price upon it—\$200 per day.

As I have said, I am afraid a mistake was made; it may be that if the penalty had been left where it was, or retained at a higher rate than \$200 a day, we should be spared the scandal that has been inflicted on Parliament and on the country this Session. Who is to pay the penalty now? Now, Sir, I have not complicated this case with a single word with reference to the incompatibility of the Ministerial office with the office of High Commissioner, or with reference to the incompatibility, on other grounds, of the office of High Commissioner with the position of a member of Parliament. These are distinct questions; they are questions of the gravest importance, which, as I said early in the Session, I intend to take an opportunity of raising. They are constitutional questions—questions of policy—while this is the question of the seat for Cumberland, and I do not complicate it with a single word with reference to those points. I think it will be made clear by what has occurred that the penalty is not sufficient—that more was required to have prevented this thing. I think it will be clear to the House that a breach of the law has been committed; and in view of the conduct of the Minister, in view of the plainness of the law, in view of the Order in Council which I have read, in view of the moneys which have been received, in view of the course which the Minister has taken since the commencement of this Session in reference to voting, I believe I am not speaking harshly or uncharitably when I say that there has not merely been a breach, but a wilful, a conscious, and an intended violation and breach of the law. That, Sir, is not merely wrong: it is a flagrant insult to this House. It is a flagrant insult to this House that an hon. gentleman, a Minister of the Crown, having no right to sit here, should on false pretences be sitting and moving and addressing this Assembly. I believe, Sir, the House will agree with me that that condition of things should not longer remain; that the people of Cumberland, who for the last nine months have been unrepresented in Parliament, should be placed in a position to be here represented; that this Parliament should be purged of the presence of one who has no right to a place amongst us; and that the House ought to take prompt and decided action. I move:

That it appears, that the office of High Commissioner of Canada is an office in the service of the Government of Canada at the nomination of the Crown, to which salary, wages, allowance, emolument or profit of some kind is attached, within the meaning of the Act for further securing the Independence of Parliament.

That it appears that in addition to the salary of \$10,000 a year, attached to the office of High Commissioner, there has been voted yearly, since the establishment of the said office, a sum of \$4,000, to cover amongst other things, the payment of house rent, fuel, light, and taxes of the High Commissioner.

That it appears that on the 23rd of March, 1881, it was ordered by the Governor in Council, that in lieu of payment of house rent, fuel, light and taxes, an allowance of \$3,500 be made to Sir Alexander Galt, then High Commissioner, to be taken from the annual vote for his personal contingencies (being the said sum of \$4,000) to commence from the 1st April, 1881.

That it appears that thereafter during the tenure of the office by Sir Alexander Galt, such allowance was regularly made.

That it appears that Sir Alexander Galt resigned on the 1st June, 1881, and that Sir Charles Tupper, then member for Cumberland, and Minister of Railways and Canals, was appointed High Commissioner of Canada in his place, retaining the office and salary, \$7,000 a year, as Minister of Railways and Canals and the Order in Council making and appointment, bearing date the 3rd May, 1883, states, that Sir Charles Tupper has kindly consented to proceed to England and perform the duties of the office for the present without salary; and that the expenses of the High Commissioner will be paid in the same manner as the expenses of Sir Alexander Galt.

That it appears that the said Sir Charles Tupper accepted, and still holds the said office of High Commissioner of Canada.

That it appears that on the 28th August, 1883, the said Sir Charles Tupper, as High Commissioner, received from the Government of Canada £800, or \$3,893 33, in respect of the said allowance of \$4,000, being neither a fraction of the whole sum voted and payable for the current financial year, ending 30th June, 1884.

That it appears that the said payment is exclusive of the removal expenses of the said Sir Charles Tupper, amounting to \$836, and of the

travelling expenses of the said Sir Charles Tupper, amounting to \$836, and of his travelling expenses as High Commissioner.

That the seat of the said Sir Charles Tupper, as member for Cumberland, was, prior to the commencement of the present Session of Parliament, by reason of the premises vacated, and his election has become null and void.

That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to make out a new Writ for the election of a member to serve in this present Parliament for the Electoral District of the County of Cumberland, in the place of Sir Charles Tupper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has stated that this question is one of Parliamentary practice, and he said that he carefully divided the question of the expediency of uniting the two offices from the question of whether Sir Charles Tupper had his seat or not. It is a pity that that principle, that rule, had not been before the hon. gentleman's mind from the time he commenced his speech until the end. But he took the occasion, at a time when he thought, perhaps, my hon. colleague was not in a position to answer, to make an attack on him which did not, I think, raise the hon. gentleman in the opinion of the majority of this House. I shall not imitate his course. I shall not look back to other circumstances, to other individuals, to other votes, and to other speeches and conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite, but shall confine myself strictly to the discussion of this question. It is of course impossible for a House like this, composed of a majority of laymen, to come to a conclusion upon it on the nonce, on the spot, on this question being raised for the first time, and I am going to move an amendment to this Resolution, in accordance with the universal and uniform practice of Parliament, that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. This Committee will examine into all the authorities, look into all the cases, report fully upon this question, and inform this House what conclusion they have come to; they will perform the duties for which they have been specially selected, and the House, on their report and with full information, will be able to decide whether my hon. friend has his seat in this House or not. The hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend insulted this House; that he was acting in contravention of the rules of Parliament in speaking, in moving and in pressing questions of importance before this House. All I can say is, this House does not feel the insult. This House knows no insult was intended. My hon. friend has been advised that he did not forfeit his seat. He has been advised that he is still the member for Cumberland and has every right to sit or vote, but the question having been raised in the public press, the hon. gentleman did not choose to record his vote and add to the weight of the opinion of this House on the great questions before it. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the mischief which the Independence of Parliament Act was intended to cure. The Independence of Parliament Act was passed for the purpose of preventing the Government of the day from inducing members who are not members of the Government of the day, who are otherwise independent, to sell their independence for the sake of office, profit or emolument. That is not the case of my hon. friend. He was a Minister at the best or at the worst; it was an accumulation of office. He could not be supposed to be bribing or inducing an independent member of Parliament to sell his principles, to sacrifice his principles, or to give his support to the Government by a promise of office. Mr. Speaker, it does not come within the mischief of the Act, in the first place. It does not come in any way within the mischief which the Act was intended to cure. The hon. gentleman has quoted from Mr. Todd's constitutional work on Parliamentary law. The hon. gentleman knows that that is an authority that is always received with respect in this House, and it so happens that I hold in my hand a letter written by Mr. Todd, which I propose to lay before the Committee, if the House sends this question to be discussed there, in which he says;

"But, on the other hand, the English practice will clearly sustain the member so circumstanced in retaining his seat, as will appear from the following precedents."

He gives a series of precedents on the point, that the seat was not vacated in any way whatever. That was the opinion of Mr. Todd, and the opinion of Mr. Todd as applied to the case of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways.

Mr. BLAKE. As to English practice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As to English practice, I know that perfectly well; but the hon. gentleman commenced by referring to English practice and quoting English cases.

Mr. BLAKE. I said our law was more stringent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Do not interrupt me, please. The hon. gentleman read the Order in Council which stated that Sir Charles Tupper had kindly consented to act as High Commissioner for the present, and, of course, he said, that was understood, and, after the present had disappeared, and the future had become the present, some arrangement would be made to pay him a salary. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the circumstances under which Sir Charles Tupper went to England last year. He was struck down from overwork, and was obliged to absent himself from attendance on this House for nearly a month before the end of the Session. His health was so shaken and imperilled that he thought he would be obliged to give up the position he held in the Government. His colleagues, agreeing in this, I am sure, with the opinion of a majority of this House, thought it would be a great loss to the Government, as it would be to any Government, to lose the services of so able a Minister, so good an administrator, as Sir Charles Tupper, and, Mr. Speaker, I individually pressed the hon. gentleman to go to England. I pressed him to get that rest which he had earned, and which his health demanded, in the hope and in the belief—a belief which, I am happy to say, proved to be correct—that rest from his labours, change of climate and change of work would restore him to the same state of health that all his friends are glad and proud to see him enjoy at this moment. He did so, Mr. Speaker; he went to England; and he went with the express understanding and condition that, during the time he was in England and serving as High Commissioner, he should enjoy no salary. It was a condition made in the Order in Council. The hon. gentleman says that, although it was in the Order in Council, it is not made a condition, it is merely made a statement. But I hold in my hand the commission under the great seal of the Dominion, issued by Lord Lorne, in which it is said:

"Now know ye that, reposing special trust and confidence in your loyalty, etc., we do hereby nominate and constitute you, Sir Charles Tupper, knight, to be the High Commissioner for Canada from and after the first day of June next, in the room, place and stead of Sir Alexander Tilloch Galt, knight, whose resignation takes effect on that day, to have, hold, exercise and enjoy the said office unto you the said Sir Charles Tupper, knight, without salary, but otherwise with all the duties, power, rights and advantages unto the said office belonging."

So, Mr. Speaker, he was to go without salary. There was the condition of his office, the condition of his holding, the tenure under which he held the office of High Commissioner. Their argument is: Oh, but there are some emoluments, there are some expenses or allowances; and the hon. gentleman pressed that, that the word "allowance" was to be held to apply to my hon. friend's case, because rent and other expenses were to be paid. The meaning of the Statute is that no party who receives a salary, or anything in lieu of a salary—

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, in lieu of a salary; that is the law. We remember when the law was altered, and the occasion of it. It was said that a man might not receive a salary, but might get an office similar to that of a

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

registrar, where the emoluments came from fees in lieu of a salary.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the fair construction of the Statute, but we know perfectly well that expenses, simply as expenses, allowances in the nature of expenses, or expenses which will be called allowances, stand upon their own footing. We know that our Act was intended to meet the same view that the various Acts in England were passed to meet, to prevent members who were mere hangers on of the Government for emoluments' sake sitting in Parliament and affecting to be independent members when they had no independence. Now, there is a question which the hon. gentleman fairly enough raises, and, if he had confined himself to the legal argument, no one could object to it. He says our Statute is more stringent than the English law. It may be so, and it is a fair argument to use, though I do not see the force of the argument myself. He says that, under the strict construction of our Statute, a member might lose his seat in Canada when he might not in England. That is a fair argument to discuss, and one which I am quite ready to discuss with him before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but the reason we passed the Act is the same as the reason why Acts were passed in England, and the Parliament of Canada had no desire, had no intention I am sure, other than to follow the judicious and praiseworthy precedent set in England, of protecting the independence of Parliament by legislating in the same spirit and in the same direction. We know, Sir, that in England there could be no objection to it. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is not considered an objection in England for a member of Parliament to take an appointment from the Crown, he receiving no pecuniary advantage adding to his means, to his revenue, to his income; if his income is not added to, although his expenses may be paid, every farthing of them. Why, Mr. Gladstone, the Premier of the present Government, when an independent member of Parliament, in opposition to Lord Beaconsfield, accepted the office of Lord High Commissioner to the Ionian Islands, he went in the Queen's ship, he lived in the palace, he occupied it as High Commissioner, every farthing of his enormous expenses was paid during the time he was there to settle the question whether the Ionian Islands should remain under the protectorate of England or be added to the Kingdom of Greece; and no Opposition member, no Ministerial member thought he was offering an insult to Parliament, by accepting large allowances, enormous allowances. No member thought he could attack an opponent by speaking offensively of him or raising the point at all. Mr. Gladstone's independence was known; Mr. Gladstone's expenses were paid, and he had a title almost identical to that which my hon. friend took when he went to England—He was Lord High Commissioner; my hon. friend is High Commissioner. Mr. Gladstone's expenses were paid; my hon. friend's expenses will be paid. But nobody thought for a moment that Mr. Gladstone was offending against the independence of Parliament, or offering an insult to Parliament. No one ever thought that. It was reserved for the hon. gentleman to cast an imputation across the floor against a man of equal standing with himself, and whom he greatly fears—whom he greatly fears, and, Mr. Speaker, if we take the present leader of the Opposition in England, Sir Stafford Northcote, we find that he accepted a commission from Mr. Gladstone as Lord High Commissioner to Washington. And I was there. I did not lose my seat here—because I dare say it would have been brought up against me, I would have been told that I was offering an insult to Parliament, that I was sacrificing my independence by requesting the Governor General to let me go to Washington on an imperial mission. England paid all

my expenses, and therefore I could not lose my seat,—and the Lord knows, I have been attacked enough without that. Sir, look at the Public Accounts in England of the expenses of the Lord High Commissioner at Washington. Why, that Commission cost tens of thousands of pounds. Sir Stafford Northcote was not supposed to have forfeited his seat, to have forfeited his independence, or in any way to have infringed upon great constitutional principles, by going to Washington, and then returning home and sitting through the whole Parliament. No one ever thought of taxing him with having committed any impropriety. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is another question—my hon. friend was not only a member of Parliament but he was a member of the Government. There is no point clearer than that a mere accumulation of offices in the Minister, as laid down by the late Mr. Todd—

Mr. BLAKE. Qualifying offices.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says: Supposing that any Minister or any member of Parliament in England had accepted the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, would he not have lost his seat? Yes, Mr. Speaker, he would. Any member of Parliament would have lost his seat; but if the First Lord of the Treasury, a member of the Government, accepts the double office of Chancellor of the Exchequer as well, he does not forfeit his seat. It is an accumulation of offices. He does not forfeit his seat; he keeps his seat. Mr. Gladstone was First Lord of the Treasury and he was Chancellor of the Exchequer—he has given it up now, and Mr. Childers is Chancellor of the Exchequer. If Mr. Childers choose to resign it and if it was convenient for Mr. Gladstone to accept it again, the latter would not lose his seat; he would assume the double office again, but he would keep his seat.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Mr. Gladstone accepted both offices when he took office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may or may not be the case. I will read upon that point:

"In 1809, when Mr. Percival, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Portland Administration, was commissioned by the King (upon the Duke of Portland's resignation) to form a new Ministry, he assumed for himself the office of First Lord of the Treasury, in addition to that of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Desirous of knowing whether this act necessitated his reelection, he consulted the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Lord Chancellor, and the law officers of the Crown. All these authorities concurred in the opinion that Mr. Percival's seat was not vacated. (See Walpole, Life of Percival, vol. 2, p. 62).

This memorandum goes on to say:

"It is true that in 1861 Lord Palmerston, then First Lord of the Treasury, vacated his seat and went for re-election upon accepting from the Crown the Lord Wardenship of the Cinque Ports. (See Ashley, Life of Palmerston, vol. 2, p. 207). but this would appear to have been an unnecessary and superfluous proceeding, for in August, 1873, a case parallel to that of Mr. Percival occurred. Mr. Gladstone being then First Lord of the Treasury, assumed, in addition thereto, the office of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was contended by some persons that under these circumstances the law required that he should offer himself for re-election. But Mr. Gladstone was properly advised by the Crown Law Officers that such a course was unnecessary, inasmuch as an exchange of offices, and an accumulation of offices, by a Minister of the Crown, are identical in principle. Mr. Gladstone accordingly did not vacate his seat. (See Law Times, Vol. 56, p. 246.)

"In point of fact there would be no difference between such a proceeding and that of the continuance of the seat after Parliament had decided to increase the salary attached to the office held by a Minister of the Crown."

There is the principle. Now, when our salary was raised in 1873 from \$5,000 to \$7,000, we did not vacate our seats; and the addition of another office is simply an accumulation of offices accompanied or unaccompanied, as the case may be, with an addition to the salary. Then Mr. Speaker, on these two points—first, that my hon. friend has not vacated his seat; and in the second place that besides being a member of Parliament, he was Minister of the

Crown—on these points according to all the authorities his seat is not in any way affected. It was an accumulation of offices, and he was not liable to the imputation of bribing himself. Now, Sir, I do not propose to elaborate these cases. As you can well see from the manner in which the hon. gentleman has opened the discussion, and the imperfect reply I have made to him—on the nonce—the only word I had that the hon. gentleman was going to move in the matter was just before coming into the House—the House can see that the case presents very many considerations, and opens a very wide question. Therefore, I move the following amendment:—

That all after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted:

The question whether Sir Charles Tupper is now the member for Cumberland, or whether he has vacated his seat as such, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not think the hon. First Minister has any substantial ground of complaint as to the manner in which my hon. friend from West Durham made his proposition. I do not think that any unnecessarily harsh language was used with respect to the hon. Minister of Railways or with respect to the extraordinary and anomalous position the hon. Minister of Railways has occupied in this House for the last six weeks. Now the hon. First Minister tells us that the Minister of Railways was advised that the acceptance of the office of resident representative agent in London did not vacate his seat in Parliament although there were certain emoluments connected with the office. Now, if I am not very much mistaken, the hon. Minister of Railways himself stated in the last Session of Parliament—or if not in Parliament, out of Parliament—that the acceptance of the office of High Commissioner to England would necessarily vacate his seat. I know, at all events, that about the time the late member for Cumberland was appointed to that distinguished position, some organs of the Government intimated to the public that the acceptance of the office of High Commissioner by the member for Cumberland, then Minister of Railways, would necessarily vacate his seat; and it was stated particularly, and stated very distinctly, that the hon. gentleman would not return to his duties in Parliament, that having accepted that office the seat would necessarily become vacant, and there would be a new election for Cumberland. Now, the hon. gentleman referred to the opinion of Mr. Todd on that subject. Of course, we all have great respect for the opinions of Mr. Todd upon questions of constitutional law and constitutional usage. But to make that opinion worth anything, one would require to know exactly what the propositions submitted to Mr. Todd really were. Was Mr. Todd made aware of all the facts connected with this transaction? Was Mr. Todd aware that the Government proposed to give the High Commissioner an allowance of \$4,000 a year, which was formerly given to Sir Alexander Galt? And besides, before forming an opinion, as to the weight that should be attached to the views of Mr. Todd, one would require to see what the opinion really is. I have not seen it, I have not heard it read altogether. I do not know the foundation, the groundwork of facts before Mr. Todd when he gave that opinion; and until all these matters are laid before us, the House is not in a position to be asked to act on the opinion of Mr. Todd, however much we may respect Mr. Todd's views respecting constitutional questions. We all know that during the last Session of Parliament the then Minister of Railways was not in very robust health. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) has told us it was at his earnest solicitation that the hon. Minister of Railways accepted this position, because his health was a matter of deep concern to his friends, and the trip across the water was made with a view to recovering his health. But it was an extraordinary mode of aiding Sir Charles Tupper

to recover his health to appoint him to a high office involving very considerable duties and very heavy responsibilities. And at the same time to continue him in the responsible position of Minister of Railways. He was not only Minister of Railways and assumed to be discharging all the duties connected with that office, but he was High Commissioner and supposed to be discharging duties connected with a position of such high importance. The hon. gentleman asks the House to believe that the hon. Minister of Railways proceeded to England for his health's sake, when he was actually given additional work to do. I cannot understand that such was the reason why the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) was appointed to the position of High Commissioner. The hon. gentleman has told us that the Minister of Railways was appointed to this office without salary. I propose showing, in a moment, that it is of no consequence, in so far as the Minister's right to sit in Parliament was concerned, whether or not he accepted the salary of \$10,000 a year attached to the office. The hon. gentleman read a part of the commission appointing Sir Charles High Commissioner. I do not want any better evidence than that which the hon. gentleman himself has submitted to Parliament that his seat is now vacant. It is true that Sir Charles Tupper accepted the position without the salary attached to the office, but he accepted it with all the advantages and privileges, allowances and emoluments, and all the profits and perquisites connected with the office. It seems to me that under the reading of the law now under discussion, in the light of the commission produced, it is just as effectual in vacating the seat whether he accepted the salary attached to the office or not. Then the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government told us that the allowances attached to or in connection with the office were not in lieu of the salary; that they were usually given in England, to English statesmen when discharging important functions abroad and had no relation whatever to the disqualification of a member accepting them. The hon. gentleman will recollect perfectly well that the old law, the law of 1868, provided that:

"No person holding any office or commission or employment in the service of the Government of Canada at the nomination of the Crown to which an annual salary or fee, allowance or emolument in lieu of an annual salary was attached."

Is that the law now? No; the law has been altered and changed. Why? It was found in more than one case that in the practical working of this section of the Act of 1868, methods were constantly adopted of evading it, and therefore it was thought important that there should be no chance given for the Government of the day to employ any person who held a seat in Parliament at either salary or something in lieu of a salary. That law was altered for some purpose. It was altered with the sanction of the hon. gentleman. It was altered in 1871 by the hon. gentleman himself. Why did he alter it? If the law was right, as the hon. gentleman says it now is, why was the law of 1868 altered? Why did the hon. gentleman in 1871 pass the Statute in question? Let us see what the law says:

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, to which an annual salary or any fee allowance or emoluments, or profit of any kind or amount whatever from the Crown is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote in the same during the time he holds such office, commission or employment."

You will have observed, Mr. Speaker, that the old Statute simply provided that no person receiving any salary or anything in lieu of a salary should be appointed to an office in the gift of the Crown and at the same time occupy a seat in Parliament. The law is much broader, wider and fuller now than it was in 1868, when the old law was in operation. It now provides that no member of Parliament shall be

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

appointed to any position at the nomination of the Crown to which any salary or any fee, or any emolument, or any allowance, or any profit of any kind is attached. Will the hon. gentleman pretend to argue that the \$4,000 a year which is the allowance made by Parliament to the High Commissioner, is not an allowance, an emolument or a profit under this Act? Unless the hon. gentleman can argue that, and that is the law which I have just read, he cannot for one moment be heard to say that the late member for Cumberland is entitled to sit in Parliament. The hon. gentleman has referred to several cases in England where a Minister of the Crown was appointed to a similar position, with allowances, without vacating his seat; but in every one of these cases the individual had a right by law to hold office and still occupy his seat in Parliament. Will the hon. gentleman argue that he can appoint a Minister of the Crown to be Collector of Customs? Can the hon. gentleman say that Sir Charles Tupper can receive the emoluments and allowances attached to this office, and at the same time sit as the member for Cumberland? I say it can't be done. The First Minister says this is a complicated question, a difficult question, a question of law and fact, which requires investigation; it is not a plain question, and therefore he wishes it referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That was not the hon. gentleman's opinion always. To my mind it is a perfectly clear case, and there can be no doubt respecting the interpretation of the law bearing on the case. If the hon. gentleman were called upon as counsel to give an opinion as to the effect of the wording of the Statute of 1878, he would not have any doubt regarding it. To me, Sir, this is just as clear and perhaps clearer than the position of a member of the late Parliament of Canada in 1877 was to the First Minister then. A motion was made in that Session to refer the case of a member of that Parliament to the Committee on Privileges and Elections on the ground that he had some contract with the Government. The hon. gentleman waxed indignant at the proposition; he said it should not be done, that there was no necessity to do it, that the law was perfectly clear, that the responsibility rested on the shoulders of the Government and that the Government ought to deal with the matter promptly. They were, he said, responsible to Parliament and the country for the mode in which the laws were administered, and they knowing, as they must have known, that the member in question had vacated his seat by having accepted a contract under the Government, it was the duty of the Government to declare the seat vacant and to order the issue of a writ for a new election; and the hon. gentleman protested against its being referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That was the line which the hon. gentleman took then; and if he will refer to the language which he made use of in 1877, when discussing this question, he will find that what I have stated is absolutely correct. Now in this case, it appears to me that the law is manifestly clear; I cannot see how there can be the possibility of a doubt about its meaning. The facts are in a nutshell; there is no mystery, no complication about them, unless the right hon. gentleman can place some mysterious and unheard of construction on the Statute which makes it illegal for members to hold seats in Parliament who are appointed to offices with salaries or allowances attached. The member for Cumberland, while Minister of Railways, was appointed High Commissioner under the provisions of the Statute to which my hon. friend from West Durham has referred. Now it is true that in the commission appointing the hon. gentleman and I believe in the Order in Council as well, the office is conferred without the salary, but with all the advantages connected therewith. There was evidently here a premeditated, designed attempt, to evade the law, on the part of the First Minister, who intended from the very time he advised his colleague to

accept this office, that he should not only be Minister of Railways, but should be High Commissioner, with all the allowances and perquisites attached to that office, and that he should, at the same time, occupy his seat in Parliament. That was the intention and the design, otherwise there could be no object in providing in the Order in Council and in the commission that the office should be accepted without salary. We can thus see how the law can be evaded, how it can be trifled with, if the hon. gentleman can appoint any member of the Government to the highest, and most responsible position in the service of the Government, and still permit him to occupy his seat on the floor of Parliament. Suppose the salary attached to this office was \$1,000, or even \$100 dollars, and the perquisite, allowances, emoluments and profits were \$10,000; the nominee could easily say "I will accept this office without salary, but I insist upon my 'allowance' of \$10,000." He would then be receiving every dollar to which he would be entitled if he were appointed with the full salary stated in the commission, and thus evade the law. All the hon. gentleman has to do is to change the law, make the salary say \$1,000, and the emoluments \$10,000 or \$15,000, and the Minister of Railways can hold this office and retain his seat in Parliament as long as he likes. Now, it is worth while drawing the attention of the House for a moment or two to the peculiar wording of the Statute of 1880, authorizing the appointment of a High Commissioner to England. Here are the words:

"The High Commissioner shall receive a salary of not more than \$10,000 per annum, and the same shall be payable out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue fund of Canada."

Now you see, that by an Act of Parliament, a salary of \$10,000 is attached to the office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, the High Commissioner shall receive a salary of \$10,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, that is the salary, which by the wording of the Act, is attached to the office, and it is open to no other reasonable construction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A salary not exceeding \$10,000.

Mr. CAMERON. That does not affect the question. I do not care if the hon. gentleman by Order in Council makes the salary \$5,000 or \$15,000. What I say is that the salary is attached to the office of High Commissioner, and the Government have no power, by an Order in Council, to deprive the nominee to that office of the salary which is attached to it. I lay it down as a legal proposition, and I defy the hon. gentleman to contradict me; that in defiance of the Order in Council the hon. member for Cumberland might if he saw fit to-morrow bring an action against the Government to recover that \$10,000, and there is not a court in Canada but would give him a verdict for \$10,000. To-morrow, the hon. gentleman may get a new commission appointing him anew to that office, and he may by that commission get the full salary of \$10,000, and say further that if Parliament and the country should unfortunately be deprived of the hon. gentleman's services as a representative in this House, he can bring an action against the Government for and recover every dollar of the \$10,000 of salary attached to the position of High Commissioner. Now, if you look at the disqualifying Act, you will find that it declares:

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission, or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance, or emolument, or profit, of any kind is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons," etc.

Now, the salary is attached to the office, as I contend, and I say that the moment you admit that proposition, the other necessarily follows. The salary being attached to the office, the hon. gentlemen having accepted the office, he is entitled to the salary and necessarily vacates his seat. But I do not think it is necessary to go that far, in order to show that the hon. gentleman is disqualified from occupying his seat. We have here the word "allowance." What is the meaning of the word? Does it mean salary? No, for if it did there would be no necessity for putting it there. The hon. gentleman who passed the Act of 1871, from which this clause is taken, must have attached some different meaning to the word "allowance," or the word "emolument" or "profit" besides the meaning attached to the word "salary." These words have each a different meaning and signification. Now let us look what is the meaning of the word "allowance," because if it can be shown that the Minister of Railways has received any allowance, and that "allowance" has a distinct meaning, apart from the word "salary," he is disqualified by the Act. Worcester says that the meaning of the word is: "That which is allowed for the expenses of maintenance." Now, what is the hon. gentleman receiving this money for if not for the purpose of maintaining himself and family on the other side of the water, and if so it comes under the provisions of the law. Worcester says that another meaning is "a limited portion of food and drink." Of course £800 sterling would pay for a considerable portion of food and drink; but there is still another meaning, "something conceded as a compensation." He gives another definition—he says an allowance is gratuitous, and may be paid in any form. Now, that is just the position here. I do not recollect at this moment whether there is any statutory law fixing the exact amount that should go to the High Commissioner by way of allowance. I understand that to be entirely in the discretion of Parliament; it is a mere gratuity—something given for the purpose of maintaining the position. It is given every year by Parliament, with the sanction of the Ministers of the Crown, and on their advice and responsibility; and having been given by Parliament and received by the High Commissioner, I say the hon. gentleman has brought himself under the disqualifying Act, and that beyond all reasonable doubt. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman got £800 sterling shortly after he was appointed. What has he done with it? Was it given for the purpose of maintaining him? Will the hon. First Minister say it was not given for that purpose? Because if he cannot say so, his argument goes for nothing. Can he say it was not compensation for the services rendered by the hon. gentleman? Can he say it was not part of the emoluments, part of the perquisites of the office? Can he say it was not some pecuniary gain or advantage or benefit? If he cannot say so, I maintain that the case of the hon. member for Cumberland comes under the disqualifying Act, and that his seat is now vacant. Now, Sir, let us for a single moment see if there is any loop-hole by means of which the hon. gentleman can evade the provisions of the Act of 1878—any means by which he can say, although I received \$4,000 from the Government of Canada to maintain and support me, to pay my house rent and my fuel and gas bill—any means by which, having admitted all that, he can evade the provisions of this Act. Now, we know perfectly well that these sums have been paid all along. In 1880, when the office was established, we paid a large sum by way of "allowances"—say over \$5,000; in 1881 Parliament voted \$1,000 for the same purpose; and in 1883 the Public Accounts show that a sum of £542 18s. 2d. was paid on account of the office of High Commissioner in England. I do not know what the items are that make up that sum, in addition to the salary of \$10,000. Now, I ask again, what were these sums paid for? I say they were the "allowances," the "emoluments," the perquisites of the office, and the hon.

gentleman, having received them, I contend, vacated his seat for Cumberland. If it could be shown that there was any doubt or misapprehension on the part of the hon. gentleman as to what the law really was on the subject, if it could be shown that the hon. gentleman misread or misunderstood the provisions of the Act of 1878 for preventing members of Parliament from holding offices in the gift of the Crown with salaries attached, in that case perhaps the course suggested by the hon. First Minister would be the correct one. I ask you if there is any doubt—if the hon. gentleman has not, knowingly, wilfully occupied a seat in Parliament, knowing that he was disqualified? Has the hon. gentleman done it in ignorance? No; he appears to have done it in wilful defiance of the law. What has been the hon. gentleman's conduct in Parliament? If he had misapprehended or misread or misunderstood the law, there might be some ground for the motion made by the hon. First Minister; but he could not have misunderstood the law. He has been here since the first day Parliament opened, advocating certain measures. By his own energy, force and eloquence he has almost carried some of these measures through Parliament; but, as the hon. member for West Durham says, when it became necessary for a vote to be recorded, we found the hon. gentleman leaving the House, and not backing his opinion by his vote. If the hon. gentleman was acting in good faith, there could be no reason for his shirking the responsibilities attaching to every member of Parliament, introducing a Bill, the responsibility of voting for it to become law. I say he has violated the law openly and knowingly, else he would not have taken that course; and having violated the law openly and knowingly, he does not deserve any consideration at the hands of Parliament, and his seat ought to be declared vacant at the earliest moment. I ask the hon. First Minister to point to a single instance, in the whole history of Parliamentary Government, in this or any other country, in which a Minister of the Crown has pursued the course which has been pursued by the hon. Minister of Railways in this instance, or in which even a member of Parliament has pursued such a course? The hon. gentleman will fail to adduce a single instance that will justify the hon. Minister of Railways in the course he has pursued. I know that the hon. Minister of Railways has said and done many extraordinary things in his long and eventful political career; but the most extraordinary thing he ever did was to sit in Parliament when he had no right to do so, and to initiate and carry through Parliament measures of legislation, when he was not prepared to assume the responsibility of backing up his views by his vote. The hon. gentleman had no right to be here during the whole of this Session of Parliament, and I say that from his conduct one can come to no other conclusion than that the hon. gentleman knew that he had no right to be here. Now, let us see what the hon. First Minister himself said when a Bill was submitted to Parliament in 1877 on this subject. Let us see what high ground he then took against members in similar circumstances to those of the hon. Minister of Railways, occupying their places on the floor of Parliament. The hon. gentleman was then a real purist in this matter; if there was not any doubt but that the seat became vacant by the conduct of the member, the matter ought to be dealt with promptly by Parliament; then, the hon. gentleman's opinion was that members of Parliament should be, like Cæsar's wife, above suspicion. But now, he allows his colleague to occupy his seat for six weeks, and to initiate and carry measures through Parliament, when he knows that by the Statute he had no more right to a seat in Parliament than the door-keeper without the door there. Now, I say that the hon. gentleman took high ground in 1877, when questions were under discussion that related to independence of Parliament, and when a Bill was introduced

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

for the purpose of indemnifying persons who had unwittingly violated the law. The hon. gentleman does not take such high ground to-day. The hon. gentleman knows that in olden times they did not refer cases of this kind to the Committee on Elections and Privileges. They had a summary way of dealing with men who occupied seats on the floor of Parliament which they had no right to occupy, and I sometimes regret we have not to-day more of those sturdy out-spoken vindicators of the Constitution in Parliament. If we had, this question would have been dealt with in the earlier days of the Session, and the hon. the Minister of Railways would not have been occupying for the last six weeks a seat in Parliament which he had by his own conduct forfeited. In the olden days, if a member of Parliament accepted an office under the Crown to which any allowance or any fee was attached, they did not go through the formality of referring his case to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but his seat was at once declared vacant, and he was expelled from Parliament, if he had not the good sense to resign. Parliament expelled him without hesitation, if he had the indecency to sit in Parliament without having the right to his seat. Two hundred years ago that was the course taken, and I say I regret we have not to-day more of the sturdy old vindicators of the Constitution in Parliament that they had 200 years ago. Then, in 1693, Mr. Isaacson was expelled for having acted as Commissioner of Stamp Duties. They had no such strict law then as now, they had no law at all of the character of the law we have now, yet so anxious were they to maintain the freedom and the independence of Parliament that no person who occupied a position under Government with any allowance attached to it, was allowed to sit in Parliament. Mr. Cornish in the same year was expelled for the same reason. Yet to-day we have the hon. gentleman, as High Commissioner, receiving £300 sterling for allowances and perquisites for the purpose of meeting the expenses connected with his own maintenance in his mission to England—we have Ministers admitting that, yet we have him sitting on the floor of this House, not voting, it is true, but initiating and carrying through the Legislation of the country, just as if he had not been appointed to any office except the one he holds as Minister of Railways. In 1700 Sir Henry Furness was expelled for acting as trustee for circulating Exchequer Bills; in the same year Mr. Heathcote was expelled for the same offence; in 1762, the seat of Mr. Lind who had accepted the office of Conservator of the privileges of the Scotch nation in the Netherlands and resident there for the affairs of Scotland, was declared vacant. None of these cases were anything like as clear and strong as that of the hon. Minister of Railways, yet in all of them the seats were declared vacant and in some of them the members were expelled. In 1869 a new writ was issued for Poole in the room of Mr. Jeffrey, Consul-General to the Queen of Portugal; and in the Cambridge Election case in 1866, it was determined that the Counsel to the Secretary of State for India was disqualified to sit and vote in Parliament, as holding a new office created under the India Act of 1858. There was no salary attached to that office; there was no lump sum fixed as salary; the Counsel got fees or "allowances" only, and yet his seat was declared vacant because he was appointed to a position of emolument under the Crown. Here, however, in defiance of the Act of Parliament, in the face of his own Commission, in the face of the fact that he received these allowances and perquisites, he sees fit to occupy a seat in Parliament; and it appears from the statement of the hon. the First Minister that the hon. the First Minister is disposed to justify him. If we only do our duty towards Parliament and the people, we shall declare this seat vacant now. Hon. gentlemen will understand that the disqualification for a seat in Parliament does not depend entirely on the salary attached

to the office, but, as the hon. member for West Durham showed, if there are any emoluments, perquisites or allowances attached to the office, the seat becomes vacant just the same as if a fixed salary were attached to it. Before the recent changes in the law in England, the office of King's Sergeant, an office of importance, had no salary attached to it, and if the hon. gentleman will enquire he will find that when Mr. Sergeant Best was appointed to that distinguished position, he had the patent creating him King's Sergeant so drawn that it would not contain the words usually contained in a patent of that kind. He had it so drawn, that it gave him only the office and not the perquisites connected with it. These perquisites were not in money or in allowances for fuel, maintenance, coal, or house rent, but there was a certain quantity of stationery given to the King's Sergeant each year, and in order that he might not, on this account, be disqualified to hold his seat in Parliament, Mr. Best had the patent so drawn as to exclude the words granting these perquisites. This is a case in point. It was admitted that if the patent had been issued in the usual form, Mr. Best would have been disqualified from occupying a seat in Parliament, and to get over that difficulty every perquisite connected with the office was excluded from the operation of the patent. Is that the case here? No, Sir, the advantages, the perquisites and the allowances attached to the office of High Commissioner are all handed over to the hon. Minister of Railways. Another case in point, is that of the Chiltern Hundreds. In England, the only way a seat can be vacated in Parliament is by the member receiving the appointment to and accepting the office of Steward or Bailiff of one of Her Majesty's three Chiltern Hundreds of Stoke, Desborough and Bournemouth. Everybody knows there is no salary attached to these offices, but there are certain perquisites attached to them, and as the warrants appointing members to the positions say: "Together with all wages, fees, allowances, etc.," they assume the form of places of profit, and thus vacate the seat. The hon. the Minister of Railways has his fees, with the emoluments and allowances connected with the office of High Commissioner, and he took good care to get the allowances before he left Canadian territory to discharge the important duties that devolved upon him in connection with this mission. There could not be a clearer case than the case referred to by the hon. member for West Durham, that of Viscount Palmerston. It is a case expressly in point. The very words used in appointing the hon. Minister of Railways to the office of High Commissioner are the very words used in the appointment of Viscount Palmerston, in 1881, to the distinguished office of Constable of Dover Castle. The hon. Minister of Railways accepted office without the salary, but with the perquisites and the allowances—with an allowance of £800 sterling—and yet he still occupies a seat on the floor of Parliament. There was never a greater outrage perpetrated upon Parliament.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CAMERON. Hon. gentlemen opposite may call derisively, oh, oh. I do not expect anything else from hon. gentlemen. They sustained the hon. Minister of Railways in forcing the Bill through Parliament, giving \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway; now they will defend and justify him for illegally occupying a seat in Parliament. I say boldly, that no member of Parliament ever occupied a more humiliating position than the hon. Minister of Railways. He comes illegally into Parliament; he forces legislation through Parliament, and at the critical moment, when the vote is to be taken, and after having rallied his friends, the hon. Minister rallies, Mr. Speaker, behind your chair. He told us the other day he always had the courage of his convictions, that he always voted according to them; but his courage to-day, like that of the

immortal Bob Acres, oozed out of his finger ends. What has the hon. gentleman to be afraid of? The Act of Parliament provides in clear terms that he is not entitled to sit or vote in Parliament, and that he who sits and votes in Parliament without the right to be there, shall be liable to a penalty of \$200 for each offence. He is liable to a penalty of \$400 per day, if he sits and votes. The hon. gentleman's courage was only equal to his convictions to the extent of half of \$400. I say now that, if we want to sustain the independence and freedom of this Parliament, if we want to maintain the honour and dignity of this Parliament, if we want that the fountains of legislation shall be pure and uncorrupted, if we do not want to have members here who are incapable of giving free and unbiassed voice to their opinion, then the motion of my hon. friend from West Durham ought to prevail, and ought to prevail now. I shall vote for that motion. I shall support that motion. I shall, with all my power, both of voice and vote, sustain that position, and it is the only honourable and fair position that a man can take. I am satisfied that, if you search the history of this country you will find no parallel to the case of the hon. gentleman, and I trust that the student of the history of Canada in the future will find no case except the case of the hon. the Minister of Railways, where a Minister has been appointed to an important position, with emoluments, and allowances, and perquisites attached to that office, and yet has not had the courage to go before his constituents and ask for their confirmation of the position which he has taken, if a confirmation could be had in the case of the hon. gentleman. There is no justification for it. There is no justification for the position that the Minister of Railways occupies. There is no justification for the position the Government occupy, knowing full well for the last month that the Minister of Railways had no more right to that seat than the page who is on the floor of Parliament, and the Ministers have been derelict in their duty to the people and to the Parliament of this country; otherwise, on the opening day of the Session, they would have introduced the resolution that my hon. friend has now introduced, and declared the seat for Cumberland vacant.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I observed that the First Minister commenced his speech, in reply to my hon. friend from West Durham, by accusing him of having degraded the debate by making certain observations. These were not observations of my hon. friend himself, but he read them from a speech made by the hon. the Minister of Railways some two or three years ago, and addressed to the House on an occasion similar to that which occupies the attention of the House at this moment. It seemed to me, when the First Minister made his observations, that they were rather a censure upon his colleague than an attack upon my hon. friend, for, if it were an improper thing to quote those observations, how much more improper was it for the hon. gentleman who addressed them to the House. The First Minister said that these perquisites which the hon. gentleman received, these allowances which were voted him, were no part of his salary, and that the Independence of Parliament Act expressly provided that it was only allowances given in lieu of salary which could disqualify a member for sitting in the House. The hon. gentleman, it is quite obvious, had forgotten the words of the Independence of Parliament Act. Those were the words in the Act many years ago, but the right hon. gentleman himself ought to have remembered that a colleague of his proposed an amendment to the Act in consequence of objections made to the present Judge Gray for sitting in the House. Mr. Gray was paid in a particular way for undertaking the codification of the laws of the Provinces. The hon. gentleman had appointed Mr. Gray to that office. He proposed to pay him in a way different from that provided

by the Independence of Parliament Act, and it was for the express purpose of meeting that particular case that the Act was changed at that time, and has been further changed and made more strict in its provisions since that time. One thing that impressed itself on my mind very strongly, when the hon. gentleman was addressing himself to the motion of my hon. friend, was this: He said there was no objection to a Minister holding an accumulation of offices. That is true, if the offices are such as a Minister is entitled to hold, or any party is entitled to hold and sit in the House. But he took this position, that a Minister might hold a position which would disqualify any other member. The hon. gentleman held, as I infer from his remarks, that it is perfectly true that, if a private member of the House were appointed to this particular office, he would vacate his seat, but that the rules which apply to other members under this Independence of Parliament Act do not apply to a Minister of the Crown, because a Minister of the Crown cannot be influenced to vote for the Administration, he cannot be purchased to vote in the way an ordinary member can, and therefore the reasons for the law relating to the independence of Parliament do not apply to a Minister of the Crown. But, Mr. Speaker, in looking at the Independence of Parliament Act, I find other provisions. I find it is declared that persons holding certain fees, wages, allowances, or profit of any kind whatever shall be disqualified to sit in the House. I find that the Act goes on and makes certain exceptions, and in the exceptions it includes persons holding certain offices, Secretary of State, Minister of Justice, Minister of the Interior, and other Cabinet offices are mentioned, and it further continues in these words: "Or any office which may be hereafter created to be held by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada"—any other office which may be created to be held by a Minister of the Crown. Is this an office created to be held by a Minister of the Crown? Is it a Cabinet office? Certainly not. It was created, and Sir Alexander Galt was appointed to it. It was created for the purpose of being held by some one who is not a Minister of the Crown, for the purpose of being held outside of the Government altogether. The character of the office is not changed by appointing a Minister of the Crown to it. The moment he is appointed, he vacates his seat in Parliament. What would be the conclusion which would flow from the statement of the right hon. the leader of the House? The conclusion would be that the hon. member for Cumberland may accept this office and continue to sit here, and it does not affect his seat because he is a Minister of the Crown; but, if he resigned his seat in the Cabinet, he would be disqualified, because as a private member he would be holding an office in which he might be influenced to support the Government against his judgment. That shows that the line of argument taken by the hon. gentleman is not tenable. Can it be that Sir Charles Tupper, that the Minister of Railways, could hold this office without its affecting his seat, because he is a member of the Government, and that, by resigning his position as a member of the Government, the Independence of Parliament Act would be revived against him, and his seat would be vacated because he was High Commissioner? That is sufficient to show that the construction which the hon. gentleman seeks to place upon the law is not a reasonable construction; and we have, besides, the rule that the inclusion of certain offices is the exclusion of all others. You have in this Act declared, on general principles, that any party holding an office of profit or emolument, to which a salary is attached, shall thereby vacate his seat; you have in addition to that certain exceptions taken, and those exceptions include certain Cabinet offices now existing or certain other Cabinet offices which it may be found necessary hereafter to create; and when these are specially mentioned, it is perfectly obvious that no other offices can be included within that exception, except those expressly set forth.

Mr. MILLS.

That being the case, I think it is perfectly clear that the seat of the Minister of Railways has become vacant in this House, and I shall vote for the motion of my hon. friend, and against the proposition of the First Minister, because I have no doubt in my mind, and I think an enquiry is altogether unnecessary.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Speaker, I rise, first, to protest, as a member of this House, against the imputation which I think is wrongly cast upon the conduct of a member of this House and of a member of the Government, who has, in the office which he has accepted in the disinterested manner in which he has done it, not only not forfeited his seat in Parliament, but certainly acquired the thanks of this Parliament, the thanks of the people of this country. I may say, speaking personally, that I have also been prompted to rise upon this occasion, in order to set aside once for all the absurd and unfounded rumours which have been circulated by Opposition papers, that there had been dissensions between myself and the hon. Minister of Railways. Our political, official and personal intimacy has never ceased, and not even a shadow has ever come over our intercourse. Therefore, I hope this rumour will be forever set at rest in the minds of those people who have nothing else to do but to try to excite division in camps that are never divided. I was sorry that the mover of the first resolution thought necessary to use expressions which, upon an occasion of this kind, were not warranted. I think, in a discussion of a question so important, hon. members might have avoided personal attacks upon the hon. member against whom this proposition is made. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman who has made the proposition, that the hon. member for Cumberland, in accepting the office, did not do so for the purpose of making any profit or lucre, which is forbidden by law and by honesty. I desire to say a word as to the manner in which the High Commissioner has performed his duties in England and in Europe. It is known to every one that he has occupied that position with great credit to this country. On more than one occasion he has performed services which have gained for him the gratitude of the whole community. On one occasion we know that it was owing solely to his personal energy, solely to his special acquaintance with certain parts of science, that he was able to secure great advantages to this country in one of the most important branches of its trade. I, for one, am exceedingly happy to render this testimony in his favour. On one or two occasions the hon. Minister of Railways has visited France in order to pursue negotiations toward extending commercial relations between France and Canada. I have had correspondence with eminent men in France who have spoken highly of that hon. gentleman's high qualities, and have acknowledged the credit he was doing to this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, in coming to the question before the House we should endeavour not to confuse two separate questions—the position of a member of Parliament, and the position of a member of the Government. An hon. member has quoted the Statute of 1868 and has contended that that Statute clearly shows what was the real intention of our Parliament at that time, and what the view was in England when similar Statutes were passed. That clause has been repealed, but it was not repealed for the reason mentioned by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). That clause stated that a member of Parliament would be disqualified by holding any office to which was attached any salary or emolument, or for which he received anything "in lieu" of a salary. What was, and what is, the intention of Parliament? Everybody knows that it is to prevent a member of Parliament from being under the undue influence of the Crown by receiving certain profits or emoluments that might destroy his independence as a representative of the people. The words "or anything

in lieu of a salary," were added because fees might be given to a professional man really amounting to a yearly salary, or to prevent accepting offices where a commission on dues collected would have taken the place of emoluments. It was never meant to cover the case of a member of the Government for performing certain services and incurring certain expenses, and in which position he could in no wise be unduly influenced by the Crown. In that case, the Minister is still in the pay of the Crown, and the Statute was never meant to cover such a case. It was not intended to prevent a member of the Government from being paid his necessary personal expenses when acting in the capacity of an agent of the Government if that capacity was not inconsistent with the duty he had to perform as such member of the Government. The hon. member has asked whether a member of the Government could be appointed, for instance, Collector of Customs at Toronto, or Montreal, and receive fees or salary therefor. No Sir, he could not, because then he would be receiving a salary or a fee. But I would put the question in another shape. Suppose a difficulty arose in one of the districts of British Columbia in respect to the collection of Customs, and suppose the Minister of Customs, by an Order in Council, was authorized to go and settle the difficulty which the Collector of Customs himself could have settled, and suppose the Minister, in fulfilling this mission, was promised that his expenses would be paid, would he thereby be disqualified? Would he be disqualified for doing the work of a Collector of Customs? Suppose a Minister of the Crown was sent on a mission abroad, as has been the case in England, and that he was also authorized to perform other duties, but without receiving a salary therefor, and if the Order in Council appointing him, specially mentioned that no salary was attached to the mission—in that case would he not be entitled to have his expenses paid? The hon. member says that two hundred years ago the members of the English House of Commons were a great deal more strict in these matters than we are now, that the proceedings were more rigorous, and that a member of Parliament who received any money from the Crown would not be entitled to keep his seat. Two hundred years ago the law upon the subject was not more severe than it is to-day. All I know is that during the last century, during the continental wars of the first Empire, there was a celebrated man who was, for several months, on the continent fulfilling important duties. This Minister, I am sure, received large sums of money, from the British Government, and no one ever imagined that, acting as he did in a public capacity for the Government, he forfeited his seat in Parliament—I refer to Lord Castlereagh. Is it not a fact that the spirit of the law in England has ever been that Ambassadors and Ministers to Foreign Courts still held their seats in Parliament? They did so long before any legislation enabling them to retain their seats whilst under pay from the Crown. Two hundred years ago the spirit of the law in England, being the same as it is to-day in Canada, did not exclude from seats in Parliament those Ministers who received both the salaries and the expenses of their mission. The acceptance of a commission in the army did not prevent a member from occupying a seat in Parliament. It will be answered that these cases have been provided for by Statute. But I say it was the intention of the English Parliament, and it was held long before any law was enacted in that respect, that the fact of Ministers accepting special missions and receiving money from the Crown in respect to such missions, should not prevent them from holding seats in Parliament. Our Statutes, and especially the Statute of 1878, all point in the same direction. The Act of 1878 provides:—

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada at the nomination of the Crown or at the nomination of any of

the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages allowance or emolument or profit of any kind is attached."

There is the meaning of the law, the spirit of the Statute, the intention of the Legislature: that is to say, that the holding of any office with a "profit of any kind," which is equivalent to a fee for the performance of work done, equivalent to a fee for the time taken up in such employment, such fee, such emolument, such allowance, being a profit for work done, is considered to be a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. I need not refer to the assertion, because I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will not take the point much into consideration, that in the Order in Council referring to the appointment of the Minister of Railways, no mention is made of any salary; on the contrary, the salary is specially suppressed. Again the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) said that the Minister of Railways or his heirs and assigns, after he had left his seat in the House, could recover the amount of \$10,000 salary as High Commissioner. Well, we all know such exaggerations are not to be taken into consideration by this House; but the statement shows to what means hon. gentlemen opposite will have recourse in order to try and make an argument. So the question is, whether the office which the Minister of Railways held and the services rendered by him in his capacity as High Commissioner, were such as to render him, as a member of the Government unfit to hold his seat in Parliament. I say no. I say that, because a member of the Cabinet can, outside of his Department, fill a mission, at the bid of the Crown and for the benefit of the country, provided he has done it and given the whole of his time and the benefit of his experience, talents and efforts, without hope of any profit whatever to himself, and no Statute forbids that his expenses in the service of his Government and the country should, under such circumstances, be paid to him. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) contended that much depended on whether the office held was one which could be held hereafter by a Minister of the Crown, and he affirmed that the office of High Commissioner could not be held by a Minister of the Crown. Suppose for a moment that the expenses of the Minister of Railways in England and on the continent had not been paid, surely this question would not have arisen, or if it had arisen, it would have fallen to the ground. The argument of the hon. member for Bothwell, that it was not competent for the Minister of Railways to fill an office which cannot be held by a Minister of the Crown, cannot obtain, because I contend that a Minister can lawfully, and according to the Statutes, be appointed High Commissioner, provided he receives nothing in the shape of profit, as set forth in the Statute, and salary is specially mentioned in the Order in Council as not to be received by him, and it has not been received by him. Then the whole question is whether the sum received is a fee or an emolument, or whether it is only the ordinary expenses which a Minister of the Crown can receive; and I hold the opinion that it is one of those cases. It is to be regretted that such a case should have been brought before the House. Everyone acquainted with the work performed by the High Commissioner, would consider it a degradation of Parliament to indict and impeach a Minister of the Crown and member of Parliament for having done gratuitously duty for which everyone will praise him and which the country will thank him for having performed.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. First Minister will lay on the Table the entire letter, from which he read an extract.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give the hon. gentleman a copy of it.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the debate closes? Before eight o'clock?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. There is an ominous "but" in it. It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### After Recess.

Mr. CASEY. I should hardly have troubled the House with regard to what appears to me to be a very clear and simple case, were it not for my connection with a former case of a somewhat similar character, in the discussion of which the right hon. Premier and other members on that side of the House took a very different position from that which they now take. I refer to the motion with regard to the seat of the hon. Mr. Anglin, then Speaker of this House, who was accused of being in the position of a contractor under the Government, and of having thereby vacated his seat in Parliament. It will be remembered, Sir, that on that occasion the attack was made, not as now, by a motion capable of being amended, capable of being dealt with by the House in the ordinary way, but by an amendment moved to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, when no amendment could be made, when, consequently, a subsequent motion with regard to the disposal of the case could not be made until after the original amendment was disposed of. Now, Sir, on that occasion, I moved the reference of the whole case to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the right hon. Premier, yourself, Sir, and other prominent members of the party, directly opposed that reference, claiming that the case was a clear one on the face of it, that no matter of law or fact was in doubt, and that it was one which the House could and should dispose of without reference to any Committee. I venture to think that the cases are very different; that on that occasion there were matters of fact and matters of law in doubt, as shown by the fact that opposing views of those matters of law and of fact were taken by members on the same side—by the members of the then Opposition themselves. There were matters of law in doubt as was shown by the finding of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, who found that there had been, on a previous occasion, a precedent for exactly similar transactions taking place without vacating the seat of the member whose right to sit was in question. They found that a member of this House had previously held a printing contract under the Government without vacating his seat, but that in view of subsequent legislation, in view of the moral aspect of the case, it was inadvisable to abide by those precedents, and they consequently reported in favour of vacating the seat. Now, Sir, if at that time, in a case where there was on the face of it so much room for doubt, where there was room for enquiry—room for doubt as to the law as well as to the facts—if, in such a case, the right hon. gentleman opposite felt it his duty to urge that the House should proceed to execution at once, without further form of trial, then certainly it is the duty of the House to proceed in the present case without reference to a Committee. I must here quote a few remarks on this point by one of the leading legal gentlemen of the House, the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in regard to this matter. He is reported as having said:—

"The position which he took was simply this. He believed there was no subject for enquiry by a Committee. If there was any doubt which would render a reference to a Committee necessary, he would not support the resolution. But no person had suggested that the facts could be questioned."

Now, Sir, I think the analogy is complete. Nobody suggests here that the facts of the case can be questioned. There is no doubt whatever that the hon. gentleman who has been acting as Minister of Railways was appointed as High Commissioner; no doubt that he went to England; no doubt that money was paid to him, which he received and

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

converted to his own use. Then the member for North Simcoe proceeded to say:

"What could the Committee say or do? It could only say that the member for Gloucester had entered into a contract for printing with the Government, for which he received the money, and that they found this to be a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. But the House knew all about that without a Committee."

Now, Sir, what could a Committee say in this matter? They could only say that they found that certain payments had been made to the hon. gentleman in question, that those payments were contrary to the Independence of Parliament Act, and that therefore, to use the words of the hon. member for North Simcoe, "there was no object in sending the matter to a Committee." There is no object now, more than there was then, in sending the matter to a Committee, because, unless the Committee have some peculiar power of manipulating language so as to make it mean something else than is meant upon the face of it, the hon. gentleman's other contention on that occasion, that there is no question of law, is borne out here. The words of the Act have been quoted by my hon. friend beside me, and by other hon. members, that any allowances, or fees, or profits, constitute a breach of the Act. Now, Sir, if this allowance, amounting to £800, is not an allowance in the terms of the Act, I cannot imagine what would be an allowance. It is by the resolution of the House as much a part of the emolument of the High Commissioner as the original salary of \$10,000 is; it is as much something for the private use of the Commissioner as his salary is; it is as much an allowance, or an emolument, or a profit, as any other money received in connection with a position could possibly be. Now, as I contend, the facts are admitted. There is no room for doubts as to the facts; and I contend that there is equally little room for doubt as to the interpretation of the Statute. Indeed, this has been practically admitted by the Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau), who spoke this afternoon in defence of his colleague. He did not attempt to say that there was not any breach of the letter of the Statute; he practically admitted that the letter of the law had been broken, but he contended that the spirit of the law was intact. He asked what was the intention of Parliament in passing this Act, and he replied that it was to maintain the independence of members of Parliament; that it never was intended to prevent a member of the Government, who was receiving a salary as such, from receiving money, not for his own use, but for expenditures as a member of the Government attending to the Government's business. Nobody ever contended that it was. It has never been contended that the payment of a Minister's travelling expenses was a breach of the Act, but that proves nothing in regard to the present case, because this was not an allowance for travelling expenses; it was not an allowance to a Minister travelling as a Minister, and attending to the duties of a Minister. It was an allowance to an official, appointed by Order in Council, by his colleagues in the Government, as a servant of the Government, and appointed to do the work of a particular office created by Statute and one to which certain emoluments were allowed partly by Statute and partly by vote of this House. There is no parallel whatever between the case of a Minister who has his travelling expenses paid as a Minister, and the case of a Minister who attempts to assume, at the same time, the character of a paid official of the Government. The hon. Secretary of State said, by way of illustration that a Minister could not be a Customs officer, but if the Minister of Customs went to an outpost to settle some questions in dispute, he would have the right to have his expenses paid. There is no doubt about that. But on the other hand, there is no doubt that if the Minister of Customs allowed himself to be gazetted as Collector of Customs at Toronto, without salary, and if he went and served there as Collector of Customs, and, without drawing

his salary, was allowed \$4,000 for six months' work, acting there as Collector of Customs, and not as Minister of Customs, there would be clearly a case of breach of the Independence of Parliament Act, and his seat would be vacated. The hon. Secretary of State referred to the case of a Minister going abroad on Government business, who, he said, might receive his expenses, so long as his Commission noted the fact that no salary was attached to the position he held. Well, Sir, no case has ever occurred before, that I am aware of, of a Minister going abroad as something else than a Minister—in the character of a nominated and paid public servant; and no parallel can be drawn between this case and the case of a Minister travelling for the purpose of floating a loan, of scattering information with reference to Canada, or any like service. The law of the case is admitted by implication by the hon. Minister to be against his contention, which he only claims to hold good in regard to the moral effect of the law. He said that the intention of Parliament was to prevent any undue effect on the action of the member concerned, on account of favours he had received from the Government, or words to that effect, that in this case nothing of the sort could be urged; that the hon. High Commissioner was a member of the Government already, and could therefore not be affected by any favours they showed him—in fact, that no favour was being done to the hon. gentleman by appointing him High Commissioner. He said that anything in the nature of a fee or recompense for the work done was illegal, but that the money paid in this case could not be regarded as a fee or recompense for work done or as a means of influencing the action of the hon. gentleman. Well, Sir, we must recollect that the total amount of money paid to Sir Charles Tupper was considerable. He was absent about six months, and was paid, in all, something over \$5,000, only a very small part of which, about £160, was for travelling expenses, and another small amount for expenses of removal. But, in addition to this, he was receiving a salary as a Minister, and I suppose he also hoped to receive his Sessional allowance as a member of this House during the time he was in England he received about \$3,500 as a Minister; he also received payments at the rate of about \$8,000 a year. Whether you call it salary, allowance or fees, it was applied solely to his own use, and was not intended for travelling expenses or anything of the kind, because his travelling expenses were paid over and above. As to the contention of the hon. Secretary of State that the Commission was no favour to the hon. gentleman, I am not so certain. We all know that that hon. gentleman is sometimes in a weak condition of health, and we all know that a trip across the Atlantic has, on previous occasions, had a marvellous, I might almost say a miraculous, effect in the way of improving his health. We all know that three years ago he left Ottawa in such a condition of health that his physicians spoke of him with a gloomy shake of the head. We all know that he did not leave his house until he started to cross the Atlantic, and that he was wonderfully improved and apparently able to attend to business as soon as he reached England. Even if this appointment did not enable him to save any money, it afforded him at any rate an enjoyable trip to the old country, and I hope produced as good an effect on his health as the former trip did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

M. CASEY. It seems to disagree with the digestions of hon. gentlemen opposite—judging from the noises they make—to suggest that the late member for Cumberland had been improved in his health by a trip to the old country. They do not, surely, deny that the former trip improved his health. They do not, surely, ridicule the idea that it had a beneficial effect because, if they jeer at that, I am bound to think that they do not

believe it did. The hon. Secretary of State dismissed contemptuously the contention of my hon. friend from West Huron that the late High Commissioner could sue the Government for \$10,000 of salary as being still due to him, notwithstanding the arrangement expressed in the Order in Council as existing "for the present." Now, if the hon. Secretary of State, who is a gentleman of high legal attainments, instead of dismissing this contention with such an appearance of contempt, had analyzed it and shown us that there was nothing in it, his treatment of the matter would have been much more satisfactory to the House. We have, on the one hand, the statement of an eminent lawyer, that the late High Commissioner could sue; we have, on the other hand, a contemptuous dismissal of that statement without any argument; so that, I think, the inference must be in favour of the hon. member for West Huron. If the contention could have been shown to be wrong, I think the hon. Secretary of State would have shown it, instead of contenting himself with the casual reference he made to the matter. But, Sir, the hon. Secretary of State wound up his remarks with an appeal of a very peculiar nature. He said it was "beneath the dignity of Parliament" to punish a gentleman who had done such service to the country as the hon. High Commissioner, by declaring his seat to be vacant. Well, I do not know that the services rendered by that hon. gentleman were so very conspicuous. I do not remember that he did anything more than one would naturally expect from a gentleman occupying that or any other position. He attended to the duties of his position, I believe, and that is what is expected of any one who is appointed to an office. Perhaps it may be urged in his favour that he was not paid quite as much as his predecessor; but if a man accepts an office, even at a reduced salary, he is bound to fulfil the duties of that office as carefully as if he had a higher salary, and nothing can be said to the credit of the High Commissioner beyond the fact that he attended to his duties. What extraordinary results he achieved, differing in kind or degree from those achieved by his predecessor, we have not been told, and do not know. But even supposing his claims for services rendered had been as eminent as the hon. Secretary of State contends, is that any reason why his seat should not be declared vacant by this House if it is vacant, or why this House should decline to assert what it believes to be the truth of the matter as regards the law and the fact. I hardly think so, Mr. Speaker. I think, and I believe the House will agree with me, that the dignity of this House is better consulted by our seeing that no person sits in it who has not a right to a seat here, than by trying to screen, on the ground of exceptional services, any member of this House who has laid himself open to the charge of having vacated his seat. But, Sir, I am not content to rely upon my own opinion in this matter, however good I may think it to be. I am able to quote an opinion in regard to the duty of the Government in a case of this kind, which will, I have no doubt, have the greatest weight with this House. I am able to quote the opinion of yourself, Sir, when you were not as yet the Speaker of this House—an opinion whose authority will be greater, no doubt, by the subsequent fact of your elevation to the Chair you so worthily fill. This promotion conferred upon you by your own friends will, no doubt, add to the authority of your opinion with them. You stated on that occasion that:

"The object of the Independence of Parliament Act was to secure the independence of Parliament, and to take care that no contractors, placemen or office holders should have a seat in the House."

A little further on you said:

"There was nothing wrong in the Government giving a contract to a member of Parliament, but it was wrong in them to conceal the facts from Parliament and the country, and not to issue at once a writ for a new election to fill the vacancy caused thereby."

*Mutatis mutandis*, I think this opinion will have very great weight. There is nothing wrong, in your own words, Mr. Speaker, in the Government giving an office to a member of the Cabinet, but it is wrong for the Government to conceal the facts from the Parliament and the country, and not to issue at once a writ for a new election, to fill the vacancy caused thereby. I simply substitute the facts on the present occasion for those that were alleged to have existed on the former one, and your opinion, Sir, should convince the hon. the First Minister that he ought, some time ago, to have issued a writ to fill the vacancy caused by the appointment of the hon. Minister of Railways to the office of High Commissioner. The hon. the First Minister himself was very clear in the opinion that it was the duty of the Government who knew a member had vacated his seat for any reason, to call the attention of the House to the fact, and to take measures to fill the place vacated. "Who knew," he asked, "that the Government, in 1874, was giving a contract to a member of Parliament, and yet allowing him to retain his seat?" He may with more force ask to-day: Who knew the Government, in 1883, were appointing one of themselves to a Government position in which he received allowances and yet allowed him to retain his seat? Who knew this, yet continued in this hon. member in his position of Minister of Railways? Who knew this and yet allowed that hon. member to urge forward by voice, though not by vote, the most important legislation before us this Session? "Who," he asked again, "knew the hon. Mr. Anglin was, week after week, month after month, quarter after quarter, receiving his Commission at the hands of the Government, for which he signed receipts?" I ask: Who knew, on the present occasion, that the hon. Minister of Railways was receiving, not month after month, or quarter after quarter, but all in one lump sum, pretty much in advance, the whole allowance for a whole year's work in the first six months of his incumbency, and yet continued him in his place as Minister of Railways? The First Minister then said:

"They knew that his (the Speaker's) seat was vacated, and yet they did not take the steps which ought to have been taken but made the country believe that Mr. Speaker was member for Gloucester, which he was not, and that he was Speaker of this House, which he ought not to be. This was the conduct of the Government, and it was a great triumph for the Opposition when they saw those members opposite had belied all their professions and had taken the course they had."

Substitute for these alleged facts, the facts of this case. They knew his seat was vacated, and yet they did not take the steps which ought to have been taken, but made the country believe that the hon. Minister of Railways was member for Cumberland, which he was not, and that he was Minister of Railways, which he ought not to be. It was a great triumph for the Opposition, when they saw those hon. members opposite had belied all their professions and had taken the course they had. If that was proper language to address to the Government of that day, it is proper to address to the Government of this day. If it was proper, constitutional and courteous to say it at that time, it is preeminently proper, courteous and constitutional to say it now, in regard to existing facts. If there ever was anything calculated to excite the indignation of the House and the people, it is, that, sitting on that side of the House, as Minister of the most important Department of the Government, for the time being, is a gentleman who has no more right to a seat in this House, to use the right hon. gentleman's own words, than one of the pages. A great many of the gentlemen opposite were here when those words I have quoted were uttered, and they did not then howl at all in disapproval, as they are now howling. On the contrary, they cheered them to the echo. Why? Because they were addressed to the hon. gentleman who filled the Chair before you, Mr. Speaker. But when I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to accept the words of the

Mr. CASEY.

Premier himself on that occasion and apply them to the present case, they are not slow in signifying their displeasure. I do not know that I need quote any further authorities on this question. I believe those I have quoted are ample. I believe your own authority, Mr. Speaker, the authority of the Premier, and the authority of the hon. member for North Simcoe, will be quite sufficient to convince hon. gentlemen opposite that they should, on this occasion, proceed to immediate execution without further enquiry before a Committee. If there was any ground at all for the contention that the House should decide immediately in the case of Mr. Anglin, there is certainly ample ground why the House should take immediate action now. I will not detain the House longer by entering fully into the feelings entertained by us and by the country at large, with respect to this case. I believe these feelings will be manifested in a way that will startle hon. gentlemen opposite, even in a few days, as soon as the news goes abroad, that this charge has been made in the way it has been, and that hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the action they intend taking. An expression of the strength of that feeling will be made very soon, but it will remain for a later period to give a full test of its strength. As I see an hon. friend of mine opposite looking very dull at the prospect of that future, I can understand his feeling; but no doubt it will be very pleasant for us, at all events, to have an opportunity of testing the feeling of the country on this subject.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this seems almost a repetition of the debate that we had last Session in regard to sending a certain matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. It does seem to me that it would be more in accordance with that judicial spirit that has not been, I am sorry to say, evinced by certain hon. gentlemen opposite, that we should send this matter where it should be sent, and where it will be dealt with in a judicial and in a proper and unprejudiced manner. The debate this Session was opened by the hon. leader of the Opposition in an acrimonious spirit, and not in the way that the debate last Session was opened; and I could not see for the life of me, why it should not have been dealt with by that hon. gentleman in the judicial and liberal way that would have become him, and that was within his right. This motion is a question of privilege. It is a question of whether we should denude a member of this House of his privileges here, whether we should strike him down and not allow him to sit here longer or vote in this House without further enquiry, or send this matter where it will be properly tested in a proper crucible for the test. I have given some attention to the question since this debate was opened, and I find, and I believe the hon. member for West Durham will find, that he will be as compelled to give in his adherence to the voice of the majority as he did last Session on the legal point. Last Session I had the honour to quote in this House the Act of 1872, which seated the member, now the member for King's, P.E.I. I was met then by the hon. member for West Durham with a derisive cry that that Act had been repealed, and that was supplemented by the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I., who ably seconded the hon. member for West Durham in his efforts; and we found, on investigation, that it was not repealed, and that the hon. member now for King's, P.E.I., was entitled by law to that seat; and we have heard no more of that debate since, although the time of the House was taken up, hour after hour, in debating it, although the member for West Durham declared then, as he has declared to-night, although the member for West Huron declared then, as he declares to-night, and although the member who has just taken his seat declared then, as he declares to-night, that there was no doubt about this question at all, and we

ought to proceed at once and seat a gentleman of the name of Dr. Robertson; and, if we had done it, we would have done it in defiance of the law, we would have done it in defiance of the plain Statute, and this House would have been in the humiliating position of having put on record a wrong done, and of having done a wrong to the constituency which is now ably represented by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. The leader of the Government, the Premier, has moved that this question shall go, and he has touched upon the points of why he thinks the member for Cumberland is entitled to a seat in this House. First, he says, in all fairness, that Act, liberally interpreted, never touches this case at all. He says that the Act was made for the purpose of not allowing any member to sit in this House who was subject to Governmental influence. That is not this case. It cannot be said that the High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, member of Government, was susceptible to the influence of the Government, and therefore had no right to sit in this House; and, when you look back upon the Independence of Parliament Act of 1878, you have a right to look back and see why it was placed before this House and enacted. We all know it was the outcome of what was called the Anglin Committee, that it was upon the report of that Committee, that some proper steps should be taken and an Act re-enacted, that the Act of 1868 was re-enacted, and we have the Act of 1878. I went into the library to see what was said on that occasion, and I have listened to the hon. gentlemen opposite, who have cited what you yourself said, Mr. Speaker, or some other gentleman said, different members of this House said, but they have not touched the point yet of in whose interest or why this Act was passed. Certainly, if a vacancy exists, a writ ought to be issued. They said a writ ought to be issued. That is the question. The Premier of the day, then, the hon. member for East York, upon the debate on the Bill introduced by Mr. Lafamme, then Minister of Justice, used these words:—

"The clause passed by this House"—referring to this Act of 1878—"was clearly intended to preserve its independence, which could only be done by limiting the choice to those who were in an independent position and not subject to Governmental influence."

That is the reason he introduced this Act. Then, could it be said, giving a free and liberal interpretation to this Act, that the High Commissioner, who had proceeded to London to exercise the duties of that office, was subject to Governmental influence, and that the Independence of Parliament Act was passed to prevent him from sitting in this House? Certainly not, because the intention of the Act was expressed by the Premier of the day. So, taking a broad and liberal view, it did not touch the hon. member. It may as well be said that the Minister of Customs, who undertakes the duties of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the time being, and goes abroad to execute those duties—goes outside of the Dominion—charges his expenses to the office, and it comes under the head of emolument or allowance is therefore unable to sit in this House. Such a contention would be silly and idle, and no member of the House would dare to place such a proposition before it. Therefore, the Act was not passed in that interest or for that purpose. Then, Sir, it was passed to keep persons out of this House who were subject to Governmental influence. I will come then to the legal part of the Act. I would rather not have discussed this question. I thought it would have been better that the member for West Huron, as a member of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, who was going to sit as a judge, should not have discussed it. I thought it would have been better that the member for West Durham who, however, had some colour, it is true, because he moved his resolution, and was met by this amendment, should still have waited for the report of the Committee before discussing it. But, since it is clear

that hon. members have chosen to speak upon it, who are much older members of the House than I am, I think it is only right and proper that I should follow in their wake. The Act of 1878 enacts that:

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance or emolument, or profit of any kind is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons."

Well, the Act of 1880 created a new officer, a resident representative agent for Canada in the United Kingdom, to be called the High Commissioner for Canada, and that enacted, among other things, in the last clause, that "The High Commissioner shall receive a salary of not more than \$10,000 per annum, and the same shall be payable," and so forth. Very well; the salary has not been attached by this Act, referring back to the Act of 1878.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. "Hear, hear," derisively says the hon. member for West Durham. I had the pleasure of being interrupted by him last Session when he said the Act of 1872 was repealed, and it was not repealed, and I think his derisive "hear, hear," will be turned into solemn silence before many weeks. I say the salary is not attached by Act, because they may give the High Commissioner nothing. If it were said that it should not be less than \$500, if a minimum was put, it might have given some colour to the contention, but, when it said, "not more than \$10,000," it did not attach the salary. Then we have had the patent from the Crown read, and that did not attach the salary. That took away the salary. It took away any emoluments or allowances whatever, and therefore the hon. member for Cumberland stands in this House to day with this Act not touching him legally. I assert that. I believe that. I have looked into it. The argument is very short and very clear, and I do not believe the hon. member for West Durham, after looking at the Acts, and after hearing read the patent in which it is stipulated that he should not receive a dollar for his services, would put in writing his opinion that he accepted an office to which a salary was attached. He accepted no such office. As shortly and as clearly as I possibly could, I have first shown that this Act, liberally considered, did not apply to the High Commissionership at all, because the High Commissioner was a member of the Government, and secondly, that it does not apply to him legally. I do not think that the hon. member for West Durham should have gone out of his way, at the threshold of this debate, to excite unkindly feelings on the part of members of this House. It was his right as leader of the Opposition, or as member of this House, to bring this matter to the notice of the House; but I do not think it conduced to the strength of his argument to lecture the hon. member for Cumberland; to speak of him as the ex-member for Cumberland, and to point to one of the pages and say he had no more right to sit there than one of the pages of this House; and when he undertook to tell him that he had committed a flagrant violation of Parliament; that he had insulted the members of this House by daring to sit here; when he undertook to tell him that he had been fulminating diatribes here by the day, and without having a right to sit here at all, I do not believe that added to the strength of his argument, if argument he had. Then why was it done? Why, coolly and deliberately, before the assembled Parliament of Canada, if he had a legal argument, why did he not, with his great and acknowledged ability as a Chancery lawyer, who boasts that he never tried a jury case in his life, that he has always been appealing to judges—why did he not appeal to this House as judges? Why did he appeal to the lowest passions of his own followers? Why did he use language to the hon. member for Cumberland, the High

Commissioner, that was calculated to irritate the friends of that gentleman in this House? Why, Sir, I will venture to say that he has not got a generous foe on the other side of the House who did not feel annoyed to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition so inopportunistically, so unprovokedly and so wilfully endeavour to appeal to passion and to excite the hostile feelings of members of Parliament. He was followed by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), who joined in the chorus, and they asked why my hon. friend did not go back to Cumberland and be regularly re-elected, saying that if he did dare to go before his constituents, so great were his crimes as High Commissioner, so great were his crimes as Minister of Railways, and so great were his crimes as one of the leaders of the Conservative party in this country, that he could not be elected in his own constituency. Do they not know that there would not be a man to oppose him when he went there? Do they not know that for twenty-five long years he has met the best men they could put up against him, and that, notwithstanding all their efforts, he has been returned every time from his own county in his native Province. He has nothing to fear from them, and everybody knows that they know it right well. Then why did they adopt this querulous tone instead of the calm, judicial tone that ought to characterize us in deciding whether the hon. member for Cumberland has a seat in this House or not? I say the hon. member went out of his way to do it; I say it was not complimentary to him to do it; and I believe, from the bottom of my heart, that had the hon. Minister of Railways sat in his seat, had he had the opportunity of replying—which the hon. gentleman knows he has not got this Session—but had he been sitting here, the hon. gentleman would no more dare to use the language he did than to cut his hand off. But to tell him that he dare not back up his opinions by his vote! Who is this hon. gentleman, that he would lecture the Minister of Railways on courage?—the man whose back no enemy has ever seen, the man whom, over and over again, he has refused to meet on the same platform, hand to hand, and hilt to hilt, to try out the great national quarrel between them. And is this the gentleman who, during the time he was Minister, and supported the Government of the hon. member for East York, swept with his coat-tails making right angles with his body out of that door, from time to time, and did not dare to stand up and vote! Was he the one to lecture the man who never refused to back his opinions by his vote?—who never refused to back his vote by his opinions? Why, Sir, I expected some one would have called him to order; I thought you, Sir, possibly might have done so—although it might not have been strictly within the line of your duty; although the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) the other night was called to order for a much lesser offence; and after the hon. gentleman himself had strayed from the subject to refer to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—I say, Sir, that any one who had the slightest idea, the slightest scintilla of knowledge of the orders of procedure of this House, would have singled out the member for West Durham as being the greatest transgressor against them. I thought it was in good taste for the hon. member for Cumberland not to vote. I thought that after they had raised the question in the press, after they had moved for papers, after they had, at all events, given a *quasi* notice that they intended to prosecute this matter—I thought it was a proper thing that he should not vote in this House. It seems that that does not meet with the approval of the hon. member for West Durham. Why, Sir, he could not leave the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) alone the other night, because he would not vote. When the latter gentleman asked to have the rules read, and when the rules were read, the hon. gentleman for West Durham said that he did come within those

Mr. WOODWORTH.

rules and he wanted him to vote. The hon. member for Argenteuil answered: "I do not like to vote; there are certain reasons for it." Everybody knew that the hon. member legally, and outside this House, has been connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as their solicitor, and he did not wish to vote on questions in which that Company was concerned. Was the hon. member for West Durham as sensitive last summer when, according to Sir Henry Tyler, he proceeded home to England with a suitably prepared speech to deliver before the Privy Council as the counsel in Canada of the Grand Trunk Railway? If the hon. gentleman says that connection is severed, I would ask his pardon at once. But, certainly he is not the member of this House to impute want of delicacy to members who refuse to vote because there is a slight shadow of a shade of reason why they do not wish to vote. The hon. member was driven the other night to say that he had given up \$25,000 for \$2,500. He has always complained, however, of other members bringing their personal concerns into debate, and of their telling what emoluments or what salary they were receiving. I say that if the hon. member for West Durham finds the members of this side of the House, during this Session, more irritable than they have been, and giving him back sometimes two Rolands for one Oliver, and sometimes heaping upon him a little more than he wishes to get, he may thank himself for the intemperate speech he has made here to-night, in regard to a man who has done more in one year of his political life to build up the land of his birth, to build up the country that he loves and that he has worked for, than the hon. member could do for the rest of his natural lifetime—yes, and I may repeat it, more than he could do for the rest of his natural lifetime, if he transformed himself into the patriotic Canadian which he has not, up to this moment, evinced himself to be. We know the great services that the High Commissioner has done for us in England; we know that the farmers of this country are of one accord, no matter whether Grit or Tory, in according him the greatest praise that can be given any man for the dispatch, for the executive ability, and for the value of the services rendered to them when he reopened the markets for their cattle in England; and they will unanimously agree that he has done more for them than all the speeches of the hon. member for West Durham can do for the next fifty years. I repeat that when another question of this kind comes up, let us act in a judicial spirit if possible, let us see if we can get at the pith of the matter and give a proper verdict. We may have prejudices—we cannot divest ourselves entirely of them; but we certainly can refrain from dealing with a great question like this, a question respecting which Mr. Gladstone and all the great leaders of parties in England affirm, that where there is any doubt the matter should be sent to a Committee. That has been over and over declared and adhered to. There is not only a doubt here, but a very grave question. I think the hon. gentleman had a right to bring it up, but with the papers before me, with the patent, with the Act of 1878, with the speeches of the hon. members who passed that Act, with the High Commissioner Act of 1880 before me, until I am better informed, I believe the hon. member for Cumberland has as much right to sit here as I have myself or the hon. member for West Durham. I happened to be a member of that Committee, and if the hon. member for West Durham convinces me that I am wrong, I promise him I will not do as he did last Session—go out of the building and refuse to vote. I did not intend to speak at any length; I merely rose to give expression to my feelings, and in doing so I have tried to keep within Parliamentary rules; but I do say that in future, when we have a matter of this magnitude before the House, I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will deal with it in a manner different

from that which they have dealt with it, not in the offensive and insulting manner in which it has been dealt with by some members who have spoken on the question.

Mr. BLAKE. If no other hon. member wishes to address the House, I desire to say a few words in reply. Who is it who has been said to be sometimes engaged in reproving sin? After the temperate, the courteous, the kindly, the regular speech of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), I think I may apply that proverb to the hon. member, not in order to violate once again, as he says I have done, the decencies of debate—

Mr. WOODWORTH. I beg pardon, I never said such words as "decencies of debate."

Mr. BLAKE. But you stated so in substance.

Mr. WOODWORTH. State the words.

Mr. BLAKE. I am speaking of the substance. I would not befoul my mouth by repeating the hon. gentleman's words.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a question of order.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I ask the Speaker if I am not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is perfectly in order in rising to a point of order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a point of order. I did not use the words, "violated the decencies of debate." The hon. member said he would not befoul his mouth with my words when I ask him to repeat the words I used.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD. When one hon. member says he will not befoul his mouth by repeating what another hon. member has said, he must be held to state that the hon. member has used language which was unparliamentary, and which he would not and could not, as a gentleman, have used. That is the charge against the hon. gentleman, and I think he is out of order, unless he establishes that the hon. member for King's did use language that would befoul the mouth of an hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER. I regret very much, that in our debates, one of the rules of the House is transgressed by many hon. members. I will first read the rule, and then apply it to this case. Rule 13 says:

"No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family, nor of the Governor or person administering the Government of Canada; nor shall he use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof; nor shall he speak beside the question in debate. No member may reflect on any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded."

In a great many of the speeches made in this House, offensive words are used against hon. members, which I very much regret; and I think the hon. gentleman, in this case, has perhaps used words which are offensive to an hon. member.

Mr. BLAKE. I bow at once to your decision, Mr. Speaker, as I have always done. I regret that you should deem the words used to be offensive. I conceive that the language which the hon. member used demands, or deserves, or justifies at all events, very strong language from myself; but if I have used language contrary to parliamentary usage, I very willingly withdraw it. I was about to observe that I would not follow in the hon. gentleman's course and conduct my remaining portion of the debate in the spirit in which he proposed it should be conducted—the spirit, in fact, which he introduced into the debate. He complains that I expressed an opinion on this case, and that I endeavoured to justify that opinion by an argument, and he thinks it would be better for me if I had not expressed any opinion. I have moved that the seat of the hon. member for Cumber-

land be declared vacant. I propose to ask the House to affirm that proposition. That is a legitimate motion.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman has again misstated what I said.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is not the time for a personal explanation. When the hon. gentleman has finished his speech, you can make a personal explanation.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a question of order. I say the hon. gentleman has misstated what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already said the explanation must be made after the hon. gentleman has finished his speech, not now.

Mr. BLAKE. The First Minister has himself, on former occasions, made motions like this which I have proposed. In 1877 he moved that the seat of Mr. James Norris, then member for Lincoln, be declared vacant, and that a new writ should issue. He expressed his opinion, and sustained it as well as he could by an argument of the case, and said it was perfectly clear. I do not myself very clearly perceive how I would have paid due respect to the House if, making the motion, which is a legitimate motion, setting forth that the seat is vacant, I had abstained from pointing out the reasons on which, in my judgment, that motion should be assented to. The First Minister has said there is no salary attached to this office, and that circumstance disposes of the case. He says that, having looked into the matter for some time, such is his opinion as a lawyer, and that it disposes of the case altogether. In the first place, there is more than salary here. In the second place, the language of the Act is: "The hon. Commissioner shall receive a salary of not more than \$10,000 a year." He is, therefore, to receive a salary. So much is clear: "He shall receive a salary." The maximum salary is to be \$10,000 a year; and the Act says that the salary shall be payable out of the unappropriated revenues forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. This, therefore, makes the High Commissioner a salaried officer, even although the actual amount of the salary had not yet been fixed, because the law says there shall be a salary. The *quantum* is supposed to be as yet unfixed; and if it remains unfixed, such would be the law. But more has been done, as the papers show, because an Order in Council was passed, as I have said, on Sir Alexander Galt being appointed, or immediately afterwards, actually fixing the salary at \$10,000 a year, and the papers indicate that the salary of the High Commissioner was fixed at the maximum here prescribed. My position with respect to this matter is sustained by the argument of one of the ablest parliamentarians known, a man of almost unexampled prestige and knowledge of parliamentary matters of his day, Mr. C.W. Wynn, who, in the case of D. W. Harvey, the Southwark case, moved that the writ should issue, and dealt with this very question of the salary—the *quantum*—not having been assigned. He thus argued:

"It may be contended that this is not an office of profit, on the ground that no salary has been actually annexed. But the Act of last Session says that 'It shall be lawful for the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to fix and appoint such salaries to be paid to such registrar, clerks and officers as they shall think proper, which salaries, together with such other expenses in and about the execution of this Act as the said Commissioners shall direct, shall be paid, by the said Commissioners of Stamps and Taxes out of any moneys to arise from any of the duties under their care and management.' Now, it seems to me that under this clause a duty is imposed upon the Treasury which they are to discharge, by fixing the amount of salary to be enjoyed by the Registrar. We all know that the words 'It shall be lawful,' are constantly construed as imposing a duty, and I apprehend that if the hon. member for Southwark had continued to hold the office which he has resigned, and that the Treasury had not fixed a salary, might have compelled the Commissioners of the Treasury to assign him one. What should be the amount of the salary would, indeed, be left to their discretion, but

it would have been imperative upon them to fix one. It might further be contended that no emolument or profit has been received from this office. But the hon. member in his letter to the Noble Lord, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, said that he would not receive any emolument or profit from the office, if Parliament should be of the opinion that its acceptance would oblige him to vacate his seat. The hon. gentleman's refusal to accept a salary was therefore only a qualified refusal, dependent upon the decision of Parliament, as to the effect of accepting a salary. This, I contend, does not exempt him from the disqualification created by his original acceptance of the office. Let the House suppose that a change of Administration takes place, and that the new Ministers do not think it convenient immediately to dissolve Parliament, would they, supposing them to execute a renunciation of the salaries attached to their offices for a couple of months, be thereby rendered capable of holding their offices without vacating their seats in Parliament? I apprehend not. It seems to me that when Parliament constitutes an office, and directs a salary to be paid, the individual appointed to that office has no right to divest himself of the salary. The office still has all the qualities of an office, and it is wholly immaterial whether the person holding it accepts a salary or not. There is to prevent an individual accepting the Chiltern Hundreds, whether he claims the salary attached to the stewardship or not. I have been told that it is not the invariable practice to refuse the salary attached to that office, for that one gentleman who accepted it did afterwards take the salary of £10 for the half-year which expired before the office was disposed of to another person. It seems to me, therefore, that this is a new office or profit under the Crown, created since the Statute of Anne, and consequently not tenable in conjunction with a seat in Parliament, whether the salary be claimed or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is good law.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I dare say it is. At any rate, I have read it all, and have not followed the hon. gentleman's example with reference to another paper, which I am about to read throughout. The Committee reported shortly afterwards that they were of opinion that the office was an office of profit; that Mr. Harvey had accepted the office, and that his seat was vacated. Now, Sir, it will appear from what I have read, I think, that the case is not such as the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Woodworth) has stated. The hon. gentleman concluded his observations by repeating something which had been said before by the right hon. First Minister. He declared that I was afraid to meet the Minister of Railways, and that I would not have made these observations had the Minister of Railways been able to be in his seat; that I knew he could not be here to answer me, and that, therefore, it was, that I stated that proposition. Now, Sir, under the law of Parliament, the Minister of Railways, claiming to be the sitting member for the county of Cumberland, had a right to take his seat on this motion. He had a right to speak after this question was put, and was called upon, after speaking and making his explanation, then and then only to withdraw. That is the course which has been pursued on several occasions. It was pursued on the occasion of the references in 1877. I recollect the present hon. member for the city and county of St. John, speaking in answer to the motion against him. I recollect the late hon. member for Lincoln speaking in answer to the motion against him. I recollect the member for Cumberland himself, when a personal motion was made against him a good many years ago, on an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, directed to a particular act of his as a Minister of the Crown, speaking in his place in answer to the motion, and then withdrawing. In this very case which I have just cited, the case of Mr. Harvey, the question was discussed and the authorities of the House were agreed that it was the duty and the right of Mr. Harvey to speak if he pleased, after the motion for a new writ had been made, and Mr. Harvey did address the House after the motion for the writ was made, and then withdrew. Consequently, Sir, knowing the law of Parliament on this subject, knowing that the Minister of Railways had as much right to sit and speak on this motion as he had the right to sit and speak on any other motion which has been made this Session, knowing that he was in his place in this House, and had himself formally answered a personal motion, I had no right, no reason to believe, and had not

Mr. BLAKE.

the remotest expectation, that he would carry his delicacy and modesty so far on this occasion as to disable himself from sitting opposite to me, as he has for some years, and assume a seat to your right. He had the right to speak; he had spoken before on similar circumstances; he was in the House, and how should I know that he was not going to avail himself of his right? Hon. gentlemen have said I am afraid of him. Well, Sir, I have sat opposite to the hon. Minister of Railways for sixteen years, more or less; I have been engaged in many a hot contest with him, and have not observed that I have any reason to be afraid of him. I do not perceive any ground on which I should be afraid of him. The hon. gentlemen invent the passion of fear for me. They are determined to believe that I must be afraid of the Minister of Railways, and they choose to say so. I tell them that I am not conscious of entertaining any such fear—that I know of no ground for it. He certainly has a great capacity for words; he certainly has a large collection of strong adjectives; he certainly has great volubility, but I have not been able to perceive any reason why any hon. gentleman, any hon. member of this House, however humble he is, who has a good cause to maintain, should be afraid of the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, the Secretary of State began his speech by declaring that he must consider what the motives of the Minister of Railways were in accepting this appointment, and then he discussed the question at some length. He also introduced the services of the High Commissioner of Canada as an element in the discussion. What have they got to do with it? We are here discussing a question of Statute, of parliamentary law, whether the seat for Cumberland is vacated or not. However good a man may be, the Secretary of State must admit—however bad a man may be, I am myself obliged to admit—this question has to be decided irrespective of his goodness or his badness, his merits or his demerits, whether he has done much or little, whether he has done well or ill, whether his motives have been laudable or the reverse—we have to decide whether the seat for Cumberland is full or empty, altogether irrespective of any considerations of that description. For what purpose then was it introduced? Then the hon. gentleman says the intention of the Act is to prevent a member from being under the influence of the Crown, under obligation to the Crown, and therefore it does not apply to a Minister of the Crown. Does it not? May not a member who is disposed to be hostile to the policy of a Government be seduced into acquiescence in that policy by being made a Minister? May not a Minister who differs from his colleagues on some question of public policy be seduced into silence, into acquiescence, or into both, by being retained in his position as Minister? Have not we heard of such things? Have not we witnessed such things? Have we forgotten them already?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I think we have not forgotten them, and I do not think we shall hear much more in this discussion of the extraordinary proposition, that there is to be less jealousy, less watchfulness, less care, less vigilance, on the part of the people of this country and the Parliament that represents them, with reference to the dealings of a Minister with public moneys, than with reference to the dealings of other members of Parliament with public moneys. That is the question. Ministers, forsooth, occupy such a lofty position that they could not be influenced, no matter how much more they should get—that they could not be influenced, no matter what favours the Crown might shower upon them. Cannot a Minister, who holds his office reluctantly, who wants to leave the Administration, be persuaded to remain by getting an office with perquisites and advantages. Have we not seen it happen? Have we not heard of such a thing within the last few days? And yet it is said, forsooth, that Ministers are not within the mis-

chief of the Act. Whatever the hon. gentleman says about the mischief of the Act—and we are threatened with an Act on the subject of the Independence of Parliament—the hon. gentleman may observe—unless, indeed, it is proposed to set up one rule for Ministers, and another for the common herd, one rule for those who are above common temptations, who have nothing to ask for, and therefore may take all they please, having the power and the will, and another rule for the common herd of members of Parliament, over whom a tighter rein must be kept, because they are not above such influences—the hon. gentleman may observe that Ministers sometimes depart more easily than ordinary members. They are of the same flesh and blood that we are; they are subject to like passions with ourselves; if we are likely to be influenced by the attractions of honour and emolument, by the attractions of filthy lucre, so are they. Sitting in this House, they are subject to just the same restraints, and I believe ought to be subject, if there is to be any distinction, to still greater restraints than ordinary members. Well, suppose, said the hon. Secretary of State, that a member of the Government, say the Minister of Customs, is called upon to go somewhere to investigate the affairs of some Custom House, and his expenses are paid, is his seat to be voided on that account? His seat is to be voided if the law so says, and if the law has that operation, I dare say a good many seats would be voided. But I can understand a very reasonable distinction, which I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not see. This case has reference to the Minister acting in his quality of Minister. A Minister is here; his house and household are here; he lives here or ought to live here, at the Capital. He is allowed his salary in order that he may live, in order that he may pay the expenses of his household—his house rent, fuel, light and taxes; send his children to school, provide food and drink, and pay for his clothes and those of his wife, if he has one. These are the objects to which his salary is intended to be applied; the salary is kept up to enable the man to live. If, under such circumstances, a Minister is called upon to go on a work for a month or six weeks to a distant part of the country, his establishment has to be kept up in his absence, and his expenses go on as usual. He cannot pack up his traps, and take his wife and family and household goods along with him, and call on the State to pay the cost of his doing so. He makes nothing out of that work, and his expenses must be paid. But suppose a Minister, in his quality of Minister, were appointed, if he could properly be appointed, on some distant mission, for some long and definite time; suppose he were allowed to take his family and his furniture along with him to his new residence at the expense of the State; and suppose that his establishment here had to be altogether broken up, so that it would not be subject to any of those expenses, such as rent, taxes, fuel, light, &c., which are paid for by the State in his new residence, is it not obvious that he occupies a wholly different position? Is it not obvious, in that case, that he is making money? That that \$4,000 a year, which otherwise would have had to come out of his salary for those very objects, is saved from his salary? But the argument of the hon. gentleman was wholly inapplicable to the case in hand, because it was confined to the case of a Minister acting in his quality of Minister. It was not in his quality of Minister that Sir Charles Tupper went to England to discharge those duties and receive those allowances. It was in his quality of the holder of the office of High Commissioner of Canada, for whom the salary was voted, which he did not receive, and for whom the \$4,000 a year was voted, which he did receive. That makes the case altogether different, because, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, if it was in some other quality than the quality of Minister, if you carried that argument out to its legitimate conclusion, the salary, or emolument, or profit, in whatever shape it might be, would have no effect. The hon.

Secretary of State also said that this matter ought not to have been brought before the House—that the question ought not to have been raised. Was that the view of his leader? He has been himself for a long time a First Minister, and the leader of a party, and perhaps he has not learned thoroughly those lessons of subordination which belong to a follower instead of a leader, and to a follower although a colleague. His leader said that my argument was a fair argument. That while he did not agree with it, he thought it was quite proper to leave it to the Committee. That he thought it was a complicated question with a great deal to be said on both sides, &c., &c., and that the House, composed largely of laymen, could not be expected, at a moment's notice, to come to a right conclusion, and that the question should go to a Committee, where all the precedents would be considered, and the arguments weighed, and where a sound conclusion would be reached on the question which his colleague, the Secretary of State, says ought not to have been raised at all, because there was nothing in it. Well, the hon. First Minister does not venture to meet my motion by a negative, which would be the logical conclusion of the hon. Secretary of State's remarks. If there is no case of enquiry, why do you not negative my motion? But the hon. First Minister says there is a case to be enquired into, and he proposes that it shall be enquired into. Then, Sir, there was a good part of the speech of the hon. First Minister that I have heard often before. I have heard those references to the English cases, and especially to the case of Mr. Gladstone and the Ionian Islands, at least half a dozen times.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only at the beginning of this Session, in answer to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. I heard them so often that I forgot that. That was his argument when we were considering the Independence of Parliament Act, as compared with that which prevailed at the time of Confederation, and were objecting to his alteration of the law. We heard that argument from time to time, subsequently, when we called for amendments, when we pointed out defects in the law, when we pointed out the abuses which the hon. gentleman made of the loopholes which he purposely put into the law, and when we, from time to time, pressed upon public attention the necessity of greater stringency, until in the end, by dint of a striking example, we drove the hon. gentleman's colleague, in his absence, to bring forward a measure which culminated in the Act of 1871, and which altered the law. The hon. gentleman told us that it is not a salary but a wage, allowance, profit or emolument in lieu of a salary, and said that is what the law is. This is not what the law is; it is what the law was, and as the hon. gentleman would have it to be, if the hon. gentleman had his will today. It is the law which he was forced out of by the pressure of the Liberal Opposition between 1867 and 1871. The law was altered in 1871, and the words he cherishes so much, which he believes in so fully, which he has argued from so often, and which he holds so dear that he almost imagines they are in the Act still, were struck out of the Act in order that the law might be more wide, clear, stringent and binding in its operation. The hon. gentleman said: Quite true, I struck out the words, but after all the accumulation is just the same—I go back to my old ways, and walk in my old paths. But it is not so; the law is not the same. The hon. gentleman says that he appeals to the English cases, these cases of Mr. Gladstone and the others. Sir, the English law is not our law. We occupy a different position here from that occupied in England on public questions, as I have frequently shown. We occupy a position in which the question of money emolument

is of even more consequence than in England, and their law is not so stringent as ours, because so stringent a law as ours is presumed not to be necessary there. If these gentlemen have gone upon these missions, I have no doubt whatever that they occupied, during the time they went upon these missions, just the position of a Minister, whom I suggested as going on a mission of a perfect character, in answer to the Secretary of State awhile ago. I have no doubt they were gentlemen of large means, who kept a country house and a town house, etc., and kept up those establishments in the same way when away as when at home, so that their allowance for their house expenses was a very different thing from the allowance for house expenses and house rent of a man whose only house is the house the State pays for. If you had called upon those gentlemen, keeping up a country house and a town house in England, to pay the rent of a house in the Ionian Islands or in Washington, they would have to take money out of their own pockets to do so; but in the case of the hon. gentleman, he sold his house here, sent his furniture across the water, removed his establishment—had only one establishment—and for that establishment he is here paid out of his salary, and was also, in England, paid by the State. The hon. gentleman says: But there is an accumulation of offices, and, under the English law, the reason of the case is entirely in favour of that, and I have Mr. Todd in favour of it, and I say to you, that concludes the question. This argument is entirely fallacious. I do not hesitate to say, that whatever the Committee on Privileges and Elections may do—and I know something of these matters—they will not come to the conclusion that the doctrine of the accumulation of offices can have any application in this case. I shall not this evening enter into a discussion whether the doctrine of the accumulation of offices could have a reference to the conjunction of two political offices with us. My belief is that it could not. My belief is that you could not arrange for a Minister to hold the two offices here of Minister of Finance and of Minister of Public Works under our Constitution and laws. But however that may be, it has no application in this case. The English law as expounded, if rightly expounded—and I assume, for the purpose of argument, that it is rightly expounded—is simply this: that if there be two political offices which may be held by the Minister of the Crown in conjunction with each other, if he may have both, or, holding one, may accept the other without a fresh election, on account of the acceptance of the second, each of them must be an office which he is capable of holding and yet sitting in Parliament; each of them must be a Parliamentary office. Now, I do not think that is settled law even in England. I have not looked into the matter lately, but my recollection is that the cases of Mr. Gladstone were distinct; that in the first case in which he held these offices in conjunction, he accepted them when forming his Administration and accounting to his constituents. In the other case, he did not accept the Chancellorship of the Exchequer—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Low had it.

Mr. BLAKE. I was going to say so. He resigned; Mr. Gladstone accepted it, and he did not accept it until after he had been elected; and there was much criticism on the subject of that acceptance at half salary, as it was said. There was very strong argument used in the press and by political men opposed to Mr. Gladstone against the view that he could sit in the coming Session of Parliament without a fresh election. The sudden dissolution which took place prevented that question being decided. He went to the country, was defeated, and ceased to be both First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer. The question, therefore, never became a practical one. I admit there are some

Mr. BLAKE

precedents on either side, but I do not agree that it is settled law. Even if it were, it is monstrous to say it could apply to a disqualified office. Are we to hear it said that in addition to the other privileges in a constitutional country, jealous of the prerogatives of the Crown yielded by Ministers, jealous of the influence of Ministers, there is this privilege, that a man who is a Minister may accept a disqualifying office, an office which would disqualify anyone else from sitting in Parliament at all, and because he is a Minister he may sit here? Is that the proposal? Is it to be said that an office which could not be held by any other member of Parliament without vacating his seat may be held by a member of Parliament who happens to be a Minister? That argument is absurd, and I venture to say will not receive the support or sanction of any constitutional authority. I will read the letter of Mr. Todd to which, the hon. gentleman alluded:

“MY DEAR SIR JOHN,—As I observe in the newspapers criticisms in relation to Sir Charles Tupper, Minister of Railways and also High Commissioner for the Dominion in England, continuing to hold his seat in the House of Commons, and as it is probable that the question of his right to retain his seat will be raised at the ensuing Session, it has occurred to me that you might like a reference to certain English cases bearing on this point. And first, I would remark, that the point is urged in the newspapers, that in order to avoid disqualification, a member accepting an office to which a salary is ordinarily attached, may resolve to fulfil the duties of the same without emolument. But this will not, according to British practice, suffice to sustain the seat. It has been ruled otherwise in the case of Daniel Whittle Harvey, which is noted in my ‘Parliamentary Practice in England,’ Vol. 2, page 260. You will find the arguments in support of this view in the debates cited in the note.”

The hon. gentleman did not read that part. He began with the *but*. I do not know whether he agrees with Dr. Todd's views or not. He told us, when he gave a partial reading of the letter, that he cited from Mr. Todd, who is our constitutional authority, whose opinions were deferred to, and that Mr. Todd believed Sir Charles Tupper could hold his seat, and that he, Sir John, was going to read the letter. He began, however, with the *but*. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman agrees with this view I have just quoted from Dr. Todd's letter as applicable to the case or not. If he does, it settles the question; if not, it must destroy, in his opinion, the value of Mr. Todd as an authority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said I did not read the whole letter. I sent the hon. gentleman, however, the whole letter, and the hon. gentleman did not quote from all that Mr. Todd wrote on the subject, but left out the most important point. For instance, he did not read that sentence. He read the next sentence, in which it says that Mr. Bathurst, Secretary of State, took the office temporarily of President of the Board of Control, and it was held that he did not vacate his seat. The hon. gentleman did not read that. He read the next sentence and dwelt upon it. He dwelt upon the case of the Warden of the Cinque Ports and Lord Palmerston.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He quoted that, and in answer to his quoting British precedents, I said, here is what Mr. Todd says about British practice, and I quoted that portion of his letter.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not read one word from Dr. Todd's book on this branch of the case at all, but I read what Dr. Todd says on page 233 and page 234, with reference to the constitutionality of a Minister of the Crown, with a seat in the Cabinet, holding his office without a seat in Parliament. That was the only quotation I made from Dr. Todd's book on the subject I am now discussing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not upon Lord Palmerston and the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports.

Mr. BLAKE. Am I not to be allowed to refer to the original authority; am I not to be allowed to cite the case

of the Cinque Ports and others without referring to Dr. Todd's book? I got that from other books altogether.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You did not read that part from Dr. Todd's book at all?

Mr. BLAKE. I did not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then the hon. gentleman skipped that part; he read before it and he read after it, and he skipped that.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, Sir, it is not in this part of Dr. Todd's book at all. This part of Dr. Todd's book is in reference to the presence of Ministers in Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the page?

Mr. BLAKE. 233 and 234.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the other page?

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know. I will try and find it out for him if he likes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no use in showing courtesy to that gentleman. I sent him that letter. He is unworthy of it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says there is no use in showing courtesy to me, that he sent me that letter, and that I am unworthy of it. Now, of course, he sent me the letter. The hon. gentleman read a portion of the letter; and he was called upon to read the rest of it. He said he would read the rest of it. My hon. friend asked for it, I asked for it, one or two of us asked for it, and in the end he said he would send us the letter to see what that letter was of which he read a portion, and then he chooses to accuse me of discourtesy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House sees it.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say the majority of the House sees it, because they always look through the hon. gentleman's spectacles:

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman chooses to attack the majority of this House and say that they are not independent members of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say so. I said they always looked through the hon. gentleman's spectacles, and I appeal to every vote they have given in this House to prove it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to order. I say that statement is not true, and I am a living proof of it. I do not see through the spectacles of the First Minister, and I have shown by my voting with the hon. gentleman last Session on a very important question, that I did not see through the spectacles of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is the left centre. I did not count him as one of the majority. He is a party by himself. I apologize to the hon. gentleman if he thinks I suggested that he is submerged in the majority in this House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman recognizes my position as the leader of an Independent party in this House, and the only Independent party.

Mr. BLAKE. "On the other hand," says Dr. Todd—

Mr. ORTON. I rise to a question of order. I look upon it that this House has been insulted by the hon. member. I think when the hon. member accuses members of this House of looking through the spectacles of another hon. gentleman, it implies that they are voting simply and solely upon his judgment, and not upon their own.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not said. It was simply said that they looked through the spectacles, and I cannot interfere on that.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure the hon. member for Wellington will not accuse the First Minister of not seeing straight.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The First Minister does not wear spectacles.

Mr. BLAKE. Dr. Todd says:

"But on the other hand, English practice—  
And this word is underlined—

"English practice will clearly sustain the member so circumstanced in retaining his seat, as will appear from the following precedents. In 1809, when Mr. Percival, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Portland Administration was commissioned by the King (upon the Duke of Portland's resignation) to form a new Ministry, he assumed for himself the office of First Lord of the Treasury, in addition to that of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Desirous of knowing whether this act necessitated his reelection, he consulted the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Lord Chancellor, and the Law Officers of the Crown. All these authorities concurred in the opinion that Mr. Percival's seat was not vacated. (Sir Walpole, life of Percival, vol. 2, page 52.)"

There you see the case is one of the character I refer to. Ministerial offices, Parliamentary offices, neither of them a disqualifying office, held in conjunction—

"It is true that, in 1861, Lord Palmerston, then First Lord of the Treasury, vacated his seat and went for reelection upon accepting from the Crown the Lord Wardenship of the Cinque Ports. (See Ashley, life of Palmerston; vol. 2, page 207.) But this would appear to have been an unnecessary and superfluous proceeding, for, in August, 1873, a case parallel to that of Mr. Percival occurred. Mr. Gladstone, being then First Lord of the Treasury, assumed in addition thereto, the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was contended by some persons that, under these circumstances, the law required that he should offer himself for reelection. But Mr. Gladstone was properly advised by the Crown Law Officers that such a course was unnecessary, inasmuch as an exchange of offices and accumulation of offices by a Minister of the Crown, are identical in principle. Mr. Gladstone accordingly did not vacate his seat. (See *Law Times*, vol. 56, page 246.)"

Once again, there is a conjunction of Ministerial offices, an amalgamation of offices by the Minister, but they must be offices each one of which will not disqualify him from sitting in Parliament. If one be a disqualifying office, even though the sacred robe of a Minister is on the man who takes it, that sacred robe will not save him from disqualification:

"In point of fact, there would be no difference between such a proceeding and that of the continuance of the seat after Parliament had decided to increase the salary attached to the office held by a Minister of the Crown."

Once again, you see the argument. There is the principle on which Dr. Todd goes. It is the same thing as if, in the case of a Minister elected while a Minister, or after he accepted office, Parliament decided to increase his salary; that would surely not apply to his accepting an office which constituted a positive disqualification for his seat.

"For the vital point of principle involved in a case of this description is really between the absolute 'independence' of a member of Parliament, and the justifiable 'control' which is exercised by the Crown over members who are likewise office holders. That 'control' is not affected by the mere addition of the amount of emolument received, whether the same has arisen from increase of salary or from 'accumulation' of offices. The question whether the office of 'High Commissioner' to England is or is not compatible with that of a Minister of the Crown in Canada, is, of course, a wholly different question, and must be argued upon its own merits."

So that Dr. Todd himself feels that the precedents he cited as English precedents, and the argument he advanced might or might not apply; at any rate, he did not intend to imply that they were of the least force in deciding the question in hand—

"In presenting to your notice these precedents, I make no reference to the precise wording of our Canadian Statutes on the subject. Upon this subject, you are better able than myself to express an opinion. I have limited my remarks to English precedent, which undoubtedly embodies the true interpretation of constitutional law applicable to the case."

So that, Sir, first of all, Dr. Todd's argument is in favour of the view that the non-acceptance of the salary makes no difference, and that the office, if it be a disqualifying one, is a disqualifying one though the salary is not accepted. Secondly, his view is that, according to English practice, ar

accumulation or conjunction of Ministerial offices, each of which is not a disqualifying office, each of which is capable of being held, and a seat in Parliament held at the same time, a conjunction of these two offices, being an accumulation, does not necessitate a reelection. Thirdly, his view is that he is not at all implying or stating that the office of High Commissioner for Canada is an office of the character of the precedents to which he has referred; and, lastly, he disclaims implying any interpretation of this case, according to the wording of our Canadian Statutes, to which he does not refer at all, saying he speaks only of English practice. That is the opinion of Dr. Todd, which is said to decide this question. Now, the hon. gentleman stated that Sir Charles Tupper did not wish to vote on these various matters because the press had said something about his position, and he did not desire to vote. The law says that a person who is not a member, whose seat or election has become void, shall not sit or vote. If there was a reason for his not voting, there was a reason for his not sitting; there was the same reason for his not sitting—of feeling, of principle, of view—precisely the same. His vote was not wanted. What was wanted was that he should be here to expound the policy of the Administration; so he declared that he would, as my hon. friend from West Huron has said, save as many penalties as he could, in sitting, inasmuch as his sitting here was in the interests of the Administration, and not voting, inasmuch as the majority was so multitudinous that his vote could be spared. But, Sir, this is not all. The hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau)—once again to refer to his argument—has said that this question is one so trivial that it ought not to have been brought before the attention of the House. What did Sir Charles Tupper himself say when his not voting was challenged? He said:

"The hon. gentleman will, at a very early period, probably in the course of to-day or to-morrow, have an opportunity of ascertaining exactly what has prevented me from doing that which I regret most deeply—not having had the opportunity of doing that which I shall be most proud to do, and which I trust, before this Bill becomes law, I will have the opportunity of doing—backing, as I am accustomed to back, my opinions by my vote."

There was a great mystery. It was something which he most deeply regretted—his not having voted. Yet he had not voted, and we were to learn, in the course of the day, or the following day, what that was. Well, we have two sources of information—the Ministerial organs and the notice paper. On the next day the Ottawa correspondent of the *Montreal Gazette* said:

"It is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure amending the Act relating to the High Commissionership. It appears, under the law at present, Sir Charles Tupper cannot vote in the House while holding the office of High Commissioner, the Act declaring that he shall receive a salary in such capacity, and this technical obstacle is to be removed."

And the Ottawa correspondent of the *Toronto Mail*, of February 27th, said:

**" WHY SIR CHARLES TUPPER DID NOT VOTE.**

"It is understood that the reason Sir Charles Tupper has not voted this Session is because of a technical objection that might be raised. A Bill will be introduced to remove the doubts existing."

Such is the information which we have got within a day or two from the Ministerial organs, as to the hon. gentleman's view of his position and the Government's view, namely, that he was debarred from voting. If he was debarred from voting, he was debarred from sitting, and if debarred from sitting and voting, he is not a member of this House. I said there was one other source of information to which we might appeal, and only one, and that was the notice paper. On it I find given a notice by Sir John A. Macdonald:

"On Thursday next, a Bill respecting the Independence of Parliament Act of 1878."

Sir, I shall vote against the amendment.  
Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a personal explanation. The hon. member who has just taken his seat declared that I had found fault with him, because he had given his opinion in regard to this matter. On the contrary, I have not done so, but excepted him, as he had moved a resolution. Before the amendment was moved by the hon. First Minister, the hon. member for West Durham stated the very opposite of what I had stated in my remarks, and I rose for the purpose of an explanation. I have always understood, hitherto, that that privilege was accorded a member when he rose for a personal explanation, and I have to-night learned the contrary for the first time. I have submitted to it at his hands, and I now give him fair notice that hereafter I shall neither ask quarter from him nor shall I give it.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) carried on the following division:—

**YEAS:**

**Messieurs**

Abbott,	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Allison (Hants),	Fortin,	Méthot,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Fréchette,	Moffat,
Beaty,	Gagné,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Belleau,	Girouard,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gordon,	Quimet,
Benson,	Grandbois,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Hackett,	Pope,
Blondeau,	Haggart,	Reid,
Bolduc,	Hall,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Hay,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hesson,	Royal,
Bowell,	Hickey,	Scott,
Brecken,	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Homer,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Houde,	Smvth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Tassé,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Temple,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Tupper (Picton),
Coursol,	Landry (Kent),	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Valin,
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers,	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desjarlins,	Macmaster,	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Williams,
Dodd,	McCallum,	Wood (Brockville),
Dundas,	McDougald,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dupont,	McGreevy,	Woodworth,
Farrow,	McLelan,	Wright.—122.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	McNeill,	

**NAYS:**

**Messieurs**

Allen,	Fisher,	McIsaac,
Allison (Lennox),	Fleming,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchar,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Oatudal,	Landerkin,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Vail,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Watson,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Wheler,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Wilson.—57.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved, that as the time for the reception of reports from the Committee on Private Bills expires to-day, the same be extended for a period of three weeks, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. Motion agreed to.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY LOAN BILL.

On the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 101) to amend the Act intituled An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for other purposes, being read,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move that the order be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole, with instructions to insert the following amendment:—

The Canadian Pacific Railway shall not, nor shall any of its branch lines nor any line of railway leased by the Company or under their control, be at any time amalgamated with the Grand Trunk Railway or any of its branch lines or with any branch lines leased by the Grand Trunk Railway Company or under their control. And such amalgamation and any arrangement for making a common fund or 'pooling' the earnings or receipts of the said two railways, or their or any of their branch lines, or of any railway lines for parts thereof leased by the said companies, or either of them, or under the control of either of them, shall be absolutely void.

This provision, however, not to extend to traffic or running arrangements made with the assent of the Governor in Council, nor to hinder the acquisition by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the railway between Quebec and Montreal, known as the North Shore Railway.

The Supreme Court of Canada shall have jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of this clause and to prevent, by injunction or otherwise, any infraction thereof and to punish any breach or disobedience of any order, decree or judgment of the Court in this behalf, and for these purposes shall have all the powers, both at Common Law and in Equity, of a Superior Court of original jurisdiction.

I am sure, Sir, I need not take up the time of the House with any arguments to show the advisability of adopting this provision. We all recognize that the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are two great and powerful corporations in this country, and I believe it will commend itself to the judgment of this House and meet with the hearty approval of the people, that due competition shall not be prevented, as it would be prevented by such a proposal as was intimated a short time ago by the Managing Director of the Grand Trunk Railway, that that Company should enter into arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by which they would obtain the entire and exclusive control of the railway lines of communication in the great Province of Ontario. I believe, Sir, that the public interests will be promoted by the adoption of this measure, to which I have referred, which circumstances have forced upon the attention of the Government as being essential to protect the country from having its entire railway communications absorbed and controlled by one great and powerful company controlling the entire lines of communication within our borders. As I have said, this is a proposal that, I believe, will so commend itself to the judgment of the House as to render it unnecessary, at this late stage of the Bill, to occupy further time in its discussion.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman should not have given notice of this proposal, in order that the language in which it is expressed might have been considered a little by the House. With the general proposition I need hardly say I heartily concur. Having been fighting for many years against monopoly in one part of the Dominion, I am little disposed to throw any obstacle in the way of any plan which may tend to prevent the creation of a still more gigantic monopoly in the rest of the Dominion. Whether the clause is needful, I do not at this moment remember. I do not remember that there

is any power on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to amalgamate with the Grand Trunk. I doubt if there is—I certainly should be surprised if there was. Of course, if there is no power it can do no harm to express the proposition that they shall not have such power: Whether it is expedient that an exception of an extraordinary character should be made to our general system of jurisprudence, whether it is not more expedient that the ordinary courts of the country should be resorted to in the first instance, in order to do the right and prevent the wrongs which may arise under the operation of this clause is, I think, rather a serious question. I think it will be rather a serious question that the proposal should be made—unheard of, so far as I know—to confer, in this class of cases, original jurisdiction upon the Supreme Court. That is, of course, in one sense, a question of form. But with reference to the general conduct of jurisprudence with reference to the question of how we shall work it, the question of whether the provincial right to have causes civil or criminal administered by the courts created by the Provinces—subject, of course, to appeal to the Supreme Court—should not be maintained in this case is, I think a serious question. I quite admit that under the Constitution the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction to create a Supreme Court, or courts for the better administration and execution of the laws of Canada. That was an essential provision, because in the absence of such a provision it was possible that the laws of Canada might remain unexecuted, for want of Provincial Courts. The Provinces might create courts not having that jurisdiction, or they might inhibit their courts from exercising jurisdiction in cases of certain laws, and that power was necessary under the ordinary laws of the Constitution; but unless there was some such conjuncture as I have mentioned, I think it was intended that the laws of Canada, civil and criminal, as well as the laws of the Provinces themselves, should be administered by the provincial courts, and that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should be an appellate jurisdiction. The mode in which the proposed clause is to be enforced is also of a very vague description. I am not very well satisfied with the draughtsmanship. I think if the House had one or two days' notice of the clause, so that the legal members would have had an opportunity of considering it, some suggestions might have been made which would have had the effect of improving it. It has a laudable object; but it is always to be remembered that a mutual understanding between these two Companies, that they shall charge the same rates and fares, will make such a clause waste paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear the leader of the Opposition express his great satisfaction with the amendment which has been submitted by the Minister of Railways. It was found fault with me to-day, in another place, that I was not sufficiently supporting the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill—that I had not taken sufficient interest in it. I was also found fault with the other day by hon. gentlemen opposite for expressing too much sympathy with the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill. Now, my object in performing my duty in relation to public questions in which these railway corporations are involved, is to guard the public interests so that there shall be no monopoly on one side or on the other. There has nothing been submitted to Parliament this Session—although it proposes to restrain the powers of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—which has given me so much satisfaction as the amendment of the Minister of Railways, for if there is one thing to be guarded against by the people of Canada, it is that the powers of these two great companies—for as I said the other day, everything that the Grand Trunk had not taken from Canada seemed to be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway—shall not be united. I wish that, in the legislation we are now adopting, while we will do, and ought to do, every-

thing possible to help this great national undertaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which they have so far carried out so successfully, with such credit to themselves and honour to the country—it is our duty so to guard the interests of the country that for the future no combination, no proposition such as we saw might possibly have arisen a few months ago, for a union between the heads of these two great companies should be allowed; that it is our duty to prevent such a union coming to a successful issue by which the interests of the people of Canada, by the establishment of one grand monopoly in this country. I am glad to hear the leader of the Opposition express himself so well satisfied with the amendment, and I believe it is the only thing in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Act upon which I have heard him express himself in that way. As to the legal question, I shall not enter very much into it. I do not pretend to find the same objection that the hon. gentleman finds to that portion of the amendment. But I say that whatever remedy may be devised, I want the best, the speediest, and the most effectual means to prevent these companies doing what we all desire to prevent them doing—combining between themselves and forming one grand monopoly. We have too many monopolies now, and I wish to prevent the extension of them in future.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that the hon. leader of the Opposition expresses his satisfaction with the amendment, because it will have the effect of repressing, or obstructing, or preventing monopoly. Well, it is satisfactory to hear that declaration from the leader of the Opposition, but that satisfaction was rather qualified by the statement in the last sentence of his speech, that the amendment would be made waste paper by the two companies coming to an agreement between themselves. With respect to the point he raised, that it might be left to the courts of original jurisdiction in the various Provinces of the Dominion, the House will see that the courts of one Province can only affect the portion of the railway within that Province, and this railway will run through Provinces yet unborn—as well as Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, so that any one court, in any one of the Provinces, could not have that complete control of the subject that the Supreme Court, which is the common court of the whole Dominion, would have. But, as my hon. friend who has spoken says, these railways ought not, and I do not think will require, to have recourse to the courts. It was necessary that some provision should be made to enforce the law; but these great corporations cannot afford to break the law, cannot afford to act against the declared will of Parliament; and when any arrangements for amalgamation, or for working together in any way, are not approved of by the Government who represent the people of Canada, and such arrangements or such amalgamations, or such agreements, are declared absolutely void, these companies will, as a matter of course, yield to the direct voice of Parliament. There is a technical question, which has been raised, that the Supreme Court might be made a check court, as it is a court of original jurisdiction for some purposes. But that question requires a good deal of consideration. The Exchequer Court sits with one judge, with an appeal to the whole Bench, and it is thought that it would be better, in case of any extreme instance of infraction of the law, that application should be made at once to the Supreme Court, to a full Bench, and the mere statement or intimation of the court to either of these railways of any action being illegal, would have full and final effect.

Mr. WELDON. The question might arise as to whether or not the Supreme Court could act out of Term, because that court only sits by law during Term, and it might be

Mr. MITCHELL.

necessary to confer with a judge to have a different arrangement made.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps I may be permitted to make another practical suggestion. The hon. gentleman knows that it might be difficult, under his arrangement, to have a prompt decision. There is always one judge in town for pressing emergencies, who could always hear a case, and in case of an appeal, the full court could be summoned, and got together. I rather think that if the hon. gentleman would provide for the matter being taken into the Exchequer Court, with a speedy appeal to the Supreme Court, he would make an improvement.

Bill considered in Committee, and reported with an amendment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the amendment be now read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a convenient opportunity for making a suggestion that I have to make. I move:

That the said Bill be not now considered, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, with power to provide for all the interests of the Company, and all railway securities and railways, including established lines, shall be pledged to the Government as additional security for the proposed aid.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot accept the amendment of the hon. gentleman. It would have the effect of making the Government responsible—in case of default taking place and the Canadian Pacific Railway coming into the hands of the Government—for all the obligations that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company may have entered into, and for all the lines they have leased, and it is not the intention of the Government to allow itself to be placed in that position. I must ask the House to reject the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Motion negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	McIsaac,
Allison (Lennox)	Forbes,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Auger,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchar, d,	Gunn,	Platt,
Blake,	Harley,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Vail,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Watson,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Wheler,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Wilson.—58.
Fisher,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison (Hants),	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Fortin,	Méthot,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Foster,	Mitchell,
Beaty,	Fréchette,	Moffat,
Bell,	Gagné,	Montplaisir,
Belleau,	Gault,	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Orton,
Benson,	Girouard,	Quimet,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Paint,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Paterson (Essex),
Billy,	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Pope,
Bolduc,	Hackett,	Reid,
Bossé,	Haggart,	Riopel,
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hay,	Royal,
Brecken,	Hesson,	Scott,
Burns,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,

Cameron (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Smyth,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Tassé,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Temple,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Tupper (Picton),
Coursol,	Landry (Kent),	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Valin,
Outhbert,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	McDonald (Cap-Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers,	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desjardins,	Macmaster,	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Williams,
Dodd,	McCallum,	Wood (Brockville),
Dundas,	McDougald,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dupont,	McGreevy,	Woodworth, and
Farrow,	McLelan,	Wright.—122.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	McNeill,	

Mr. BLAKE moved :

That said Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with power to provide, as a condition of the proposed advances, that any contracts to be let for the construction of any part of the works of the Canadian Pacific Railway, whether on main or branch lines, shall be let only after such public notice, and upon such conditions as the Government shall approve; and that no Director of the Company shall be directly or indirectly interested, either as members of a construction company, or otherwise, in any such contracts.

Motion negated on the same division.

Mr. BLAKE moved :

That the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with power to provide, as a condition of the proposed advance, that the expenditure of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be subject to the audit of the Auditor-General of Canada.

Motion negated on the same division.

Mr. BLAKE. As I cannot persuade hon. gentlemen opposite to change their course in any way, I will not, although I have some other suggestions to offer and objections to make, trouble those hon. gentlemen too much by putting them in form.

Bill read the third time and passed, on the same division reversed.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:25 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 29th February, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### ADDITION TO COMMITTEES.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the Mr. Mills and Mr. Temple be added to the Standing Committees on Privileges and Elections, and on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

### COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. TUPPER As the case of the hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) has been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, of which I am at present a member, I would, under the circumstances, and for obvious reasons, beg to be excused from serving on that Committee. I therefore wish to withdraw.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not necessary for the hon. gentleman to attend the Committee.

Mr. TUPPER. In order that my non-attendance on that Committee may not lessen the number of its members, I wish to withdraw altogether from serving on that Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In that case I would move that Mr. Tupper be discharged from being a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that Mr. Girouard be appointed in his stead.

Motion agreed to.

### WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker, in moving that you, Sir, do now leave the Chair, I desire to take advantage of the motion to make my statement to the House in regard to the financial condition of the country, and the policy of the Government with regard to the Tariff at the present Session. It will be remembered, Sir, that in the Session of 1882, as well as in the Session of 1883, I felt myself warranted in stating that at no period in the history of Canada did the credit, the financial standing and the general business of the Dominion stand in so good a position as it did at those two periods. I am in a position, I think, to state to-day that at no previous period in the history of this country did the credit of Canada and the financial condition of Canada stand better than it does now. With respect to the general trade of the country, I regret to say that owing to the depreciation in the value of lumber, which is one of our principal exports, owing to over-trading in certain branches in the Dominion, as well as over-imports, we have a depression at the present time, which I trust will not be of long duration but will be speedily overcome, and we may soon be in the position we occupied a year ago, prospering in every particular. I trust, Sir, that the statement I am about to submit to the House will add to the evidence which has been given from year to year since 1879, that the policy adopted by the Government in that year has been successful and in the interests of Canada. Sir, I desire in the first place to call attention to the receipts and expenditures for last year, and I will be brief in doing so because the details of the expenditure for the last fiscal year, as contained in the Public Accounts for that year, are in the hands of hon. members; but there are some points to which I desire to call the special attention of the House. I may state, what every hon. member knows, that the receipts for that year were \$35,794,649, that the expenditure was \$28,730,157, leaving a surplus of \$7,064,492. Adding to that the \$1,009,000 received from the sale of lands in Manitoba and the North-West, gives us a surplus for that year of over \$8,000,000. Sir, it has been said, and it will be said no doubt during this discussion, that the expenditure for the fiscal year 1882-83 being \$1,663,054 in excess of the previous year, it is an evidence of extravagance on the part of the Administration. In order to meet that charge I desire to state the items composing that additional expenditure, and then I will leave the House to decide whether the Government, because they are responsible primarily as submitting the Estimates to Parliament, are open to the charge of extravagant expenditure during that year. The \$1,663,054 of increase may be stated as follows, these being the principal items. Sinking fund, \$53,412. That is simply, as every hon. member knows, a redemption of the debt to that extent over and above the previous year. Subsidies to Provinces, \$75,673. That we know is a payment made under statute, which requires that every tenth year the subsidies to the smaller Provinces be increased until they reach 80 cents per head of the population, on 400,000 each, and the additional concession made to Manitoba as well. Legislation (election expenses) \$158,568. That amount was required for expenses connected

with the General Elections. No objection can therefore be made to that item. Postal service, \$195,522. When I state to the House that the increased receipts were \$213,000 it will be evident that there has been no increased taxation with respect to that item. Railways and canals working expenses, \$371,364. When I state to the House that the increased income during that year from those public works was \$390,000, against an increase of expenditure of \$371,364, the House will understand that no additional taxation was imposed under that head. Immigration and quarantine, \$184,763. When we take into account the increased immigration to this country during that year, I think every hon. member will say that the money was well expended, and that it will yield an adequate return. Mounted Police, \$109,369. That expenditure was under the authority of Parliament, made upon the statement of the Minister of the Interior at the time, that for public reasons the force should be increased. It has been increased and that additional expenditure was incurred during that year. The increased expenditure on public works and harbours was \$436,359. This expenditure, I am sure, will be generally approved of. It was an expenditure demanded by Parliament on account of our large surplus, which gave us the opportunity of giving increased accommodation, and increased facilities to our commerce by the improvement of our harbours and the construction of public buildings throughout the Dominion of Canada. That expenditure of \$436,358 was not only voted by Parliament and cheerfully granted, but it will, I am sure, be acquiesced in by both sides of the House. The increase in the administration of justice was \$33,893. This increase became necessary owing to local legislation requiring the appointment of increased judges in different parts of the Dominion. Then we have an increase of \$150,000 for the bounty to the fishermen, which had the almost unanimous concurrence of this House, and met with the general approval of the country. These items make about \$1,600,000, and it will be found that only a small portion—that portion which was expended on public works, and that portion paid as a bounty to the fishermen—were direct charges on the country; that is to say, they were increases which would necessarily increase the taxation of the people. Therefore while the expenditure has been increased about \$1,600,000, the taxation has not covered one-half that amount, and the expenditure for the other portion was on public works and other public services yielding more than compensating revenue in return. Now, Sir, there were other expenditures during the year chargeable to capital account amounting to \$14,171,413. How were these expenditures met? In the first place, there was a surplus from consolidated revenue, amounting to \$7,064,492; proceeds from the lands of the North-West, \$1,009,019; deposits in the savings banks of the country, \$4,445,445; and under the arrangement made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, we received the proceeds of the sales of their bonds, which were in our hands, these proceeds amounting, at the close of the year, to \$2,694,000, upon which 4 per cent. interest was paid. This covered all the expenditures of that year, without our being under the necessity, as I stated last Session, of going abroad for a dollar in order to meet this expenditure. I may say further, in answer to the charge of the imposition of increased taxation by this Government upon the people of Canada, that deducting the surplus from the receipts of Customs and Excise since 1879, and charging simply the amounts which were necessary for the payment of the expenditures of the Government, our expenditure per head of the population since 1879, has been less than the average of expenditures from 1874 to 1879. I recollect that the leader of the Opposition in the speech he made in answer to the Speech from the Throne, remarked that I was great on averages.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Well, Sir, I believe that that is a correct principle to apply, and especially to the conduct of a Government. No Government would be justified in taking one particular year of their expenditure and presenting that to the country as an evidence of their economy; neither would it be fair for an Opposition to take a particular year, in which perhaps the expenditure was large, owing to circumstances over which the Government had no control, or if they had control, circumstances under which they felt it desirable to make increased expenditure in the interests of the country—I say it would not be fair that such a year should be specially selected. Therefore, in all discussions on this subject, I desire to take the averages as well as the expenditures in particular years, as evidence of our economy or of our extravagance. Now, Sir, we find that last year, deducting the surplus, the taxation per head of our population from Customs and Excise, and these are the only heads of taxation, was \$4.82½ as against an average of \$4.88 per head from 1874 to 1879. We also find that taking the average from 1879 to 1883 it amounted to \$4.81 per head, against an expenditure from 1874 to 1879 of \$4.88 per head. Under these circumstances it will be found that while it is true that the receipts have been large, while it is true that during last year our surplus has been large, the amount which was necessary to pay the expenditures of the country and afford all the appropriations necessary for public works, and every other expenditure, the taxation on the people of the country was less than the average from 1874 to 1879. Now, Sir, it may be interesting to the House to know under what heads the increase of income took place. The increase in Customs was \$1,428,012; Excise, \$375,257; Post Office and Money Orders, \$212,503; Public Works, including Railways, \$390,004; increased interest received \$87,184. The increase in the Customs may be stated under the following heads: Railway carriages, lumber, manufacture of, and coal, \$520,000. I may say, that a large portion of the duty paid on railway carriages and locomotives was upon railway carriages and locomotives imported by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who required them earlier than they could be made in this country. Our manufacturers of locomotives were so fully occupied at that time that even the Government had to send abroad in order to get the supply necessary for the increased traffic on the railway, and locomotives had to be imported to meet pressing demands. On brandy, gin, rum, whiskey and wines, the increase was \$236,000; on fruits and sugar, \$242,500; on laces, hosiery, jewellery, \$71,000; wheat flour, \$46,000; machinery, \$150,000; pig iron, \$28,000; glassware, \$54,000. The increase of Excise revenue was mainly on the article of spirits; and the decrease on tobacco was about covered by the increase of revenue received on malt. That was before the decrease of 8 cents per pound of Excise took place in the article of tobacco. These are the items with reference to the operations of the last year. I desire now to call the attention of the House to the estimated income and expenditure for the present year. This is an amended estimate made from our experience down to the present date. The estimate of Customs for the current year was \$21,500,000. The amended estimate is \$20,250,000. Now, Sir, it may be asked by the House, what has occurred to produce this reduction? I may state in answer to that question that the imports of last year were \$5,000,000 in excess of the estimate and the revenue from Customs \$1,000,000 in excess of the estimate. I am satisfied, and it is now well understood, that the imports of the last year were greater than was warranted by the demands and by the consumption. We are now feeling the effect of that over-importation, because there is a corresponding reduction in the revenue received from Customs as the result. Then, there is another cause. Since this time twelve months, a large portion of the imports into Canada

have decreased in value. As those hon. members who are engaged in business know perfectly well, many of the articles imported have fallen in value, owing to the increased stock in hand in the United States and in the old country. I know of one article, which was formerly sold for \$9, but which is now sold for \$6.75; and so with many other articles. Therefore, the over-importation of \$5,000,000 last year, and the fall in the value of imports this year, have resulted in a reduction in the total imports down to the present time; and, estimating that the next four months will yield one-half of the revenue that has been received from Customs in the past eight months, I place the estimated income for the current year at the following figures:—

Customs .....	\$20,250,000
Excise .....	5,550,000
Post Office .....	1,800,000
Public Works, including railways.....	3,000,000
Interest on investments .....	800,000
Other sources .....	800,000
<b>Total income .....</b>	<b>\$32,200,000</b>

The amended estimated expenditure is \$31,200,000. The estimate made this time twelve months placed the expenditure at \$31,010,000; but we have had to expend a very considerable sum on public works—for the completion of the public buildings in Manitoba, on the harbour of Toronto, and on works in various other parts of the Dominion where works were absolutely necessary, and the sum voted was not found sufficient—so that the expenditure under that head has been increased; and therefore I estimate that the total expenditure this year will amount to the sum named, leaving a surplus of consolidated revenue of \$1,000,000. I estimate that the proceeds from public lands in the North-West will amount to another \$1,000,000, making the total surplus for this year \$2,000,000. It may be said, by hon. gentlemen opposite that this is a great falling off from the surplus of \$8,000,000 last year; but it will be remembered that this time twelve months I estimated the surplus from consolidated revenue for the current year at \$2,250,000, my present estimate being \$1,250,000 less. Well, let us see, Sir, what circumstances have led to that reduction. In the first place, the expenditure has been increased, while the receipts have been reduced. Why is there such a great difference in the surpluses of the two years—\$8,000,000 in the one case, and \$2,000,000 in the other? Simply because, having that surplus, the Government felt that they could come to the House and ask Parliament to appropriate a much larger sum of money for public works, including buildings and harbours, than was ever asked from Parliament before—a sum of money that will reach \$3,250,000 during the current year, or an increase of about \$1,500,000. The Government felt, Sir, that with the surplus they had at their disposal, they were justified in asking Parliament for these appropriations; Parliament granted them; and these moneys are now being expended for these purposes. In addition to that, we have increased expenditures on the postal service, on payments on account of Sinking Fund, on Immigration, on Militia and Defence, and on Mounted Police for the current year. Well, Sir, there was an increased expenditure of \$2,250,000, with an estimated reduction in the revenue, which we supposed would leave us with a surplus of \$2,250,000; whereas, owing to the falling off in the revenue, it is estimated that our surplus will be \$1,000,000 from consolidated revenue, and \$1,000,900 from public lands. It must also be borne in mind that the revenue was decreased from other causes. What were they? One was a reduction of taxation of \$2,250,000 as compared with the year 1881-82. What were the reduction? \$844,016 on tea; \$76,313 on coffee; \$91,719 on tin sheets and blocks; \$200,000 on stamps; \$50,000 of postage on newspapers; \$700,000 of reduction in the tobacco duty; \$1,000 on scrap iron; \$14,250

on periodicals; and \$50,000 on wire and other articles; making about \$2,300,000 of reduction in the taxation of the country, which of course reduced the surplus. Now, Sir, we come to the subject of the estimated income and expenditure for the fiscal year 1884-85. The estimated income is as follows:—

From Customs.....	\$26,000,000
“ Excise .....	5,550,000
“ Post Office.....	1,800,000
“ Public Works, including Railways .....	3,000,000
“ Interest and Investments .....	750,000
“ Other sources .....	800,000
<b>Total estimated income.....</b>	<b>\$32,000,000</b>

I may mention here, as one of the causes of reduced income from Customs which we have taken into account is the increased producing power of the manufactures of Canada. The manufactures of the country have been increasing from year to year to such an extent as to materially affect the revenue of the country by causing a reduction in the imports. The estimated expenditure, according to the Estimates now on the Table, will be \$29,811,639. It will be observed by hon. members, that the estimate, so far as public works are concerned, of \$1,900,000 provides for the completion of public works, for which votes were taken last Session and are being expended this year. They contain no new item and it is probable therefore that a very considerable amount will appear in the Supplementary Estimates for public works in addition to those contained in the Estimates before us. It is probable that Parliament will be asked for some expenditure with reference to the obtaining, or, at least, securing the extension of railways, and of course the interest of that sum will have also to be provided. It has been intimated here that it may be found desirable to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway system from Montreal to Quebec, and an amount may be required for that purpose. There may be expenditures also beyond that, but whatever they may be, there will still be, in addition to the expenditure on public works, some items, no doubt, of that kind to be added. It is estimated therefore that the Supplementary Estimates will amount to \$800,000 which will make the total expenditure for the next year \$30,611,639: the estimate surplus from consolidated revenue is \$1,400,000, and the estimated receipts from land in the North-West \$1,250,000, or a total estimated surplus for next year of \$2,650,000. The leading items of increase are: Militia, \$139,000; Mounted Police, \$54,000; Post Office, \$211,000; and the leading items of decrease are sinking fund and interest \$235,000, Public Works \$750,000, Indians \$147,920. Under these circumstances, it would appear that during the current and the next year the surplus will probably be in the neighbourhood of \$2,250,000 per annum, and it will probably be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite who have objected from time to time to the large surplus to learn that it has been reduced by a reduction of taxation, by decreased importation, the result of increased manufactures in the country. Now I desire to call the attention of the House to objections that have been taken to the Tariff of 1879 by hon. gentlemen opposite who have complained of the enormous surplus that we have received in the past; who complain that we have been taking from the pockets of the people a large sum of money which it would be much better to have allowed to remain there. The hon. the leader of the Opposition in the remarks he made upon the subject, said: “\$20,000,000 have been taken out of the pockets of the people during the last four years unnecessarily; yes, he said not only \$20,000,000, but probably \$30,000,000. When I read that statement, I read it as delivered elsewhere; when it was made in the House, one of my colleagues, sitting near me, said: “What does he mean by that?” That was the question I asked myself when I read that statement for the first time. Well, I concluded, from the remarks made, that the hon. member

not only took into account the \$20,000,000 we had received but he added the interest on that and other charges, the profits, I suppose, that the consumer had to pay to the middleman. I presume that is what the hon. gentleman meant. Now, let us see how the case stands. We have had in the last four years an average surplus of \$5,000,000 a year, but \$4,000,000 of that, or nearly, has been the proceeds of land in the North-West; that therefore, was no tax upon the people. You may take \$4,000,000 off that, at all events, to commence with. Then let us see how far the position taken by the hon. member, if I understood him aright, is carried out. He estimates, I presume, from the remarks that fell from him, that the consumer pays not only an increased duty but an increased profit on that duty to the man from whom he purchases the goods. Is that clearly established? I will appeal to every hon. gentleman in the House to-day who is doing business whether the manufacturers in the United States and the manufacturers in the old country have not approached him in the last three or four years and offered to sell him goods at a lower rate to meet the increased duties that have been collected and gone into the Treasury of the Dominion. We know that is the case. No one knows it better than the hon. Minister of Customs who has been brought in contact with this from day to day since 1879. Everybody understands this fact, and therefore a very considerable portion of the \$16,000,000 of Customs that has been paid into the Treasury of the Dominion over and above what was necessary to pay our expenditure, has been, beyond doubt, paid by the manufacturer abroad. Is it a fact that the consumer always pays the increased duty? We know perfectly well that many of our men who are largely engaged in business complain that the imposition of the 2½ per cent. additional duty upon the goods they import is just so much out of their pockets, as they do not get it from the consumer. That is the allegation very often made. I will quote an authority here which the hon. leader of the Opposition, I think, will not object to, to show that in many cases and certainly in some, the consumer does not pay the duty. I quote, as an authority, the hon. gentleman who has just left his seat and is sitting at the lower part of the front benches (Mr. Paterson, Brant). The hon. leader of the Opposition may not consider him quite as good authority, judging from what has occurred lately, as if it came from the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Richard Cartwright.) Still I know he has great confidence in the opinion and judgment of the hon. member, and therefore I will give the leader of the Opposition that hon. gentleman's view to show that in many cases the consumer does not pay the additional duty. I refer to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) who said, in 1876:

"The other year the Finance Minister, in revising the Tariff, gave some encouragement to our industry which it never had before. The result was that 1,000 men who were engaged in that industry in Germany were literally transported, by the change in the Tariff, to Canada and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota, and Canada got all the benefit. The middlemen suffered a diminution of profits, but for them nobody seems to care much, the producer and consumer receiving all the sympathy."

That is the statement, no doubt a correct one, and it is applicable to many other articles upon which the duty is increased, the consumer not paying it. The experience of the last four years has proved beyond doubt the wisdom, or, at any rate, the fairness of that Tariff; that is the wisdom of its provisions in securing the necessary revenue, and besides the necessary protection for the industries of the country. Now it will be well understood by hon. members that if a Tariff had been framed that would simply give revenue sufficient to meet the expenditure for the first year or two, there would, as our manufacturing industries increased, in two or three years be a condition of things that would require the readjustment of the Tariff and the imposition of increased duties.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Well, Sir, the Tariff was to a certain extent, I admit, an experiment, because we did not know exactly what it would produce. We found that, by its application to the imports of the country, from the improved condition of the country increasing those imports, though we had a deficit in the first year, as the result of the over-importation of the year previous, we had in the next year a surplus of four millions, in the year following a surplus of six millions, and in the fourth year a surplus of seven million dollars. Under these circumstances, finding that that Tariff was ample to meet not only all that was required for the time being, but to meet the requirements of the future, the Government asked Parliament to take off two millions and a quarter of taxation. What is the position we are in to-day? Notwithstanding that the people have been relieved from the payment of that two millions and a quarter of taxation, notwithstanding that there has been a large increase in the manufacturing industries of the country, still we have a surplus of from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 a year, sufficient to meet any further increase which may take place in the producing power of our manufacturers throughout Canada. Under these circumstances, we are in a position to-day to meet Parliament and say, we have provided for the past, we have had a surplus in the past, we have reduced taxation, and the revenue, without any change so far as increased taxation is concerned, is ample and sufficient for the future, expenditure that may fall upon the Dominion. Now, under those circumstances, I hold that this Tariff has been in that respect a success. It may be said: "It is true, but should you not have made it something less than it was and not have had such a large surplus during the three years to which you refer?" We might have done it, but I doubt if it would have been politic, even if we knew that such would have been the result. What has been the effect? We have been able to take off the duties on the necessaries of life, many of them, and we have been able to do what members of the late Government said they intended to do if they had been in power when they had a surplus revenue. They justified themselves in not collecting revenue sufficient to pay the expenditure from 1875 down to 1879, because, when good times came, they would take the surplus and appropriate it to paying the deficits during that period. We have done that. We have paid off these deficits. We have reduced our debt. By the legislation that has taken place here, we have increased the Dominion note circulation since 1879 by \$6,500,000, and by providing that we should deposit Dominion debentures guaranteed by the Imperial Government for a part of it, we have not been required to keep one dollar of gold more than when we had a circulation of \$11,000,000 or \$12,000,000; therefore we have had an increased circulation of \$6,500,000 without any great cost to the country. We have reduced the interest of our debt by having a respectable surplus, and thus increasing the value of our securities; and, more than that, we have, by the course we have pursued with reference to the appropriating of this surplus in reducing our debt, placed ourselves in such a position that the net interest paid by the Dominion of Canada during the last fiscal year was \$290,000 less than we paid in 1879-80. Under these circumstances, Sir, I think that the policy of the Government has been justified, the Tariff has been justified, and I believe that the evidence that we will be able to submit a little later on will confirm our friends and supporters who have sustained this Tariff up to the present time in the conviction that it is the policy to pursue for the future. I propose to follow, to-day, the course which I have pursued since 1879, and which, I think, is the most satisfactory line to take, and that is, year after year, to place upon record the answers to the objections that were made by hon. members opposite when that Tariff was under consideration. I purpose, on the present occasion, to take up as I have in the past, all the objections urged by hon. gentlemen

opposite in 1879, and to produce, from our Trade Returns and from the statistics that we have, evidence that I think will be satisfactory to this House and to the country, that their fears, entertained and expressed in 1879, have not been justified by results any year since that period, down to the present. But I desire, before I go any further, to call the attention of the House to the few changes that the Government propose to make in the Tariff. I say they are few and unimportant, because, after considering this question carefully, the Government thought it best, this year at all events, to disturb the Tariff as little as possible. I know it has been said we have since 1879 made a good many changes every year, and I think they were wise and judicious, but we all felt at the time that it was desirable to do as little in that way as possible, unless the public interests demanded them; but in the present year the changes are not important, and they are in this direction—they are in the direction of giving to the manufacturer articles that are now unenumerated and pay 20 per cent, at a reduced rate of duty of 10 per cent., or to place them upon the free list. This is still recognizing the principle of maintaining and encouraging the industries of Canada. The articles it is proposed to place upon the free list are as follows:—Belting cloths. Boracic acid. Canvas manufactured from jute, 58 inches wide, for floor oil cloths. That has been free when uncalendered, and I may say here that the parties engaged in this industry throughout Canada thought they had a right to import and did import the uncalendered article for a time, but it was found to be not consistent with the law, and it is proposed to place the jute canvas calendered in the same position as uncalendered jute canvas was before. Cherryheat welding compound. Grease and grease scrap was upon the free list before, but connected with it was the condition "when imported by soap manufacturers." That is struck out and it is open for any person as well as soap manufacturers to import grease and grease soap. Indigo paste and extract. Indigo has been free in the past, but they have a new preparation of indigo called "paste and extract" for the same purposes, and it is proposed to introduce these articles into the free list. It will be remembered that last Session it was decided by Parliament that iron beams, sheets, plates, and knees, for iron or composite ships or vessels, should be free, and it is now proposed to add angles to that list, and make it iron or steel, because the parties are importing and using steel as well as iron, and it is simply placing steel for these purposes in the same category, and adding angles. Oxide of manganese. German mineral potash. Sulphate of sodium. Steel for saws was free before. We add straw cutters cut to shape. We strike out colcothar. It was an uncertain article, and an attempt was made to import other articles under that name. Vegetable fibre for manufacturing purposes. That also involved a great deal of difficulty in the Customs Department, and it is proposed to strike that out. Fish-plates, steel, to be struck out of the free list, and they will come in under the iron and steel plates at the same rate of duty. Then I come to the dutiable list. Acetic acid, raised from 15 to 25 per cent. It was found that a very strong description of vinegar under the head of acetic acid was imported, and it probably was acetic acid, but, by reducing it, and adding large quantities of water, they converted it into vinegar, and paid less duty than the man who imported vinegar, so it is to be placed at the same rate as vinegar, and therefore it is proposed to put such a duty upon it as will make about the same rate of duty as is paid on vinegar. Caplins, unfinished Leghorn hats, now paying 25, are to be the same as finished—20 per cent. Carpeting and mats of hemp are to be the same as jute. Jute now pays 25 per cent., but hemp does not. A difficulty occurred with reference to the character of the article that was entered, and they are to be made both the same. Celluloid moulded into sizes for knife and fork handles, and not manufactured, 10

per cent. This has become necessary in order to supply one or two outleries that have been started in the Dominion, and it is proposed to admit handles unfinished at 10 per cent. Last year we placed 27½ per cent upon cottons, prints, and dyed cottons—they remain the same. Jeans and coutilles were left on the 20 per cent. list, with one or two articles of a similar description of cotton, and it is proposed now to place jeans and coutilles only for corset makers, at 20 per cent. Cotton, 42 inches wide, for enamelled cloth. This 42-inch cotton is not made in the Dominion of Canada. The manufacturers of window shades were given the right to import it at 15 per cent., and this is extending it to the manufacturers of enamelled cloth. Earthenware decorated, printed or sponged and all not elsewhere specified—this is the same as at present, 30 per cent. I may state here that the reason for the more definite description is that a question has arisen between the importers and the Customs Department with reference to the Tariff as it exists at present. An action was brought by a firm in Montreal, claiming that the Customs Department had made an illegal collection. A suit was brought, and the verdict was given in favour of the Department; and it has been thought better in order to prevent any difficulty in the future that the description of the earthenware should be more specially given. India rubber vulcanized handles, for knives and forks, 10 per cent. Iron,—cast-iron forks, in an unfinished condition, 10 per cent. Labels for fish cans and other printed matter, to pay 6 cents per lb. and 20 per cent. Pins of all kinds at present under the Tariff, made of brass wire, were one rate of duty, and of iron wire another rate; and as a considerable amount of capital has been invested in Ontario in making these pins the duty is made 30 per cent. on all. Soap powders, 3 cents per pound. Steel now \$5 per ton, is to be \$3 per ton and 10 per cent. This is in order to equalize the duty more generally, and gives some more protection to the steel industry than it had in the past. Steel,—rolled round wire rods, under half an inch in diameter, for manufacturing wire. It now pays 10 per cent. without any condition attached to it. Arrangements are being made for the manufacture of wire, which now pays 15 per cent., and in order to give the manufacturers some profit it is proposed to reduce that description of iron used in the manufacture of wire, to 5 per cent. Needles, cylinder, hand frame and others,—this particular description of needles manufactured in the Dominion of Canada is to pay hereafter by this proposal 30 per cent. Now, I come to the question of the sugar duty. During the last six months the Government have had their attention called to this question by a number of individuals throughout the Dominion of Canada. I may mention that during last year, in October or November, a new tariff on sugar came into effect in the United States. That tariff is based upon the saccharine value of sugar below No. 13, tested by the polariscope. It has, by its operation, changed very considerably the trade in that country, and it has effected, to a certain extent, the trade with us, because a class and description of sugar that was formerly manufactured for, and taken largely by, the American market, suited our Tariff. That is now changed, to a certain extent, and the result has been that imports of sugar from the East Indies and from Brazil have increased considerably during the last six months. Therefore it became a serious question with the Government as to how they were to deal with this matter. I may say here that difficulties under the existing Tariff have arisen, as the Minister of Customs knows very well, under the following provisions: All sugars imported from the countries of produce paid no duty upon packages or charges, therefore sugar imported from the country of growth, suffered various deductions, according to the value of these packages, and the amount of these charges. These varied from 7 up

to, in many cases, 27, and great difficulty has been experienced by the Department in order to get at an accurate statement of these charges. Then, on the other hand, difficulties have been experienced by the Department in ascertaining the exact value of sugar. In some cases it was known and afterwards discovered that sugars were imported below their value, and unreasonable and illegal deductions were made for packages and for charges. After having given this matter a good deal of consideration, the Government have decided for the present—though the matter was pressed on them very strongly, and there is a good deal to be said in favour of adopting the polariscope test,—to delay action at all events for the present Session, in order to give them an opportunity of investigating this matter fully, because it is a question that we cannot deal with in a hurried manner and without giving it full and mature consideration, as otherwise disastrous results might occur. We can make an investigation ourselves; we can enter upon negotiations, which will, no doubt, be not only desirable but necessary, in the present state of arrangements between the United States and Spain. It will be one of the objects, I am sure, of the early efforts of our High Commissioner when he returns to Europe, to endeavour to make some arrangements with Spain on that subject; therefore we thought proper that this matter should stand, at all events, as far as the adoption of the polariscope test was concerned, until the next Session of Parliament. To obviate existing difficulties, we make this proposition: that while the duty now collected upon sugars imported from the country of growth and produce is 30 per cent., after deducting charges, it is proposed to make the invoice for the payment of duty free on board, including packages and all charges, and to reduce the duty to 27½ per cent. That is the proposition; and it will give about the same result. And it has been decided, also, to establish such a system as will prevent what has occurred in the past—an improper and illegal entry of goods at one port and at a lower price than at another port. The arrangement is to be made so that there will be a uniform fixed rate throughout the whole Dominion, with reference to the cost of sugar, in the future. Now, Sir, another change is proposed. At present, the rate of duty collected on molasses, when used for conversion into sugar or syrup, is 25 per cent., and for domestic purposes, 15 per cent.; it is proposed to reduce the duty on all molasses to 15 per cent. when it comes from the port of production direct, and to remain as now 5 per cent. higher if it does not come from the port direct. The duty is to be collected free on board. Then, chloride of zinc and sulphate of zinc, used in the manufactures, is to be reduced to 5 per cent. It is in the unenumerated list at present. Then will follow the repealing of all clauses inconsistent with the foregoing; and it is proposed to amend section 8, 42 Vic., chap. 15, with reference to damaged and perishable goods. At present, if less than 25 per cent. of the whole invoice is damaged no return can be had. It is proposed, now, that if for instance in a case containing plate glass or glass of any kind 25 per cent. of the package is destroyed, then the party is to have the benefit. If 20 packages out of 100 packages at the present time were destroyed and not amounting to 25 per cent. of the whole, the party would not get any benefit. These are the provisions contained in the proposals to be submitted to the House. They, if anything, reduce the amount of revenue that will be collected under their operation.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask if you propose to take the duty off corn meal?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not at the present Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope you will at a very early period, at some future Session, consider it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I desire to call the attention of the House to the objections that have, on former

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

occasions, been raised to this Tariff. One was that it would damage our credit in England. It will be remembered very well by hon. gentlemen who were in the House in 1879 that that was one of the principal objections brought forward by hon. gentlemen opposite. It has not damaged our credit down to the present time. In October last, our 4 per cent. securities were higher than they ever reached before. They were, ex-dividend, 14 per cent. more than we obtained down to 1878 or 1879. I will take this opportunity of stating what arrangements were made in England, when I was last there, with respect to the maturing loan. I placed myself, by authority of the Order in Council, in communication with our agents there, with respect to the redemption of the loan. After conference with them, it was decided that about November it would be wise to place a loan for £2,000,000 sterling on the market to redeem in part the 5 per cent. securities that fall due on 1st January, 1885. This would leave us with a smaller amount to place in the market the next year. It was suggested by the agents that that loan should be a short one, for ten years, and at 4 per cent., that we might be in a position to say to the holders of the present loan maturing on 1st January next, bearing 5 per cent., we will either exchange those with you dollar for dollar or pound for pound, which would be placing the 4 per cent. loan at practically 1½ or 2 per cent. premium, because we had three coupons to pay on the debentures maturing on 1st January next, or exchange them as far as they go, or allow the agents to purchase them as they were placed on the market. They then suggested that next year, later in the season, in December, we should place a 3½ per cent. loan on the market for thirty years for the redemption of the balance of that loan, and for the £2,000,000 sterling we would probably require to meet the expenditure on carrying the Canadian Pacific Railway to completion. They, of course, said that a 3½ per cent. loan would not bring as high a rate as a 4 per cent.; but they gave as their reason for suggesting that the loan, to be issued last autumn, should be for ten years at 4 per cent., that it would enable us to exchange them for 5 per cent., and the probabilities were that when the ten years had expired and the debentures were redeemable we could replace them by 3½ per cent. debentures nearly at par. That was their idea, and therefore they suggested a loan for a short period. The matter was left in that position with the understanding that I should cable them or communicate with them whenever a desirable opportunity offered to place on the market the £2,000,000 sterling, or \$10,000,000 for ten or twenty years—we had not fully decided on the period, but they suggested ten years. In the meantime a proposition came from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to deposit \$16,000,000 and in February a further sum of \$4,000,000 on account of the proposed guarantee, and I at once communicated to the agents that this proposal having been agreed to, the matter would stand over for the present. We thought under these circumstances we could use a portion of the \$16,000,000 and the \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 to be received on the 1st February, in the redemption through the agents of the 5 per cent. falling due in January next. The matter remained there; and I may here add that after I came from England, and after conference with my colleagues, it was decided, having made a pledge in the House last Session that if a loan were necessary during the year in order to meet the exigencies and requirements of the people of Canada who required as executors of estates and trustees to make investments, we would float a loan here for a limited amount—to place a \$1,000,000 loan on the market and that the minimum should be par. References have been made out of the House and in the House to that loan, those made out of the House, I will not say those made in the House, being made with a view of damaging the credit of Canada. But what are the facts with regard to it?

The facts are these: That hon. gentlemen opposite know right well that the only loan we have placed on the Canadian market down to 1880 was at 6 per cent.; that in 1880 or 1881 it was decided to call in those 6 per cents., and we stated to the parties who held them that they could either have 5 per cents. or their money, and only a portion of the amount was taken in 5 per cents. And this last loan is the first loan ever floated by the Government of Canada at 4 per cent. or a shade less, as this was. It may be said that it was a great mistake to place that loan on the market without being quite sure the whole of it would be taken up. It was not offered, because there was a pressing want of the money. There was no reason why we should float a loan at a less rate than in England except to meet the demands to which I have referred, which the Government were pledged to do; and there could be no doubt we could have floated the \$4,000,000 loan without any trouble had we adopted the course invariably followed in England of making certain allowances to brokers and paying percentages indirectly to parties tendering for the bonds; we were approached on that subject, but we neither paid any party in the shape of a syndicate, nor gave any commissions, nor paid any brokerage. The brokers asked a certain commission and we declined to give it, but we felt we were under an engagement to Dominion investors. We had taken up nearly every Dominion security payable in Canada. We had taken up the sixes, the fives, and the only debentures that remain now are the Savings Bank fives which are payable in a year. Many of those who were trustees of estates came to us within the last year or eighteen months asking for securities of this kind. The Government had pledged themselves, for I had stated in the House that when a loan was necessary it would be placed in our own market and among our own people. When the loan was offered we found that many of them had placed their money in banks—I do not know at what rate of interest. The banks found it in their interests to urge their depositors to allow this money to remain. Therefore we have not placed as large an amount as was expected of the loan. I had applications from England as well as from the United States. One was from a firm in Boston—Blake, Bros. & Co.—no connection, I believe, of my hon. friend opposite, but they wanted to float the debentures in the American market. I said no, these securities are held for Canadian investors, and if we had sold four million instead of one we would have had to seek temporary investment for the money. Therefore it was placed at 2½ per cent. premium in the meantime; but if we find that this is more than our securities bring in the English market we may reduce the rate. Pending that necessity, however, we felt that it was best to keep them where they are, and we told the applicants that they were held for investment in Canada, and not out of it; and for the purposes which I have stated, and to which we had pledged Parliament they would be devoted. Under these circumstances that loan cannot be considered a failure, because it was placed at a lower figure than we have ever obtained money for in Canada. We now receive money, it is true, in the savings banks, on call, for which we pay 4 per cent. It may be asked were you acting in the interests of the country in placing them at par? I call attention to one or two facts which though they are applicable to the discussion of the guarantee by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, did not come up in that discussion, though, I thought, it might be stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that we might have obtained money on better terms in England. Taking money at par in Canada, the interest and principle paid here, is as good as at 2 or 2½ per cent. premium in England. The ex-Minister of Finance knows perfectly well that when we go into that market and ask tenders for a large sum of money it is done on the wholesale principle. He knows perfectly well that the difference between every day rates quoted for the small

lots, and what the Government realizes from large loans is about 2 per cent.—that is the Government realizes about 2 per cent less than the figures given in those quotations. That is generally the case; but in addition to that, let me say, that we have to pay 1 per cent. premium, and for a large portion one-quarter per cent. brokerage. For debentures running thirty years, one-half per cent. is paid to the agents as commission for the payment of coupons, and amounts to over one-half per cent. during that period. These amount to 1½ per cent. Then the difference between having our money here, paid into our own Treasury, and having it paid in England, and transmitted here is equal to three-quarters of 1 per cent. more, and therefore there is a difference between obtaining the money here at par in preference to obtaining the money in England, amounting to 2 per cent. Therefore we felt justified in naming par as the minimum; and we felt ourselves justified in a financial point of view in taking the money at 4 per cent. from the Canadian Pacific Railway. We felt if we could obtain \$4,000,000 at par, well and good, but to give it at less than par would be to place it at such a rate that it would not be in the interests of the country to dispose of it. We are therefore holding it for its original purposes, but if it is found to be desirable or necessary we may place it at a lower rate. Now, what was our position? Our position last autumn was most favourable. We had reduced the amount of the bonds of Canada in the hands of capitalists in England, to the extent of \$10,000,000, between 1879 and 1883. We have not been compelled to go into the English market for a dollar since 1879. The fact of our not requiring to do so gave us, of course, a favourable position in the money market. Then, as I stated here last Session, the chances were, that beyond placing the loan on the market for £2,000,000 to meet the £2,000,000 sterling we were redeeming or had to redeem this year, the exchange of the debentures at 4 per cent. for the \$29,000,000, after deducting the sinking fund falling due next January—we were going into the market simply to exchange securities rather than to ask for new loans. The result has been that from our surplus, from our improved credit, the securities of Canada stand to-day from 3 to 4 per cent. higher than those of New South Wales, which used to be 2½ per cent. above Canada. Now, I am free to admit that the obligations which we have undertaken by the measure which has just passed this House, will of course, compel us to go into the English market for more money than we otherwise would have required. When we made arrangements with our agents for the exchanging of securities, they agreed not only to redeem but to place the new bonds for £2,000,000 at one half per cent., whereas under the old arrangement it would have been 1 per cent. for redemption and 1 per cent. for payment. This is a favourable arrangement and will save us a large sum of money. The probabilities are that owing to the rapid progress of the work on the Canadian Pacific Railway, we will have to go to the English market within a year for £3,000,000 on a thirty years loan. It may be desirable next year to provide £3,000,000 sterling by a short loan of seven years, which will fall due in 1891, when the advance becomes due and payable by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that that will be somewhat embarrassing, considering that we have \$29,000,000 to redeem on the 1st of January. It may, or it may not. Much will depend on the state of the money market at the time; but we are in this position: That if it should be found desirable to do so in the interests of the country, as the debentures which mature on the 1st of January next are not absolutely payable on that date, we may avail ourselves of our option and allow their redemption to stand for another year, and it is for this reason among others that the Government exacted from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a rate of interest which would place them beyond all chance of loss, and with probably a very considerable gain. Now, Sir, that is our position, financially, on the

other side of the Atlantic. Our credit has not been damaged. Our credit, as I say, was never better than it is at the present moment, and never has there been a period in the history of the country when we could go to the old country to obtain a loan for the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway on more favourable terms than we can at present. Our interest last year was \$290,000 less than it was in 1880-81, and in another year or two, at all events, we shall redeem our 5 per cent. debentures for others bearing 4 per cent. or less, and we are in a position to state to Parliament that even with the engagements we have made, the maximum net interest which was paid in 1880-81 will not be exceeded when this great work is completed. Well, Sir, there was another objection. We were told that the Tariff would decrease our trade with Great Britain. I do not desire, Sir,—because I think it would be an unfair way of dealing with this question—to shirk meeting every objection which has been taken against this Tariff year after year. I present the facts and place them on record, so that we may have a means of judging for ourselves, year after year, as to their value. Now, Sir, has it decreased the trade with England and increased the trade with the United States? Let me give you a few facts. In 1876-77 our imports from the United States entered for consumption were \$51,312,669; from Great Britain, \$39,572,239; making a difference in favour of the United States of \$11,740,430. In 1877-78 our imports from the United States, entered for consumption, were \$48,631,739; from Great Britain, \$37,431,180; making a difference in favour of the United States of \$11,200,559. In 1878-79 our imports for consumption from the United States were \$43,739,219; from Great Britain, \$30,993,130; making a difference in favour of the United States of \$12,846,089. In 1882-83 our imports for consumption from the United States were \$56,032,333; from Great Britain, \$52,052,468; making a difference in favour of the United States of \$3,979,865, against an average difference of \$12,000,000 in the previous year. Now, Sir, it may be said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the increased imports during the last year or so are in greater proportion from the United States than from Great Britain. I admit that the proportionate increase from the United States was greater last year than formerly. This was due to exceptional circumstances. Just let us look at the imports into British Columbia and the North-West Territories during the last year from the United States in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The increase of the imports from the United States into those two Provinces of the Dominion during the past year as compared with the year 1881-82, was so nothing like \$9,000,000. As I stated before, the duty paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on imports of locomotives and rolling stock from the United States during the past two years was nearly \$1,000,000, showing that that Company alone must have imported \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 worth of articles of that exceptional character from the United States during that period. You will also find, if you trace the increased imports from the United States during the past year, that a very large amount consists of cattle which have been taken from the United States into our North-West country for the grazing companies. But, Sir, these items are exceptional, and the figures I have given show that the difference in the imports from the two countries has been largely in favour of Great Britain. Now, Sir, I want to state further the aggregate trade with Great Britain—the total imports and export—was in 1879 \$67,288,848, whereas in 1883 it was \$99,197,684, an increase, in that period, of \$31,908,836. The aggregate trade with the United States in 1879 was \$70,904,720, and in 1883 it was \$97,701,056, an increase of \$26,796,336, as against an increase of \$31,900,000 in our aggregate trade with Great Britain. Let me state further that the increased duties on

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

the imports from Great Britain, under the new Tariff, are 2½ per cent., while on the imports from the United States they are 6 per cent.; showing that the application of the Tariff has not been against England and in favour of the United States, but, on the whole, largely in favour of trade with England as compared with the United States. Now, Sir, another statement made was that by the imposition of the duty on breadstuffs, we would materially interfere with the transportation of foreign produce through Canada. I recollect that the hon. gentleman who took his seat in this House yesterday (Mr. Mills) argued this point at considerable length. He endeavoured to show the advantage that we possessed in having these exports pass through Canada, in the shape of business to our railways and employment to our people, and he urged that the effect of the duty on breadstuffs would be very damaging to Canadian industry in every way. Now, I hold in my hand a statement furnished by the Customs Department of the value of the produce exported from Canada, not the produce of Canada, for several years, which is as follows:—

1876.....	\$6,417,506
1877.....	6,746,654
1878.....	9,856,246
1879.....	7,618,442
	<hr/>
	\$29,638,848
1880.....	12,462,486
1881.....	17,137,799
1882.....	6,003,233
1883.....	8,196,366
	<hr/>
	\$38,799,884

In 1882 there was a general falling off in the exports from every port on the continent. This statement shows that the average annual export of foreign goods from Canada during the four years from 1876 to 1879 was \$7,409,712, while during the four following years, from 1880 to 1883, it amounted to \$9,699,971—a satisfactory answer, in my judgment, to those gentlemen who entertained fears on this subject. Now, Sir, it was also argued that this Tariff, if it proved to be a protective Tariff, could not be a revenue Tariff, and if it was a revenue Tariff it would fail as a protective Tariff. Well, it has proved to be a revenue Tariff; that hon. gentlemen opposite will not undertake to deny, for they complain that it has given too much revenue. Let us see, then, what evidence we have that it has encouraged the manufactures of the country. Two years ago, we had two gentlemen employed to visit the manufactories of the country, in order to ascertain if legislation was necessary to protect the labourers in factories. They gathered from a portion of the manufactories of the Dominion a certain amount of information most valuable in its character, showing the increased products of these manufactories, the increased number of persons employed in them, and the increased amount of wages paid. We have on various occasions produced certain information which we think cannot be controverted, and I follow the same course now. Take, for instance, the article of raw cotton. We can gauge very correctly the quantity of cotton manufactured, or its increased manufacture in the Dominion, from these returns because cotton is not produced in the country, and therefore the imports of that article will give very accurately its increased manufacture. In 1877-78, the imports of raw cotton were 7,243,413 lbs.; in 1878-79, they were 9,720,708 lbs.; in 1881-82, 18,127,323 lbs.; and in 1882-83, 27,353,491 lbs. That shows pretty clearly that the Tariff operates as a protective Tariff or as an encouraging Tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite will, perhaps, say that it is now too highly protected, causing over-production, though they helped to induce many persons to go into that industry by stating on the floor of Parliament that it paid the parties who had investments in it at 60 per cent. The imports in wool in 1877 and '78 amounted to 6,330,034 lbs.; in 1881 and '82, they amounted to 9,682,757 lbs.; in 1882 and '83,

to 9,821,104 lbs. That gives a pretty fair index, though not so clear as in the case of raw cotton, because it is pretty well understood that an increased quantity of our home grown wool has been consumed in the manufacture of woollen goods in the past year. Still there is an evident large increase in the importation of wool of a quality not grown in Canada. Hides and pelts were imported in 1877 and '78 to the value of \$1,207,300, and in 1882 and '83 to the value of \$1,963,744, showing pretty clearly there has been a large extension in the manufacture of leather of various kinds. The increased value of machinery imported is shown by the following return :—

Value of Imports	1878	.....	\$438,037
"	1879	.....	40,3809
"	1880	.....	503,853
"	1881	.....	1,022,518
"	1882	.....	2,194,445
"	1883	.....	2,757,570

This is undoubted evidence of the increased development of our manufacturing industries of various kinds. I saw it stated in the leading organ of the Opposition, when this statement was made by one of the papers on the Government side that it was an indication that the Tariff had failed to encourage the manufacture of machinery in Canada. Well, I wrote a few letters to parties in Ontario on this subject, who were engaged in the manufacture of machinery, and then, answers were most satisfactory. They are rather long to read here, but one establishment said its production had increased by \$238,000 in the four years; and the others all said that they had a large increase, from a third to a half—some doubled the number of employees—and they attributed this increase to the policy which established manufactures in the country, thus creating a demand for machinery they had not before. With reference to my own Province, there is a firm largely engaged in the manufacture of machinery there. I did not write to this firm, but I know an application was made to it from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to do some work, and the manager replied that he was so full of orders that he could not tender for the work required by the Department. In all parts of the Dominion, there has been increased production of machinery, and machinery that could not be obtained here has been imported during the last year to the extent of \$2,757,570, showing pretty clearly the extent to which manufacturing industries have been increased throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. Take also the article of coal. It is quite true the consumption of coal has been increased by the development of our railway traffic, and we know that it has been considerably increased through this cause within the last three or four years. In 1878 the imports of coal amounted to 892,446 tons, and in 1883 to 1,686,617 tons, showing an increase of 719,791 tons while the increased consumption of Canadian coal in 1883 over 1878 was 700,000 tons making a total increased consumption of 1,493,171 tons over 1878. It is quite clear there must be some cause for this increased consumption beyond the increased requirements of the railways, and all understand this to be the greatly increase number of factories driven by steam. It is not denied that the increase in factories established throughout the Dominion has been very great indeed. This is the evidence I have adduced to show this policy has been not only a protective policy in its encouragement to manufacturing industries but it has also been a revenue producing policy. It was said the Tariff would not benefit the coal industry. I estimated in 1879 that in four years the increased output of coal in the Dominion of Canada would be 400,000 tons; and the returns I have received from Nova Scotia, though these are not quite complete, and those from British Columbia show clearly that the increased output of coal, as compared with 1879, for the last calendar year was 2,000 tons a day, for every working day, or a total of nearly 700,000 tons of an

increase. That, I think, is an answer, and a forcible answer to the fears entertained and the opinion expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite that this Tariff would be of no service to the coal industry.

Mr. CHARLTON. What proportion of the increased output is from British Columbia?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not much; it is mainly from Nova Scotia. Now, we come to two or three pet industries that have been pointed out by hon. gentlemen opposite as industries encouraged unnecessarily by the Parliament of Canada, as industries that have been pampered by an unnecessarily protective Tariff. I refer more especially to the cotton, woollen and sugar industries. With reference to the cotton industries, I think that hon. gentlemen who were in the House in 1879 and in 1880, will recollect that it was said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the capitalists who had invested their money in the cotton mills of the country were receiving enormous profits, at the expense of the mass of the people. That was the statement. Now I am not quite sure from what has taken place that these hon. gentlemen will not change their line of argument and say that this Tariff has been destructive to the cotton industry, that the men who have invested their capital in it will lose their capital, and that the public, the consumers, will obtain little or no benefit from it. That probably may be the line taken, but whatever may happen in the future, my impression is that though cotton stocks have fallen considerably from what they were a year or two ago, it will be found that the dividends which are being paid are fair and reasonable, and that the prices paid by the consumers of cotton in Canada are less to-day than they were in 1877-78. I am prepared to establish that the grey cottons manufactured in the Dominion to-day are sold by the manufacturers at prices as low, if not a percentage below what the same article is sold for in Massachusetts to men in the trade there. With reference to other cottons, the statements that I have had are that, deducting the expense in bringing them here, the cottons are sold to the consumer to-day at about 10 per cent. above the price in the United States. They are buying both grey and bleached cottons to-day for less than they could buy them under the Tariff of the hon. gentleman opposite of 1877-78. It is true that that industry has experienced difficulties; it is true that many of the parties who put their capital into the companies for the erection of cotton mills incurred liabilities beyond the extent of their paid up capital, and, when the mill was finished, as a rule—I know it is so in several cases—there was a debt upon the mill and they had no capital to work it, and the result was that they had to obtain assistance from outside, and that assistance was rendered them as long as it was possible for the party who undertook to render it to grant it. But there was a limit to which even the strongest financial man in the Dominion of Canada could go in that respect, and, when the amount of discounts in the various banks of Canada on cotton account had reached a very large sum, and that they could not be extended, a difficulty arose. They had been manufacturing more cotton of a particular line (greys) than there was demand for, which increased their difficulties. A panic occurred, and the result was a depreciation of cotton stocks—and it has to a certain extent continued down to the present time. It became necessary, in order to diminish the stock on hand of a certain class of goods, that the number of employes should be reduced, in order that their operations might be put in a healthy condition. Then, when that became necessary in order to right matters, what was said? The lumbermen of the country are diminishing this year their output, because there is a large stock on hand; but has there been anything said anywhere against their doing so? Has there been any complaint from any quarter in reference to it? Has the wisdom of their course

been questioned at all? No; but the very moment a few hundred operatives in a cotton mill were out of employment for a month, there was a cry through the country that the National Policy was a failure, that this pampered industry was in a desperate condition, and was in this condition as the result of the protection that had been given. I am prepared to say here to-day that these industries, though they are in difficulty for the want of capital—and that is the main cause—are placing themselves in such a position that an occurrence such as took place last summer will not take place again. They are arranging to have diversified manufactures. They are arranging that this surplus stock shall not occur again with reference to any one particular class; and, as far as I can learn, the dividends paid by many of these companies, under these circumstances, have been very fair indeed, and the only complaint of the stockholders is that they do not go into their pockets, but go to pay liabilities. Never mind; they get the benefit of them. But, while I believe these industries will pay and are paying reasonably at the present moment, the point I want to bring out is this, that the consumer is obtaining his goods, the clothing that he requires, the cotton necessary for himself and his family at a price less than he would have had it under the Tariff of the hon. gentleman opposite. Now, the next pet industry was the sugar industry. It was said that large fortunes were being made out of that. I should not wonder now if we were told by the gentlemen opposite that the protection we gave them has encouraged the construction of so many sugar refineries, that there is ruin before them as well.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, that is their business, not ours. But I saw the dividend declared the other day by a company that was not very fortunate in its outset, I speak of the Halifax Refinery. It was not a very large dividend, but they declared a dividend, and I have reason to believe that the other refineries are paying a fair and reasonable return for their outlay of capital. The trouble now with hon. gentlemen opposite will be that they are not getting 30 or 40 per cent.; there would then be a grievance in reference to this matter. What is the position in which the consumer is placed to-day? It was said that the consumer would pay a largely increased price for the sugar he consumed. I think I am in a position to state that, at no period in the history of Canada, has the consumer of sugar had it at as low a price as he has obtained it during the past year, and I think I am in a position to state further that, had the Tariff of the hon. gentleman opposite been in operation during the last year, the consumer would have paid under that Tariff more for the sugar than he has paid during the past year. There are many persons opposed to this Tariff who are under the impression that the manufactured goods to which I have referred, cotton and sugar, cost more than they did under the Tariff of 1877-78. Well, it is quite natural that many persons, reading the Opposition papers, should get that idea, but I was very much surprised that a leading statesman, who should be thoroughly posted on this subject, was himself mistaken with reference to the matter. I refer to my hon. friend, if he will allow me to call him so, the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). In a speech he delivered in Scotland—I do not know if it is correctly reported—he is reported to have made this statement:

"With regard to the sugar manufactories, the policy of the protectionist Government was such as to make it impossible to import sugar from any other country, and the Canadian people were taxed from two to three cents, or a penny to a penny and a-half penny per pound, more than formerly in order that sugar refineries might be established in the country. There were now five, and the probability was that there would be some more before long, leading to over-production, and all this going on at the expense of the country."

Further on he says:

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

"Now, there was no doubt whatever that the farmers would soon find out that they pay, as they are now paying, nearly two prices for cotton goods, and an additional price for prints in addition."

If my hon. friend was mistaken, as I allege he was, in reference to this, then it is quite reasonable to suppose that others who had not the same facilities for obtaining information upon the subject might also be misled. But it would strike the gentlemen present on that occasion, and some of them probably were interested in sugar refineries, as singular that under our Tariff we had only increased the duty between raw sugar and refined 5 per cent. as between the Tariff of 1878 and the present Tariff—only 5 per cent., except in regard to the United States, where they give a bounty, and therefore we make them pay on the duty paid value, but in regard to Scotland or England there was only 5 per cent. difference as between raw sugar and refined compared with the Tariff of 1878. And supposing that was  $\frac{1}{2}$  of a cent per pound. These gentlemen would naturally ask themselves, how is it that, if the value of sugar to the consumer is 2 or 3 cents a lb. more than it was before, we cannot get our sugar into the Canadian market when we only pay an additional duty of  $\frac{1}{2}$  of a cent per pound. It would naturally strike them as very strange. I know that my hon. friend opposite must have been under that impression when he made that statement. But the facts are apparent to every person that sugar was never so cheap as it is at present. All sugar is cheap, I admit; but even with the low price of raw sugar under the Tariff of 1878, sugar has been during the last year, sold all through the country at a price less than it could have been imported under the Tariff of 1878. Now with reference to woollen goods, another article on the list here. It is said that the poor are taxed to pay the increased duty on woollen goods. Well, now, we have discussed that point in this House from year to year; we have discussed it on the platform outside the House, and I think the country is coming to understand that question pretty well. I think people understand that at the present moment that woollen goods manufactured in Canada to-day are sold at a less price than they could have been sold if imported under the Tariff of 1878. I think that is well understood. I think the poor men, the labouring men, the men in moderate circumstances, and even the rich men who wish to consume as good manufactured woollen as can be made, all pay less for them to-day than they would have paid under the Tariff of 1878. New industries have been established in various sections of the country; even Prince Edward Island made a most creditable exhibit of woollen goods at the St. John Exhibition—that Province which, it has been said, over and over again, derived no benefit whatever from the National Policy. Now, Sir, at the present day the people know how it operates. It has been said that the farmer would be taxed and would have no benefit whatever under the operation of this policy. In 1882 I entered very fully upon that point, and my case was not as strong then as it is to-day. Then the hon. gentleman opposite asked us, as did their organ from month to month—where is the benefit to the wheat producer of Canada by your Tariff? Well, I admitted that they were not benefited 15 cents per bushel, but they had a small benefit—I placed it at something like 2 cents per bushel, and I had to admit that it was small. I went on to show that they had benefits in other directions which were very important to them indeed—that they had the benefits of better markets—home markets—that they had higher prices. The hon. gentleman opposite, perhaps, will take the course to-day that he has taken on former occasions, and attempt to show that the policy has increased the cost of living to the workingman beyond any increase of wages that is paid him. If he does, I will ask this House, I would ask hon. members who are cognizant of the facts to which I refer, whether the increased expenditure that we have to make at present in the cost of living, is not largely on the products of the farm? I appeal to house-

keepers everywhere and ask them whether the increase that has taken place in the cost of living, is not mainly in the increased cost of food produced by our farmer, they having a better market and getting better prices for their produce. I need not enter into details further than to say that to-day the farmer has clearly and beyond doubt a protection of 8 and perhaps 10 cents a bushel upon his wheat, over and above what he would have with the Tariff of 1878, and receives that additional price. There is no question about that whatever. And I will venture to say that you may travel through any portion of the wheat producing sections of Canada, and you will not find a man who is producing wheat who will raise his voice or cast his vote in favour of making wheat free—unless, perhaps, he be a very extreme party man. But, from all I can learn—and I have had pretty good opportunities of testing public opinion within the last two or three months—the universal voice of Reformers and of Liberal Conservatives, is: Don't change the duty on wheat. That is the demand. Well now, Sir, what do they pay in increased duty? Their tea is cheaper, their coffee is cheaper, as well as many other articles they consume, their cotton, I assert, is cheaper; their sugar is cheaper, their agricultural implements are cheaper—almost every thing they require is cheaper than it was in 1878, and I am satisfied that is their own testimony. Therefore, as far as the farmer is concerned, there is no ground for complaint, because he will understand and appreciate the position just as well as the hon. gentleman opposite, and at no period in the history of the National Policy do the farmers understand it better than they do to-day. Now, Sir, we come to the iron industry that they said was another pet industry and they particularly declaimed against the duty on pig iron. We also gave a bounty to that industry, yet notwithstanding the bounty to this industry, hon. gentlemen opposite state, it is in financial difficulty. Well, that is quite true; and I can assert, Mr. Speaker, that if they were not in receipt of the benefits of a protective Tariff and a bounty they could not continue to run a day longer. Though we require to pay from the Treasury a considerable amount of money as bounty to that establishment, or to any other that may be established, the parties who are engaged in it pay into the Treasury an equivalent to that bounty; and if it became a question as to the existence of that establishment, or the payment of the bounty, it could be easily settled, because the country would lose all these people and the revenue that is paid by this and other industries connected therewith would be lost by the closing up of that establishment. It may be said by hon. gentlemen opposite: "You have not succeeded in establishing any new industries of the kind, you have scarcely kept this one alive." Well, I believe the iron industry the world over is in an embarrassed condition to-day; every one knows that. You may go to Pennsylvania, you may go to England, you may go to any iron country the world over, and you will find the prices are lower, almost, than they were ever before; therefore, I am in a position to state that it is only by the protection given, and the bounty that was paid, that this establishment is kept in existence. We have had another indication of that. A company was formed last autumn in England with a capital of £370,000, for the manufacture of charcoaled iron. They are likely to accomplish something still. I have no doubt their operations are somewhat paralyzed by the unusually low price of iron at the present moment. Therefore it cannot be expected that we can have prosperity in any particular industry of this kind when it is not in a flourishing condition anywhere else. Well, Sir, we come to another point. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: "What have you to say with reference to the argument you have adduced here on former occasions as to the value of bank stocks as an indication of the condition of the country? What have you to say with re-

ference to the equalizing of the imports and exports—which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred to in his Speech in the debate on the Address?" Well, Sir, I say this, that the record shows that with reference to the balance of trade our policy has had, to a great extent, the effect we said it would and I will prove it. But a word or two with reference to bank stocks. Last Session of Parliament, as the hon. leader of Opposition stated, I made no reference to that subject as an evidence of the prosperity of the country; because I felt at the time that the value of bank stocks was at a point beyond which, in my judgment, the resources and rests of the banks warranted. It arose from various causes; it arose, in the first place, from men who could not obtain more than 4 per cent. for the money deposited in banks and various other institutions sought to get a larger return by investing in bank stocks; and hence this increased demand. It is true that it had the brokers who were engaged in these operations bulling the market, and forcing stocks above the point which, I believed at the time, and a great many people agreed with me, was beyond their real value. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) may ask as he did at Lennox three months ago: "What explanation has the hon. Finance Minister to offer as to the reduction in the value of bank stocks, which equals \$7,000,000 as compared with the value in 1882?" Well, I can say to him in reply: What has the hon. gentleman to say to the fact that since Parliament met, or since 1st January, the stocks of the Bank of Montreal and that of other Banks, have largely increased in value. The hon. gentleman stated at Lennox that:

"Some gentlemen present knew to their cost that, although it was not possible for the Reform Government to add one cent to the value of their tariff, yet that a Finance Minister who did not understand his business and would persist in acting on his own advice contrary to that of able men around him, could destroy the market for their barley by destroying the malt-producing interest of Canada, as Sir Leonard Tilley had done most wantonly. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) The course followed had been suggested to him (Sir Richard), but on enquiry he found that if he started in that direction he might give American maltsters the opportunity which they had long been seeking of using our action for the purpose of excluding Canadian malt. He therefore abstained. Sir Leonard Tilley took a different view. He put on a duty, and in so doing struck a blow not only at an important Canadian industry, but at the interests of our barley-growing counties, because it was of great importance to farmers that, if there should be for a time a surplus of barley, it should be malted in our own country and held over until such time as a rise in prices occurred. Now they were entirely in the hands of Oswego merchants and American maltsters. (Cheers.) Not long ago the Finance Minister stated that the Dominion was safe for another seven years of uninterrupted prosperity. Scarcely were the words out of his mouth than the list of bankruptcies began to swell to such proportions that the list for 1883 would prove greater than that of the worst year of the depression when Mr. Mackenzie was in power."

The Bank of Montreal stock was the barometer of stocks generally, and that it had gone down millions. The value of that stock to-day is \$3,000,000 over what it was on the 1st January last. This would be evidence, if I were to follow the line of argument adopted by that hon. gentleman, that business is rapidly improving, a conclusion which I am not disposed to object to. What were the circumstances which led to the depreciation in the value of bank stocks? Several circumstances combined to bring about that result, but I do not hesitate to say that the outrageous mismanagement of the Exchange Bank had a great deal to do with it. It is quite true that when the final crash came it did not affect terminally the banking institutions of the country; but it affected men seeking investments and those who held bank stocks as investments, they were led to the conclusion that as permanent investments these stocks were not satisfactory securities to hold. The consequence was that such persons sought investments elsewhere and placed their bank stock on the market, and that circumstance together with the disturbed state of the market at the time would assist the "bears" to force stocks below their real value; and that indeed was the result. What was there to justify that great reduction? I have a statement here which

shows that nine or ten of the banks increased their rest during last year by \$1,780,000, and still their stock had depreciated in value for the reasons stated. But they are now advancing, being restored to a figure nearer their fair value, and I am satisfied they will reach a higher point than at present. The existing position of bank stocks does not deprive us of the argument we used before, that it was the satisfactory financial condition of the country, that increased the value of those stocks, and they are far higher to-day than they were in 1878, and will go still higher.

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

### After Recess.

#### THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Halifax Steam Navigation Company, limited.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Canada Temperance and General Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Middlesex.)

Bill (No. 45) to incorporate the Owen Sound Dry Dock Shipbuilding and Navigation Company, limited.—(Mr. Allen.)

Bill (No. 47) respecting the winding up of the Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Coal and Railway Company, and the sale of the property thereof to the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the International Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Gunn.)

#### FIRST READING.

The following Bill (from the Senate) was read the first time, on a division:—

Bill (No. 107) for the relief of John Graham.—(Mr. Jamieson.)

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Previous to Recess, Sir, I was calling the attention of the House to the statement that was made out of the House by the hon. member for South Huron, and in the House by the hon. leader of the Opposition, relative to the sudden fall that had taken place in bank stocks. I stated that the fall in stocks was of an exceptional character, and did not go to prove that it was the result of a depression in the general trade of the Dominion. I think, Sir, that when I state that since the 1st of January these stocks have risen on an average over ten per cent.—the Bank of Montreal from 179½ to 189, the Ontario Bank from 103 to 100½, the Bank of Toronto from 165½ to 178½, the Merchants' Bank from 108 to 114½, the Bank of Commerce from 118½ to 121½, and the Federal Bank from 122½ to 136—it will be quite clear to the House that a fall in bank stocks cannot be claimed as a proof of general depression in the trade of the country. It has arisen, in my judgment, in part from the circumstances to which I referred. I also stated before Recess that there did not appear to be any good or substantial reasons why that fall should have taken place, taking into account the addition to the Rest in the last year; and I may now just read what the increases in that account were in several of the banks during the last year:—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Montreal.....	\$ 250,000
Toronto.....	60,000
Ontario.....	110,000
Merchants'.....	400,000
Commerce.....	250,000
Dominion.....	100,000
Hamilton.....	65,000
Standard.....	60,000
Federal.....	150,000
Imperial.....	250,000
Molson's.....	75,000

Total Increase..... \$1,770,000

This would appear to show that between 1882 and the present time, unless some very extraordinary circumstances have happened recently, these stocks should have increased rather than decreased in value; and I have no doubt that it will be found before long that the value of the stocks will be quite equal to what they were in 1882, when they were probably nearer their true value than they were, in 1883. I mention this, Sir, in connection with bank matters, to show that though the stocks had fallen a good deal between the spring and the autumn, still that was not to be attributed solely to a depression in the trade and commerce of the country. Now, I come to another point to which my attention and the attention of the House was called in a very emphatic manner, by the hon. leader of the Opposition—in a very sarcastic manner too, but, at the same time, in one that elicited applause from his supporters. That point was that the Government had emphatically and distinctly stated that this policy was calculated to bring nearer together than the policy that previously existed the value of imports and exports; and he quoted some statements of mine made in 1879 or in 1880, to the effect, that there was really a balance then on what I considered the right side, that the imports of the country were less by a small sum than the exports, that this was a healthy state of things, which it was desirable to continue, and that the policy adopted in 1879 was calculated to bring the two, the exports and the imports, nearer together. Now, the hon. the leader of the Opposition, no doubt, in his remarks referred to the fact, because it is a fact, that the imports of last year were larger than they were the year before, and that the difference between the imports and the exports was greater than in the year before and the year previous to that. Now, I still hold to the proposition that, ordinarily speaking, it is in the interest of the country to increase our exports and to decrease our imports by the extension of our own manufactures. This proposition I lay down that if we can increase our exports and diminish our imports by producing in the country articles formerly imported it is better than to import those articles, inasmuch as it gives employment to the people and more nearly adjusts the balance of trade. But circumstances that have taken place in the last year or two that have increased materially the imports, and there has been no corresponding exports to meet that increase. We all know the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have expended in the construction of their road and branches something like \$58,000,000 in two years; we all know that in addition to that, the hon. Minister of Railways has been constructing during the last two years a portion of the Pacific Railway; we know that the Government have been importing rails and other material for the portion of the line constructed by the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway have been importing steel rails, locomotives, rolling stock and other material, perhaps to the extent of \$10,000,000 during the last year. These are exceptional circumstances, but still, I venture to say, hon. gentlemen opposite will give us no credit whatever for them in the account. When we take into consideration the circumstances of the last year or two, we cannot expect anything else but an increase in the difference between the imports and the exports, because, taking into account all the money that came

into the North-West for its development and improvement, taking into account all the imports for the Canadian Pacific Railway, all the imports by the contractors and by the Government with reference to the construction of this railway,—what have we in return in the shape of exports? We have nothing as yet. Therefore it is under the exceptional circumstances to which I refer that the imports have been increased as compared with the exports during the last two years and especially during the last year. But I maintain the facts on record in the Trade Returns during the last five years show, beyond doubt, that this policy has brought nearer together the imports and exports than they would have been by the policy that previously existed. I will give some facts to prove this, and I will state these facts to show that, notwithstanding the increased imports for the Canadian Pacific and the Government Railways, and the large expenditure in the North-West that induced imports, we have still brought the balance of trade more in our favour than we could have done under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The value of imports per head of the population in 1883, notwithstanding the circumstances I have mentioned, was \$ 8. What was it in 1873, when no exceptional circumstances existed? It was \$33.58 per head. In 1874 it was \$32.22 per head; in 1875, \$30.24; in 1876, \$22; in 1877, \$23.29; and in 1878, \$21.44 per head—or an average on the population of those years of \$27.14 per head; while, during the last four years, with these exceptional circumstances existing which I have mentioned, the average has been but \$23.02 per head, or a difference of \$16,000,000 per year in favour of the latter period. During the last year if the imports per head of the population had been the same as they were in 1873, we would have had \$152,000,000 of imports instead of \$132,000,000, making a difference of \$20,000,000 during the year. This establishes beyond doubt the effect of the policy, because there is just about that amount of increased manufactures in the Dominion during the years to which I have referred. I took this afternoon as an illustration, the value of raw cottons imported. If we take the returns submitted by the cotton mills we find something like an increase of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 in the manufacture of cotton alone; therefore all the labour and capital expended, everything connected with this industry was so much saved to the country and a diminution of the imports. So with reference to all the manufactories in the country and their products. If these goods had not been made in the country they would have been imported, and we ask you, considering the prosperity of the country last year, and as a consequence large importations, whether, if we had not the Tariff by which we have been able to produce by these industries, \$16,000,000 a year more than we produced in 1879, the balance would not have been larger against us than it is? I hold that a policy which, if it does not increase the exports, will diminish the imports, must have the effects of bringing the exports and imports nearer together than would have another and opposite policy. I ask whether this has not been sustained by these facts? I have dealt with the leading objections down to the present time, that have been made against the policy adopted in 1879, and I think that the answers I have given, taken from the returns and other public documents, are sufficient, and the subject needs no further remarks from me. But there are some new objections which have been made lately. One new charge brought against the Government in the last twelve months is that they have neglected the interests of the country by legislating in such a way as to change the legislation in the United States with reference to the duty on malt, and thus injuring the people of Canada. Why it is well known that for the last seven years, there has been a conflict in the United States between the maltsters and the brewers. The maltsters have been endeavouring to obtain

an increased duty and to shut out the malt from Canada. They failed in their endeavours until the last Session of Congress when they gained a victory over the brewers and obtained an increased duty on malt. By that operation, they have shut out a very considerable export of malt from Canada to the United States during the last year. It is quite true that a concession on the other hand was made which really is a benefit to our farmers, though limited, by taking 5 cents per bushel off the duty on barley. We are told the Government of Canada is responsible for this. Let me read an extract from a speech made by Sir Richard Cartwright at Lennox some three or four months ago:

“Some gentlemen present know to their cost that although it was not possible for a Reform Government to add one cent to the value of their barley—”

That is declared by a gentleman who was in the late Government.

“That a Finance Minister who did not understand his business, and would persist in acting on his own advice, contrary to that of able men around him—”

When I read this speech I said, the late Minister of Finance has not such a very depreciatory view of the gentlemen on this side of the House, as I supposed he had. He says—I understood it so when I read it first—that the gentlemen around me were men of ability, and I would not accept their suggestions. But let us see.

“Could destroy the market for their barley by destroying the malt producing interest of Canada.”

I began to think, who was it sitting around me of the able men, my colleagues and those supporting us, who took exception to the legislation which we introduced. I could not recollect any one of my colleagues or any member on this side of the House. The gentleman who did take exception was the ex-Finance Minister, the present member for South Huron, and therefore the remark must have applied to him, as “the able men around me.”

“As Sir Leonard Tilley had done most wantonly. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) The course followed had been suggested to him (Sir Richard), but, on enquiry he found that, if he started in that direction, he might give American maltsters the opportunity which they had long been seeking of making our action the ground of excluding Canadian malt. He therefore abstained. Sir Leonard Tilley took a different course. He put on a duty, and, in so doing, struck a blow not only at an important Canadian industry, but at the interest of our barley-growing counties, because it was of great importance to farmers that, if there should be for a time a surplus of barley, it should be malted in our own country, and held over until such time as a rise in the price occurred. Now they were entirely in the hands of Oswego merchants and American maltsters.”

This is the report of the speech made in which a charge is brought against the Government in reference to this matter. Well, Sir, I am here represented as a most obstinate Minister of Finance. The gentleman opposite represents himself in this case as the pliant Minister of Finance. I have heard the hon. gentleman and his friends opposite speak of the Government, and of myself as Finance Minister as being too pliant, and say that all the people had to do was to come and ask that certain concessions should be made to certain interests, and those concessions were made at once. That is a different character, from what is given here. Here I was obstinate and would not take the advice of able men around me. And, Mr. Speaker, the general impression of those with whom I have had any conversation on the subject since 1878 was that that hon. gentleman opposite was the obstinate man who would not take any advice, who would not be influenced by any suggestions that were made. Now, let us see; is it a fact that the action of this Government had anything to do with this increase of duty on malt in the United States? No, Sir; none whatever; and, when I read to this House the effect of the Tariff introduced by the hon. member opposite, and of the Tariff introduced by this Government, with reference to malt, and show the rate of duty that was collected upon malt when

the change took place, you will see what grounds the hon. member had for making the statement he did at Lennox. Under Mr. Cartwright's Tariff of 1878—this is for part of the year—42,232 lbs. were imported, the value was \$1,388, duty \$1,055.77, or 78 per cent. In 1879, that is, under the Tariff submitted by this Government, the imports were 129,634 lbs. value \$3,346, duty collected \$2,592.63 or 77½ per cent., a fraction under that collected in 1878. In 1881 the duty was changed, as the hon. member knows, and malt was put in the same position exactly as barley, the duty being 15 cents per bushel Customs, and 1 cent per pound Excise. That has been the law from 1881 to the present time. That was the law that was in force when the change took place in Congress. In 1881, we that year imported 10,553 bushels, value \$10,270, duty collected \$5,171, or a fraction over 50 per cent., against 80 per cent. that the hon. member imposed. In 1882-83, we imported 15,979 bushels, value \$15,099, duty paid \$7,509.93, or a little less than 50 per cent., and yet the hon. member told them at Lennox on the eve of an election—I will not say that it was at all to affect it, but only to show what an outrageous Government this was and that they should not send any one here to support it—that we had deprived producers of that section of the country of selling their barley to the maltsters, and that their interests were sacrificed, when the duty, from 1881 to 1883, was 30 per cent. less than the hon. member himself imposed in 1878. Yet, he said we were responsible for that change, and, as that is one of the charges which I thought might possibly be brought to-night, though I do not know that it will, I thought it just as well to spike that gun at once. There is another charge, and a very general one, made all over the country, to the effect that we have imposed a duty of 35 per cent. upon imports to Canada. That is the general statement. There are a few articles that pay 35 per cent., but we know that last year the average duty on the whole imports was something like 19 per cent. I had the pleasure of addressing a meeting at Strathroy, which was referred to by the hon. member opposite the other night, and the member for Brant was present on that occasion, and he took that exception to the Tariff policy of the Government. He said to the audience, imagine your sending to Germany and importing a certain article, and, when it reached the borders of Canada, you are charged 35 per cent. duty on it, what an outrage that is. Well, I must say that, after reading the speech of the hon. member for Brant in 1866 two or three times, I should claim him, though he calls himself a Free-Trader, as one of the soundest Protectionists in the Parliament of Canada, taking his speech as a criterion, and nothing could be stronger than the way in which, in the extract I read from his speech to-day, he justified the then Finance Minister in imposing an increased duty on cigars, which he stated had an excellent result. But I say to him, and to all such, but especially to him, that, if he takes exception to 35 per cent. duty on a limited number of articles, he must not forget that the Finance Minister, to whom he appealed in 1876 for further concessions, did in 1878 change the Customs duties on cigars and cigarettes. The returns for 1878 showing the duty collected on 21,050 German cigars, valued at \$10,680, as \$12,687.10, or nearly 120 per cent. The Excise duty on this quantity of cigars would have been \$3,423.60 at that time. The protection given to the manufacturer was \$4,263.50, or 40 per cent. The hon. member was grateful for a little less protection than that, and in a year or two afterwards he obtained 40 per cent. protection, and it he says produced wonderful results; it brought a thousand people, even before the change was made in 1878, into the country, and the article manufactured cost the consumer no more than it did before. Still, the hon. member will, I presume, here as elsewhere, denounce the present Government for putting 35 per cent. duty on any articles of imports. The general objections that

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

have been taken with reference to this Tariff have been largely met by the results. The results have been, in most cases, to decrease the cost of the article to the consumer, and in many cases the increased duty that has been imposed upon it has enabled the producer, having the market to himself, to give to the consumer the article cheaper than he could have done under other circumstances, and cheaper than he ever had it before. And so, while exception may be taken to the policy which has for its object protection to the industries of the country, still our friends will be found sometimes even denouncing a policy that is doing just exactly what some of the hon. gentlemen opposite sustained, supported, defended, and spoke of approvingly. Now, Sir, we come to the question of the general depreciation of the country. Let us see what evidences we have of that. I admit, Sir, and I regret that it is so, that the wheat crop of Canada as a whole was less last year than it has been for some years previous, and this circumstance has no doubt affected, to some extent, the business of the country during the autumn and the present winter; because, had the eighteen or twenty million bushels of wheat which we are supposed to have lost by a short crop, been raised, sold, and the proceeds reached the hands of the farmers of the country, no doubt there would have been greater ease generally than there is at the present moment. But there is this to be considered, that while there was a deficiency in the wheat crop, there was at the same time a large surplus in the hay crop, nearly amounting in value to the loss in the wheat crop. So that while the farmers have lost on the wheat crop, their abundant hay crop will enable them to raise a greater number of cattle for export next year; and therefore I am satisfied the general result will be largely maintained by the increased export of cattle which they will be able to make by having in Ontario alone two and a-half million tons of hay more than usual—to say nothing of the increased crop in the other Provinces. But while I admit that a short wheat crop has caused a somewhat depressing effect, I must also admit that the price obtained for lumber at the present time is not as great as it was last year and the year before. There is also an over stock already on hand, and people are not manufacturing in certain branches as much this winter as they did last, and that also has had some effect upon the general trade and business of the country. There are other circumstances to which I referred this afternoon—over-importation and over-trading, which have left the importer and retailer with stocks on hand that cannot be immediately converted into money. These circumstances also have a depressing effect. But what evidence have we beyond this of the general depression and stagnation of trade in the country? Sir, we have undoubted testimony as to the generally prompt payment of liabilities falling due in the banks. We see by the press that the bank managers who have been interviewed in Montreal and elsewhere with reference to payments, state that they are satisfactory; this could not be if there was the great depression of trade which hon. gentlemen opposite have been asserting exists, and which they have been pointing to as, in some cases, produced by the National Policy. These things have been referred to before, and they show there is no general depression, or suffering, or want, and no unusual number of people out of employment—not at all. What are the best evidences we can have that the mass of the people are being employed, and that they have spare funds at their disposal? It is as I have stated over and over again in this House, the increased accumulation of deposits in the savings banks by people who have earned money over and above what they require for their expenditure or can use in their legitimate business, and have deposited the surplus. I may here explain to the House—and I do so for the purpose of answering a statement made by the hon. member who followed me

last Session with reference to the savings banks deposits—that the savings banks in the Maritime Provinces, are conducted upon a principle that was in force there before the Union. The Post Office Department does not receive money in those Provinces as it does in Ontario and Quebec. Down to 1879, these savings banks' agents were authorized to accept as much as \$10,000 from any one depositor, and the result, of course, was a natural temptation and inducement to business men to make deposits, inasmuch as they had interest paid from the day of the deposit up to the day of the withdrawal of the deposit. But notwithstanding these advantages enjoyed to 1879, what was the fact? The fact was that the increased deposits in these savings banks, and in the Post Office Savings Banks throughout the Dominion increased but \$2,800,000 during the five years from 1873 to 1878. But what took place after that? The Government ordered that these deposits should be limited to \$3,000 a depositor in 1879, and that the interest should only be paid from the commencement of the month, that is, if a deposit was made on the 2nd of the month interest would only be payable from the 1st of the month following; and if it was drawn on the last day of the month no interest should be paid for that month, thus greatly lessening the inducements to deposit in the savings banks of the Maritime Provinces. Well, what was the result? The result was that in 1879, these deposits increased over withdrawals \$710,669; in 1880, \$1,845,222; in 1881, \$4,703,715; in 1882, to \$5,931,989; in 1883, to \$4,450,445, a total increase in five years of \$17,722,094, as against \$2,800,000 in the five years previous, with greater inducements to deposit. It must be borne in mind that in Ontario and Quebec no one, except at Toronto, has a right to deposit over \$1,000 in one name, and notwithstanding that fact, the increase during that period was the sum I have named. During the present year the amount deposited is \$1,755,079 greater than the withdrawals, showing that even this year there is still on the part of the masses of the workingmen and others, an ability to add to their earnings and to their deposits in the Government Savings Banks. I think there can be no better evidence given that there is general prosperity in the country. Let us go a little further. The total deposits in the chartered banks on 31st July, 1879, were \$63,848,145. On 31st July, 1883, four years later they were \$99,241,325, being an increase in that period of \$35,393,180, and an increase during the five years of \$53,000,000 taking into account both the Post Office Savings Bank and the chartered banks of the country. This is evidence that the people are earning money and have a surplus or they would not be in a position to add so largely to the deposits in our banking institutions. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated last year that this was no proof of increased earnings among the masses, because there appeared to be a much larger increase in the Maritime Provinces than elsewhere, and it could not be pretended that more money had been earned in those Provinces than in Ontario and Quebec. In the Lower Provinces the people have not been in the habit of making deposits in the banks and the banks have not encouraged the payment of interest on deposits, and the result has been that the spare money of the people of the Maritime Provinces has for many years gone into the savings bank, while the chartered banks of Ontario and Quebec have paid perhaps a higher rate of interest than the Post Office Savings Bank, and the people have deposited largely with those institutions. That accounts for the apparently large increase in the Maritime Provinces as compared with Ontario and Quebec. It may be said that within the last three or four months the wages of employes of manufacturers in the Dominion have in some cases been reduced; that we have not so many men employed just now as we had three or four months ago. I am free to admit that Canadian manufacturers have to-day an unusual strain put on them.

And from what cause is this strain? Every hon. member knows that manufacturers in Great Britain, where the policy of Free Trade prevails, and manufacturers in the United States where Protection prevails, have surplus stock on hand, that they are reducing the number of their employes, that they are diminishing their wages, that they are compelled to sell their surplus stocks, and the stocks they are even now producing from day to day at a lower rate than usual. Those reductions have in many cases taken place, though resisted by the operatives in both England and the United States. What is the result? Our American neighbours and British manufacturers, owing to their profits being reduced and the wages paid to their operatives being now lower than before, come to our market and are sharply competing to-day with the Canadian manufacturers. As the prices paid for labour in the United States must regulate to some extent the price of labour in Canada, because if the wages are not about equal the operatives will soon pass across the line. Our manufacturers found it necessary to increase the wages here when an advance took place in the United States in order to keep their men; but now that there is a reduction in the United States owing to reduced prices, our manufacturers, in order to successfully compete, have also to reduce the prices of their products and in some cases the wages of their operatives. But what would have been the condition of those working people and of those manufacturing industries established throughout the country if it had not been for the National Policy? Why, if it were not for the protective tariff that shields to a great extent our industries and manufactures we would be over-run, and one-half or three-fourths of our factories would be closed within three months. These circumstances give the opponents of this policy a ground for attack on the Government and the policy. Let me say this, that we cannot object to such an attack if made against individual members of the Government or against the Administration as a whole; but what we do object to is, that the attack is made in such a way as to affect the best interests of Canada, to depreciate our credit at home and abroad, to discourage men from coming to the country and investing their capital here, and to discourage the people of the country by the cries of depression, by cries of distress, by cries of ruin. The leader of the Opposition, when speaking in the House about six weeks ago, said we had the cry of soup kitchens again. That statement might be very well to make a point; but was there anything in it of practical significance? The proposal to which he referred, in London, was made by the editor of a newspaper supporting the Administration, because there were a number of families, as there are every winter in every city of the Dominion, widows and those who are worse than widows, suffering children and many aged and infirm persons, requiring assistance. Is it right to draw the inferences the leader of the Opposition did, because benevolent individuals endeavour to provide food for the poor, it may be for some immigrants who, not finding employment in the country in the winter, have reached the cities and require assistance. But does this compare with the condition of affairs in 1878-79 when we, members of Parliament and the citizens of Ottawa, were asked to subscribe to buy bread for hundreds of men, who although they were willing to work, were starving? Is that the case now in any city of the Dominion? In regard to the city of London, I have here a statement made by the Mayor of east London about two months ago, or about two or three weeks before the speech to which I have referred was delivered by the leader of the Opposition. That gentleman says that the condition of east London has wonderfully changed within the last two years; and he is not a Liberal Conservative. And why has that change taken place? He said that two years ago 200 houses were to let, and now they are occupied, and he should know,

because he is an agent for the selling and letting of houses. He speaks of the men employed in the railway car shop and steel works and dwells in most hopeful terms as to the condition of the city; and all this comes from east London just in advance of the statement made by the leader of the Opposition. We have benevolent men and women in Toronto, Ottawa, London and other cities, providing for the necessities of the needy; but I ask hon. members whether anything has recently taken place which will compare with the condition of affairs in 1877-78.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Yes; much worse.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Much worse! Then, Mr. Speaker, it is needless for me to make any further statement. When the hon. gentleman rises in his place and endeavours to defeat the policy of the Government by stating that the country is in a worse position to-day than it was in 1877 and 1878, with reference to employment for the people of the country, I want no further statement to satisfy independent men on both sides of the House that these gentlemen are seeking really some other object than the good of the country. I am amazed at the statement of the hon. gentleman that the country is in a worse state than it was five years ago; but if that is to be the line to be taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, I wish to refer to the fact that Sir Richard Cartwright, who was not then a member of the House, at the meeting to which I have referred, said to the people, look at the state of the country at the present time: "Why," said he, "the bankruptcies this year will be in excess of the worst year of the Mackenzie Administration." But how disappointed must the hon. gentleman have been when he found that they only amounted to about one-half of what they were during the three years 1877-78-79. I have the returns here, and they show that in each of those years they were nearly double those of last year, notwithstanding the fact that the figures for last year include nearly 260 failures in Manitoba and the North-West—failures of an exceptional character, owing to causes which every person knows. We know that the spirit of speculation which existed in Winnipeg, a city of 25,000 inhabitants, was such that they were asking for lots in that city as much as, and more than could be obtained for lots in the centre of the city of Toronto—as much in some cases, as was asked for lots in Chicago. The hon. gentleman must have known that that was a state of things which must soon come to an end; that there was nothing to warrant such large prices; that they were the result of the spirit of speculation; and that outside of the speculation in land there were very large importations by men in business, importations in excess of the demand; that these men over-estimated the extent of the population which would be brought into the country, and that it was found, at the close or middle of last year, that they were not in a position to pay for the supplies they imported. For these reasons, disaster overtook these people; it was exceptional in its character, and I am satisfied that they are rapidly rising and will rapidly rise from that condition of things. But no community, no city, under similar circumstances, could expect any other result. There were 260 failures in the west out of 1,300 in the Dominion. The whole number in the Dominion, involving the sum \$15,000,000, including Manitoba, in which there was little or no business done in the other years to which I refer. But notwithstanding this fact, the amount of bankruptcy was only a little over one-half what it was in those three years. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman—unlike his position in the case of the malt duty, for he could not have known the facts exactly, because the year was not closed—still he claimed that there was blue ruin everywhere, his mind was so seized with gloom that he had to take that view of the situation. Hon. gentlemen seem to see no daylight whatever—nothing but gloom and darkness before them. I do hope that when the hon. member who replied to me last year, and who gave me

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

reason to hope from his former speeches what his real sentiments were, that if the day should ever come that he would be Minister of Finance, he would stand by the policy he advocated in 1876. Now, that the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) is here, he will take a different view. True to his extreme opinions and proclivities, true to his extreme views on Free Trade, I suppose he will repeat the arguments and the statements made by him on former occasions, in favour of Free Trade and against the National Policy. I hold this, that while at the present time there is some depression from the circumstances to which I referred, there is no reason whatever for apprehension. And let me say this, that had these depressing circumstances taken place under other conditions, as I have already intimated, the depression would have been four-fold greater than it is to-day. As I said last Session, when hon. gentlemen were stating: You are fortunate, you are lucky, everything is prosperous with you, your National Policy is therefore accepted by a large portion of the people—my answer was, and my answer is now, that the National Policy is more valuable in the days of depression than it is in the days of prosperity. I say that this National Policy, which provides employment for the people who would otherwise be idle, will continue to establish its reputation and establish itself in the hearts and affections of the people of the Dominion of Canada. And though I shall regret indeed if the line which has been indicated is taken by these hon. gentlemen, who stated this evening that the country is in a worse position than it was in 1878—though, I say, I shall regret that this line should be taken, because it is calculated to damage the country, still at the same time, in spite of those declarations, in spite of the declarations which may be made to-night, or in the course of the debate, in spite of the articles which have appeared in the Canadian, American and English papers, calculated to damage the credit of the country, there are resources in the country, there are vigour and power and energy in the people of the country, and there is in this policy to which I refer that which gives hope and energy to the people, which will place us to a considerable extent above and beyond the influence of such speeches and such arguments as may be made against the National Policy, in this Parliament or elsewhere.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, having been prevented by express provision of an Act of Parliament to that intent made and provided, from being present last year when the hon. gentleman made his financial statement, I am not quite as familiar as I could wish to be with the course of the discussion in 1883. But I will venture to say, although I was not present then, that I have very little doubt that the hon. gentleman on that occasion took a very different tone, and struck a very different attitude from that which he has assumed to-night. Sir, it was not for nothing that the hon. gentleman, in the present instance, found it necessary to apologize and defend, and excuse as far as he could, as well as he knew how, the policy of which he has been the exponent for so long. He undoubtedly made some remarkable admissions to which I shall direct your attention and the attention of the House. The hon. gentleman told us, and told us truly enough, that it is not possible for his policy to avert over-production and consequent injury to manufacturers or the loss of wages to their unfortunate employees; nor could his policy avert poor harvests, or give us a larger market for lumber, or prevent a decrease in the value of goods, nor could it check over-importations. All true, Mr. Speaker. But why is it that these economic truths are now dawning for the first time upon the hon. gentleman and his followers? Were not those things as true when my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) presided

over the affairs of Canada as they are to-day? Were any allowances then made by—not the hon. gentleman who was at that time snug and safe in Fredericton while other hon. gentlemen were bearing the heat and burthen of the day—not by the hon. gentlemen. I say, but by the hon. gentleman whom I see sitting beside him. What excuse were they willing to make, for my hon. friend when precisely these very things occurred, only in a far greater degree, in a far more intensified degree, and when in consequence of those things my hon. friend was obliged to struggle for some considerable time with financial difficulties. Sir, I hail it as a sign of improvement that the hon. gentleman at last, after a long time, is waking up to what the country is also waking up, that this policy, whatever it may be, is no panacea, that it won't save the country hard times, that it won't save a single man. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman admitted some things; but the hon. gentleman has an old habit of not telling us, when he makes these financial statements, all the expenditure which we are likely to incur in consequence of his policy. On the present occasion he told us, it is true, what we could guess without his telling us, that, in addition to the estimates we have here, doubtless large supplementary estimates are going to be brought down. We are accustomed to that. It is a misfortune—a misfortune from which I admit neither Government was quite free—that besides the facts detailed on the first occasion of making the Budget statement, there are generally other facts not then detailed, involving considerable additions to our expenditure. In my time, I can only say, I tried to keep those expenditures as low as possible. I was not always successful, any more than the hon. gentleman. But the hon. gentleman, gave us a hint that probably a million more than the estimates would be required. He dealt in the most gingerly fashion possible with the other question of how many millions this railway extension policy of which he spoke was to cost—of what additional interest charge to the country it would involve. Now, surely the hon. gentleman, when making the financial statement, could tell us whether we are going to spend \$4,000,000, or \$8,000,000, or \$12,000,000, under the guise of a railway extension policy. Surely we ought to know that. Surely the hon. gentleman will not refuse to tell us roughly—I do not ask that he should tell us exactly; but surely he can tell us within a million or two—what this railway extension policy is likely to cost us. It is a question of interest. It has been a question of interest to a great many of the supporters of the hon. gentleman, and I think we ought to know what the final figure is to be. How many millions? Perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways will tell me how many millions. We have been dealing with so many millions lately, that a few millions more or less cannot in the least discompose the hon. gentleman. I see they do not; but surely, to gratify my natural curiosity, he will tell me what is the bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In good time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is the time. Surely we ought to know. How many more millions are going to be added to the debt of the country. I think, Mr. Speaker, that they are not dealing quite fairly with the House and the country, or their own supporters, in keeping that interesting information at the back of their heads. Now, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman is going to repeat the process which he carried out in 1873. Then, I recollect, he brought down a Budget statement; but, although he must have been well aware of what was in contemplation, he did not tell us, if my memory serves me, by \$3,000,000 a year, what was to be the total expenditure under the new obligations which the country was going to enter into. Sir, I do not suppose he is going to add \$3,000,000 in the present instance to our expenditure; but he is going to add a considerable

sum, and what that sum is, I repeat, we ought to know. Now, I would like to have heard from the hon. gentleman a little more fully, a justification of the present enormous taxation. I would like to have been informed, a little more fully than he has condescended to tell us, what his policy is going to be in the event of a large reduction of imports; and I would like that for two reasons. The hon. gentleman knows—indeed he admits—that it is a thing very likely to happen; and more, he tells us that it is very desirable. The year of all years which he held up, and always has held up as a model year, is that especial year in which our exports slightly exceeded our imports. Well, Sir, if his policy is going to be as successful in the future as it has been in the past, if our imports are going to be reduced so as just to balance our exports, then it is clear, on the hon. gentleman's own showing, that we must expect a very large reduction of revenue; and we have some right to know how he proposes to meet that reduction, in such event. Sir, the hon. gentleman, in dealing with this question, and with the recent condition of the country, was in a difficulty, and a rather serious difficulty. By his own language, on the last occasion of his making a financial statement, he had practically estoppel himself from looking the situation in the face. On that occasion the spirit of prophecy descended on the hon. gentleman—or rather, I should say, a spirit of prophecy descended on him. There are differences in spirit which probably the hon. gentleman did not understand. He was good enough to tell us then that we need take no fear for the future—carry on all sail, quoth the hon. gentleman, I am at the helm, and you are safe for seven years. Now, Sir, he has given several reasons for the depression which exists. I will give another: It was the misplaced confidence which his supporters in the House and in the country put in the hon. gentleman's prophetic vision on that occasion. Sir, I was a little at a loss to understand exactly what the hon. gentleman's speech implied in the matter of depression. One-half of his speech, as I understand it, was taken up in showing that there was no depression, and the other half in assigning reasons for the existence of the depression. As my hon. friend knows, I am not a profound lawyer, but it does occur to me that there is such a thing as an objection to a plea for multifariousness. Are we in a state of depression, or are we not? I can hardly make out, from the speech of the hon. gentleman, what particular line he takes on the present occasion. It would not trouble me whether he took the one or the other, for this reason—that I can neither agree with his statement that we are not in a state of depression, nor with his explanation as to the causes which have brought about that depression. Sir, I do not believe, that there is a man of business in this House or in the country, who will say, that to-day Canada is in a very satisfactory condition, commercially or financially. At this present moment, as the hon. gentleman must know, men are apprehensive, men are not anxious to enter into new enterprises. I am sorry to say that the old enterprises are not giving as good an account of themselves as we could wish. Now, I say there is no sufficient cause for that. The check which we have encountered is apparently a slight one. One particular crop in one-half of a Province—true, a very important Province—has been a failure; but I say that under ordinary circumstances that failure should not have produced the state of apprehension or the state of depression which undoubtedly does exist to a very great extent in this country. Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman that it is beginning to dawn on men's minds, even on the minds of his own supporters, that high taxes do not insure national prosperity, and that wise statesmen will count the cost before they throw tens of millions of dollars away to aid a company that may get into difficulties. Now we will take some of the tests that the hon. gentleman has in former times, aye, and to-night, applied, and we will see to what extent those

tests indicate the present position of the country. The hon. gentleman spent a good deal of time in explaining how and why it was that the shrinkage in bank stocks was not to be taken as a matter of serious moment. I do not consider them myself as a matter of extreme moment, but I point this out, that when those stocks were high the hon. gentleman took credit for their being high; he declared that was one of the results of his policy. These stocks have shrunk to a very large extent within the last twelve months. True, there has been a rally in one or two of the most important of them within the last few weeks, and perhaps certain Resolutions which lately passed through this House might explain to those who wish to know why those one or two particulars stocks have rapidly ascended within the last fortnight or month. But the fact remains, that the stocks, as a whole, are many millions of dollars less in selling value to-day than they were this time twelve months. Why, even the Bank of Montreal stock sold on the 13th of February, last year, at 202½, and to-day, according to the hon. gentleman, it is about 188 or 189, I forget which. There is large shrinkage there, even taking the present figures, if he likes. Then the hon. gentleman just now alluded to the number of bankruptcies. I do not in the slightest degree consider that a matter of congratulation, but at the same time, as the hon. gentleman chooses to bring the question up, I may remind him that according to one authority, the amount of bankruptcies in Canada was \$15,949,000, for 1883, and according to another authority, \$22,155,000. If, as I suspect, the latter included the failure of the unfortunate Exchange Bank, I am inclined to think that the latter sum is the fairer and more proper one to take in estimating the extent of the bankruptcies in Canada in 1883. The hon. gentleman, as far as my recollection serves me, was not correct in saying that the bankruptcies in 1876, 1877 or 1878 were double even the smaller sum mentioned. I speak from recollection, but I am positive that in none of those year did they reach \$30,000,000 or \$32,000,000, which would be the double of \$15,949,000. I will not, at this moment, dwell on this other test which the hon. gentleman gave last year—the prosperity of the manufacturers or the contentment of the people. I may have more to say on both those heads before we sit down, but allow me, Sir, to tell the hon. gentleman that he is very much mistaken if he believes that, at this moment, in the principal cities of Canada the people, and particularly the employees of manufacturers are either prosperous or contented. I say it with sorrow and regret, that in the chief city of Ontario it has been stated publicly and it has not been contradicted—I believe that it is a fact—that several thousands of people were indebted to charity for a part of their subsistence during the present winter. There are other tests, however, on which the hon. gentleman is fond of dwelling, and to which we shall come after a little while. There is the test of the increase of population and the increase of traffic on our railways. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that for months back the trade of our principal railways has shown a great and alarming decrease. That surely is not, in his opinion, or in that of any other hon. gentleman, a proof that this country is at this moment in a very prosperous condition. But I desire to say a few words on a matter to which the hon. gentleman alluded in this connection, and to which, if I am not mistaken, some of his colleagues have very often alluded, and that is, the extent to which this hon. gentleman's policy has increased our trade with Great Britain and diminished our trade with the United States. Now I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman made that statement with any intention to deceive the House. I do not accuse him of doing that. But I say that the hon. gentleman was hardly fair in making a comparison between the year 1883 and the year 1876, in the matter of the trade of the two countries. One was a prosperous year

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the other was a year of considerable depression. However, I would pass that over, but I will call the attention of the House to this, that when the hon. gentleman spoke of the imports from the United States in the one year and compared them with the imports from the United States in the other, he wholly and entirely forgot to inform the House that under the present Tariff, imposed by himself, the nominal imports entered for our consumption from the United States almost exactly represent our true imports, whereas, in 1876, as everybody familiar with the Trade and Navigation Returns knows, our nominal imports from the United States include a great many millions of dollars for goods that were entered *in transitu*, and simply passed through this country on their way to Great Britain. That fact vitiates entirely the hon. gentleman's comparisons from first to last. I will go back a little further. I will take the year 1873, which is a fair year of comparison with this year of 1883, and as this point has been made a great deal of by the hon. gentlemen in this House, and on the other side of the Atlantic, I call the special attention of the House to the effect which the present policy has on our trade with Great Britain and the United States. In 1873, a year which compared fairly with the year 1883, our imports from Great Britain were \$68,522,000; our true imports from the United States in the same year, deducting those goods which passed *in transitu*, although they were, under the old form, entered for consumption, were \$40,488,000. Our true exports to Great Britain, of our own products of the same year, were \$31,486,000; our true exports to the United States of our own produce, deducting short returns, were \$37,262,000. What were the facts last year—facts well worth knowing? Our imports from Great Britain were \$52,000,000; our exports to Great Britain, of our own produce, were \$39,672,000. Our imports from the United States in goods which really and actually entered into consumption, were \$56,000,000; our sales to the United States were \$35,963,000, as before, striking out short returns. Now, Sir, what is the result? Why, the result is this, that, as between the years 1873 and 1883, we purchased from Great Britain \$16,500,000 less in 1883 than in 1873, and we purchased from the United States \$15,500,000 more than we did in 1873. We sell to Great Britain, of articles of our own production, very nearly \$8,000,000 more, and we sell to the United States \$1,250,000 less; so that, if it does matter particularly, the trade between ourselves and Great Britain and ourselves and the United States is, at the expiration of the decade of ten years, \$40,000,000 worse under the hon. gentleman's policy than it was in 1873. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that I am taking those statements from his own Trade and Navigation Returns. He knows that they cannot be controverted, and that they do not show the whole of the facts, because it is well known to everybody that, in 1873, under the old policy, we carried on a large contraband trade with the United States, selling them several millions of dollars' worth of goods that did not appear in our returns, and now, under his policy, the United States sell us several millions of dollars' worth of goods that do not appear in their returns, or ours either. Sir, I do not insist very much on the question, because I do not regard it, as the hon. gentleman appears to do, of very great moment, but it is of moment in this way, that the hon. gentleman here and the hon. gentleman's colleagues elsewhere have pointed triumphantly to the facts, as they stated them, as proof that this was a Tariff which favoured trade with Great Britain, and to a considerable extent diminished trade with the United States. Now the House, gentlemen on this side and gentlemen on that side, can judge for themselves how just was the boast that our present policy had increased our trade with Great Britain, had diminished our trade with the United States. The hon. gentleman laid great stress on the amount of deposits in savings banks. Now, as far

as it goes, that is a good sign. I am not going to dispute that position with the hon. gentleman. But I will call the attention of the House to one or two facts. First of all, I call the attention of the House to this, that a good deal of these extra deposits in the savings bank were obtained by the hon. gentleman by paying interest largely in excess of the current market rate. When the banks would only give 3 per cent., the hon. gentleman continued to give 4. That is to say, he continued to pay more for money at call, about one-third more, than those who were dealing in that commodity thought it was worth. Moreover, it is a great mistake to suppose that the money which we borrow from the people only costs us 4 per cent. All the expenses of management, amounting to from a quarter to a-half per cent. on the present deposits, have to be added. Moreover, if he adopts the ordinary rules of banking, if he preserves in gold, as he ought to do, a sufficient reserve to meet unexpected calls which may come upon him, a considerable sum would have to be kept in hand—not on deposit in the banks, that would not answer in such a case, but in gold—without paying interest. So that, altogether, the result would be that the hon. gentleman is borrowing money at call, and pays about 25 per cent. more for it than he would if he had borrowed it for a long term from the public here or in England. Then, there is another consideration. The hon. gentleman, it is true, has got some \$26,000,000, or more perhaps, from the people of this country at call, and a large sum, also at call, in the shape of the note circulation. Now, I do not regard the note circulation as likely to be a serious source of embarrassment, but it is quite on the cards that the hon. gentleman one of these days may be called upon for a considerable portion of these deposits. I do not say that it will happen. None of us can venture to say what will occur, but I say there is a chance of such an occurrence, and under no circumstances is it wise or prudent to borrow a considerable sum of money at call, and to pay considerably more for it than you can obtain the money for for a fixed period of definite duration. Then, I am not at all sure that the fact that the people of Canada are not able to employ that large sum of money to better advantage than 4 per cent., is at all a proof that things are in a prosperous condition. I would rather say it was a proof that we were approaching the stationary state, that there was a difficulty in employing money in Canada to good advantage. I am not sure that a wise statesman would bring forward the amount of money on deposit at 4 per cent. in savings banks in a country like Canada as a proof that the people were prospering as he would desire them to do. If they were, it would be taken out and used in other ways, in building up towns and cities and developing the country in a hundred different ways, and it would be better employed, if the country were really prosperous, than in being handed over to the hon. gentleman and by him invested in more or less permanent forms, from which he may find it rather difficult, at some time or other, to recover it. Now, I agree with the hon. gentleman in one respect. The hon. gentleman said that this was a fit time to review our position, a fit time to consider the platforms of the two parties in this country with respect to its financial management. As I understand it, the platform of the Liberal party was, and is, that it is the duty of a wise Government to keep down the taxes and to keep down the expenditure of a country, in the position of Canada, as low as it fairly can. We say also, Sir, that it is the interest of the people of Canada that, so far as the Government can make or keep it so, Canada should be a cheap country to live in, a country where a man's wages should go far, a country where a man could obtain a good return for the money he has to lay out, and, for that reason, we say it is a folly to impose heavy taxation on the great mass of

the community for the temporary benefit of a small portion of the manufacturing interest. I repudiate most utterly, for myself and for my friends here, every imputation that we have the smallest animosity toward the manufacturers of Canada. I repudiate that entirely. I say that we are the true friends of the great bulk of the manufacturers of Canada. I say we are their true friends, and I say that everything that tends to impoverish the bulk of the people, who are the customers of the great mass of the manufacturers, tends to endamage the great mass of the manufacturers. I say that the hon. gentleman's policy is trebly foolish in this respect, in view of the fact that Canada has an enormous stake in developing the great country to the north-west of us; I say that his policy is especially adapted to retard and impede that development, and to put every possible obstacle in the way of the unfortunate settler who may trust his fortunes in the North-West under the present Government. In all these points, the policy of the hon. gentleman, as defined by himself and by his colleagues, is directly in opposition to ours. They hold that it is well to heap up taxes and to heap up expenditure; they hold, and the Minister of Finance, has often explained, that it is the interest of the people that things in Canada should be dear; they hold that it is the interest of the great mass of the population that a small number of persons should be subsidized at their expense; they hold that the way to help and to develop the North-West is to put on taxes, and to make the small capital at the settler's command go as short a way as possible. On all these points we have ever taken issue with the hon. gentleman—we take issue now, and we will continue to take issue, and we will do our best to explain to the people on all occasions—how exceedingly they have been deceived by the sophistries, not so much of the hon. gentleman as of those who sit beside him, and who, as I said, succeeded five or six years ago in converting the people for the time to their view of the matter. Now, Sir, I will say one thing for these gentlemen, they have lived up to their creed, they have done their utmost to raise taxation to the highest point, they have done their utmost to raise the expenditure of Canada to the highest point, and it is not the first time, either. Now, we have had five years' experience, and I say, as well as the hon. gentlemen, that the time has come when we can see what we have really done, and also at what cost it has been done. Sir, the hon. gentleman defines his policy as a great experiment. He said the truth. It was a great experiment, and it was an experiment which, at the time it was tried, had every thing in its favour. We had hard times—by no fault of the late Administration; we had the example of the United States, which no doubt had a very great influence on many of our people; we had the clamour of a small and influential class who saw their own private interest in assisting the hon. gentlemen; they were able to make magnificent promises; promises cost nothing, and they made them freely, and therefore they did succeed in persuading the people of Canada to try the experiment which, as the hon. gentleman says, they have just been putting into action. Then, when the experiment was tried, they were favoured by a rather remarkable combination of accidents. I do not suppose the hon. Minister of Finance, although he has said some rather strange things, although he has advanced some rather curious theories—I do not suppose that he, although I have no doubt some of his followers are quite capable of saying it, and perhaps of believing it—I do not suppose the hon. gentleman is going to tell us that the fact that in 1879, and shortly after, money became extraordinarily cheap and plentiful in New York, in London, Paris, Amsterdam, and almost in all the great centres in commerce in the world, was produced by the National Policy adopted in Canada; and yet, Sir, that was a very important factor in the condition of the people of

Canada, that undoubtedly proved a great benefit, and the reaped a great advantage from the fact that money at that time had become cheap and plentiful in all the money centres of the world. Almost at that same time, there took place, as every man knows, a great revival in the United States. Now, I am always happy to agree with the hon. gentleman if I can; it is not often, I am sorry to say, that I can do so; and I entirely concur with him in saying that the prosperity of Canada is very intimately connected with the prosperity of the United States; but I do not believe, Sir, that the fact that we imposed very heavy taxes in Canada had a great deal to do with the other fact, that trade and commerce throughout the length and breadth of the United States revived in 1879, and I hardly think the hon. gentleman himself will venture to say so. Then, Sir, added to these things, we had, as everybody knows, extraordinary good harvests and extraordinary good prices—produced by the National Policy, were they? No; but by the fact that, unfortunately in England, Ireland, and on the continent of Europe, there were bad harvests at the identical time that we had good ones, so that we had at once unusually good prices and an unusual quantity of things to sell. Then, Sir, the North-West was opened up, and beyond all doubt for a time that gave a great impetus to trade and business in Canada. Had it been wisely and well done, had it been wisely and well administered, it would have continued to give a great impetus up to this time. And Sir, last, but by no means least, the hon. gentleman had the advantage of coming into office and reaping the fruits of five years of honest and prudent Administration under my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Sir, I am astonished at the ingratitude of hon. gentlemen opposite—as regards myself, I do not expect much gratitude from them—I waived my claims; but they ought to be grateful to my hon. friend beside me. If the hon. gentleman supposes for one moment, if the hon. Minister of Customs supposes that I am here as a craven apologist, he makes a great mistake. I am here not merely to defend, but to justify and to maintain the whole conduct of my hon. friend during his Administration.

Mr. BOWELL. And to defend your own conduct?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am prepared to do both.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not very generous to do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not claim credit for generosity. This is not a question of generosity, but of fact and truth. Sir, I do not deny there was depression at the time of my hon. friend's Administration. There necessarily was depression, but there was ten times more in the United States than in Canada at that time. I do not deny that my hon. friend made mistakes; I do not claim for him that he is infallible. I grant he made mistakes; and more, Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman what were the mistakes my hon. friend made. My hon. friend, in the excess of his zeal for the public service, greatly over-exerted his physical strength; that was one mistake. My hon. friend, in the excess of the kindness of his heart, was far too generous to hon. gentlemen opposite; that was another mistake. I admit, also, that in the excess of his patriotism, he somewhat over-estimated the sense of honesty and intelligence of a certain portion of his countrymen. Now, Sir, those are faults which I will admit on the part of my hon. friend; and to do justice to the hon. gentlemen opposite, I will further say that they are faults that there is not the slightest danger any of them, collectively or individually, will ever commit. Sir, I am prepared to maintain, here or elsewhere, that whatever my hon. friend's mistakes may have been, his policy was substantially wise, and just, and good, and that it would have been infinitely better for Canada had it been carried out from that day to this. Sir, it was a great misfortune

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

that, prior to 1873, Canada neglected the warnings and the cautions which were given to her by that hon. gentleman and his friends. It was Canada's folly that, in 1878, she held him responsible, because those identical results had occurred which he had showed must occur in certain contingencies, if those warnings were neglected or disregarded. It has not been the first time—it won't be the last—when men like my hon. friend, for doing all that mortal men could do for the benefit of their country, have found themselves treated with ingratitude by the country they have served.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). It was your friends who turned him out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the people made a great mistake in deposing my hon. friend in 1878; and I will tell the hon. gentleman more, that perhaps in his heart of hearts he is beginning to think that too. Now, Sir, how stands the case to-day? The hon. gentleman has given us his explanations. He tells us, if I took down his words aright, that one cause, among other things, of the present depression, is the fact that our lumber industry is not as good as it was. Now I will just call his attention to this. It may be true, I dare say it is true, that during the ensuing six months our lumber industry may slacken, but I see in the returns laid on the Table, that whereas, during the last six months of 1882, we had exported of products of the forest, \$18,090,000, we had exported in the last six months of 1883, \$18,183,000 worth. Now, Sir, that cannot be urged as proof of any present depression. There may be risk in future—I am not prepared to say there is not; but the fact that we sold \$100,000 worth of lumber up to 1st January, 1884, more than up to 1st January, 1883, shows that that is not a cause of the distress which has occurred up to the present time. He talks also of over-production and of the poor harvest. Well, I will agree that all those things are factors in the matter. But there are other causes, and I will tell the hon. gentleman and the House what those causes are. Canada to-day is distressed, there is no doubt of it, and I am afraid the reasons are these. First of all, because a great deal of the money of the people has been taken from them by excessive, unjust and oppressive taxation. Next, Sir, because the policy of the Government has caused a great lock up of capital in manufactures which were not wanted in so small a country as this. Then, Sir, a very considerable loss, as to which I will have a good deal to say hereafter, has been caused by the emigration which has taken place from Ontario and Canada at large, also largely caused by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The fourth cause is the locking up of capital which has taken place in the North-West, for which also I will show those hon. gentlemen are responsible. And the fifth cause is the increased cost of living, for which the hon. gentleman's Tariff and its indirect results are seriously responsible. I do not deny that the poor harvest in western Ontario has done its share; but I say that of all those causes, far the greater number and the more important ones are directly attributable to the policy of the present Government. Now, Sir, we come to the question of the first cause—the onerous taxation—and here there are a few considerations to be presented to the House. There is the nominal taxation, the amount paid into the Treasury; there is, in the next place, the amount taken out of the pockets of the people, which does not go into the Treasury, but which is paid to a few hundreds of men scattered throughout the Dominion. The hon. Finance Minister disputed some of the assertions of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) as to the extent of that. I do not suppose any intelligent protectionist can be found who will deny the plain and simple fact that, whether protection in itself be good or be bad, whether protection does or does not make us an adequate

return—from the very nature of the case, protection must be costly, from the very nature of the case, if you impose a taxation of 20, 30 or 40 per cent., as the case may be, to exclude certain goods, and cause others to be manufactured in the country, just in proportion as you increase the manufactures, you must impose a large additional tax on the people. I do not suppose the Minister of Finance himself will venture to deny that proposition; I am sure those of his supporters who have looked into the question will not venture to do so. Now, I am not going to speak of the indirect effects of protection; I am going to speak of the things to which the hon. gentleman has alluded himself. And first of all, we will take the article of sugar. The hon. gentleman says that sugar is very cheap to-day. It may be so. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that it is cheaper to-day than it was four or five years ago. It may be so. That does not affect the argument at all. Our position is this: under the tariff of the hon. gentleman, sugar is much dearer than it need be, after deducting the sum which goes into the Treasury. To-day, I am informed by men of high standing in the trade, you could say down at Montreal, free of duty, those classes of sugar which are most in demand in Canada, at the rate of \$5 per 100 lbs. I am informed by those gentlemen also, that if they buy those sugars from Canadian refineries they have to pay \$8 per 100 lbs., being an excess of \$3. We consumed, in 1883, 152,000,000 lbs of sugar. I will allow a large percentage, 12,000,000, to go for the waste in converting that into such sugar as the people require; but every man can see for himself that if you could buy that sugar at 5 cents per lb, duty free, and are obliged to pay 3 cents more to the refiner, what the cost to the people of Canada that extra 3 cents per lb. is. It is \$4,200,000. Of that sum \$2,467,000 went into the Treasury, and more than \$1,500,000 was lost. That is the state of the case now under the hon. gentleman's Tariff. So, Sir, we find this result. In 1878 we imported 108,000,000 pounds. Our duty then was largely below our duty now; our duty then was about 25 per cent. less than it is to-day on the grades of sugar which go into consumption. In that time we have added about 30 per cent. to our consumption, and we have added 25 per cent. to our duty, and the result is that we have received \$100,000 less money. We obtained \$2,567,000 in 1878, with a lower scale of duties, on 108,000,000 lbs. of sugar; on 152,000,000 lbs. in 1883 we received \$2,476,000, although we have added largely to the duties. There is an illustration, if the hon. gentleman wants it. I do not mean to say there may not be some counterbalancing advantages to be offered, that some trade may not be brought to Montreal by that policy. That is not the point. I am not arguing whether protection is good or not. But that protection costs the general public many millions more than actually goes into the Treasury. The same is true, though not to the same extent, of coal. Coal is a raw material to manufacturers. Every man knows when you place a duty on that article that the amount paid into the Treasury does not measure the amount taken out of the pockets of the people. Everyone knows that if the hon. gentleman has succeeded, as he thinks he has, and perhaps he has, in causing about \$20,000,000 worth of textile goods to be manufactured here, presumably giving employment to 14,000 or 15,000 persons, that has only been done by imposing a duty, probable of 30 per cent., certainly not less than 25 per cent, on all consumers of the goods. And therefore, I say in estimating the taxation of this country you must add many millions to the sum actually paid into the Treasury in fact we must add an amount which we cannot satisfactorily measure. The hon. gentleman is in this dilemma. If he disputes these figures, if he thinks he does not give employment to 14,000 or 15,000 persons, that he

has not succeeded in causing our manufacturers to produce that quantity of goods, what then becomes of the home market which was to recompense the rest of the people for the amount of taxation to which they were to be subjected. Let the hon. gentleman make his selection. I repeat that I am not arguing as to whether protection is good or bad, but simply as to what it actually costs the people of the country. The result is this: Canada to-day is a very heavily taxed country. There are other countries more heavily taxed than we are, perhaps, but not many. Let us compare our position with that of England and with that of the United States; and let us bear in mind that it was not always so; that Canada started on the race of national life very lightly burthened, indeed, by comparison with other countries. Now, I have never contended, I do not now contend, that it is possible to avoid all increases as a country grows in population. I am willing to admit, that as the country increases in population, a very considerable increase of expenditure is necessary and legitimate. But, Sir, I ask the House is this a reasonable state of things? In 1867, Canada commenced her career with a total population, as shown by the Census Estimate, of 3,375,000. Canada's total taxation then was \$13,500,000. In 1883, deducting Indians, the population is probably about 4,300,000—certainly not more than 4,375,000—and the taxation, according to these returns, had swollen to \$35,800,000. Our population had increased not quite 1,000,000, or barely 1,000,000; our taxation had increased by \$22,250,000. Our taxation per head in 1867 amounted to \$4; our taxation in 1883 amounted to very nearly \$9 per head—and much more, if we were to take into account the enormous amount of additional taxation to which I have alluded, which is taken out of the pockets of the people, although it does not go into the Treasury. So that, while our population increased about 30 per cent, our nominal taxes have increased about 200 per cent. Now, I admit that abstract propositions cannot always be depended on. But I say that in matters financial you can almost certainly, with safety, lay down this proposition: that whenever, without war or some other extraordinary cause like that, you find the taxes of a country increasing very rapidly, increasing out of all proportion to its population, you may rest assured that the Government has been grossly extravagant, and in all probability grossly corrupt. And when you find the taxation remain stationary for a term of years, you may feel equally assured that the Government has been honestly and economically conducted. Now, Sir, it is a matter of importance that we should know how we stand by comparison with the two great countries with which we do most of our business and most of our trade. I want to call the attention of the House to the way in which the present position of Canada contrasts with the present position of the people of the United States, who, like ourselves, have the misfortune, as I conceive, of labouring under an unfair system of taxation. In 1867, I find that the taxation of the United States, from all sources, amounted to about \$396,000,000, their population then being, as nearly as possible, 36,000,000, by estimate. Sir, in 1883, the taxation of the United States by the President's Message was \$398,287,000, and the population, by estimate, 54,000,000. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, as he truly says, is great on averages, so to oblige him I will take the United States averages for 1867, 1868 and 1869, lest he accuse me of taking a particular year, and taking those averages we have this result: At the time that Canada was commencing her national existence, the taxation of the United States was \$10 per head, as nearly as may be. We find, Sir, that the taxation of the United States is now a mere fraction over \$7 per head. We find that in seventeen years the taxation of the United States has sunk from \$10 to \$7 per head—has sunk from about \$50 per family to \$35 per family

—and in the same seventeen years the taxation of Canada has risen from \$4 per head, to \$9 a head, and from about \$20 per family to about \$45 per family. If the hon. gentleman wants another comparison, I will take the expenditure for the same years and the results are almost worse. The expenditure of the United States, on the average of those years, appears to have been \$8 per head, while now it is less than \$5 per head. Canada's expenditure in 1867 was \$1 per head; Canada's expenditure is now more than \$7 per head. So that, while the United States have reduced their burthen nearly one half, Canada's burthen has been nearly doubled in proportion to her population. Those are serious considerations, and none the less serious because, in comparing the case of England, I find that in that country, seventeen years ago, the taxation per head amounted to £2 5s. 8d., while the taxation now is about £2 9s. per head. So that while we in Canada have been adding to our taxation at the rate of about \$5 per head, England was contented with an addition of some 80 cents per head. Now, Sir, can any man say that this is a satisfactory showing? Can any man say, knowing the circumstances of the United States, knowing that they had then just emerged from a great civil war, that they are still burthened with was charges amounting, if I remember right, to \$66,000,000 last year for pensions alone—can any man say that it is a satisfactory thing to the people of Canada to find that the record, as between us and them, is so excessively against us as appears from these figures. It is not a pleasant thing for me to say—I have no doubt it is not a pleasant thing for hon. gentlemen to hear—but I have yet to learn that it is our duty to conceal the facts of the case because they grate unpleasantly on the ears of hon. gentlemen opposite. More, Sir, when did all this occur? Did it occur in increases evenly distributed over the seventeen years? Not so, Mr. Speaker. These increases all occurred in two periods, one beginning in 1867 and terminating in 1874, and the other beginning in 1879, and extending down to the present time. In those two periods all the increases I have referred to arrived—in those two periods, and those alone. Sir, in years gone by, men were wont to talk of the ignorant impatience of taxation; now-a-days it would be infinitely more to the purpose if our people were persuaded to lay aside their ignorant acquiescence in taxation. Because, if you consider, you will find that these enormous increases of taxation are fraught with great dangers to the future welfare of this Dominion. I remember well when my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) was Premier, we considered this matter, and we had come to the conclusion that every dollar of unnecessary expenditure meant, in one way or another, a dollar taken out of the pocket of some man who was earning wages, and therefore that every million dollars added to the expenditure, meant, practically, that one day's wage was taken from every wage-earner throughout the Dominion. And if, as I believe, that be a true and fair statement, let the House bear in mind that in adding this \$22,000,000 to the taxation of Canada in seventeen years, about twenty-two days' wages, to all intents and purposes, have been subtracted from the wage-earning classes of the Dominion, and I say that this is a reason, and a good reason, why my hon. friend always opposed, why he always hesitated, to add to the burthens of the people, to add to the already enormous taxation of the people of Canada. Now, Sir, I say that the condition of the wage-earning classes in Canada to-day is not good. I say that it compares unfavourably with the condition of things in England. In England, as the hon. gentleman knows, or as he ought to know, care is taken to provide that every man who earns less than, say \$2 a day—less than about £150 a year—should be—except his free will and proper motion—exempt from taxation; and it is one of the best features of the English fiscal system that it is so. Here our taxes are so arranged that they press

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

more heavily on the men who are called upon to support their families out of their daily earnings than on any other class in the community; and press, next to them, on the great producing class, the farmers and the lumbermen of this country. Sir every man knows that the labouring class in this country need more than the same class in other countries. They need more fuel, more food, better shelter; and all these things have been made dearer by the policy of the hon. gentleman. I doubt if to-day, in Canada, you can point to anything that is really cheaper than it is on the other side of the Atlantic, except certain kinds of food and land in certain parts of the country. Now, if the hon. gentleman wants to know what I compute, so far as I can judge, to be the absolute loss to the country by his policy of excessive taxation—taking into account, as I have said, not merely what goes into the Treasury, but the amount paid to a certain number of persons throughout Canada—I tell him that I believe it is no less than \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 a year for the last four or five years. True, Sir, the hon. gentleman may plead that he has saved the necessity of our going into debt thereby. Again I say, this is good so far as it goes; but it is a most wasteful mode of borrowing money. If there is one thing more certain than another, it is this, that no matter on what system taxation is levied, you cannot put money into the Treasury without taking out of the pockets of the people more than you put in; and if that is true under an honest revenue system, it is infinitely more true under the system of which the hon. gentleman is the exponent. Moreover, I say that Canada requires its own capital, and the hon. gentleman might have known that, if it were only from the failure of his own domestic loan the other day. The hon. gentleman laid some stress on the fact that although that loan failed, other applications had come in to him. Now, I say, whatever his motives may have been—and I am not disputing that his motives were good—that in view of the probability that he would have to go on the London market to borrow large sums in a year or two, he committed a huge blunder in either issuing that loan, or allowing it to fail. He has put himself into this position—that when he goes to London or elsewhere to borrow money, the mere fact that he attempted to borrow in Canada and failed, is sure to be used by some parties to depreciate the securities he has to offer. Either he ought to have left it alone, or to have taken pains to make it a success when he did attempt to float it. Now, as to the expenditure for 1884-85. It appears from the hon. gentleman's statements, that we are in all probability committed to an expenditure of \$31,000,000, or thereabouts. I am not going to say what can be done now in the way of cutting down that expenditure. Probably it could be reduced; but how for I am not in a position to say. But I say this: had my hon. friend beside me remained in power, there was no reason whatever why the expenditure should have exceeded \$25,000,000 or \$25,500,000; and I am perfectly certain that my hon. friend would have contrived to keep it within that limit, which is only \$2,500,000 more than the hon. Minister of Finance declared some years ago was ample to carry on the Government of Canada. And, Sir, the proof is this—that whereas my hon. friend, when he went into office, found himself obliged to spend \$23,300,000 a year, and had to meet a host of great and sudden demands, aggregating an annual addition to the expenditure of \$2,500,000, he did it without adding more, in the long run, than \$250,000 to the expenditure which he found when he went in. Do not say that my hon. friend beside me had no great public works to carry on. My hon. friend carried on greater public works than the hon. Minister of Railways or his colleagues did. As I said the other night, he has no need to dread a comparison between the works done under his auspices, and those done under the auspices of the hon. Min-

ister of Railways. Sir, if the hon. gentleman wants the details of the expenditures which were incurred by us after the year 1874, I am prepared to give them. I find that my hon. friend was obliged to provide for interest and sinking fund alone on account of the great public works caused by the engagements of his predecessors, \$1,400,000; for Indians, \$260,000; for Mounted Police, \$135,000; for Prince Edward Island, in consequence of the terms of the Treaty, about \$300,000; for the Post Office Department, \$330,000; and for the Supreme Court, \$50,000; making in all, as nearly as may be, \$2,480,000 additional to the expenditure which he found when he entered into office. Sir, he would have been perfectly justified, under those circumstances, had he gone out with an expenditure of \$26,000,000; instead of that, he went out with an expenditure of \$23,500,000. Then there was another cause, that is the loss occasioned by reason of the capital which is locked up in manufactures. Now, I agree that this is a matter of estimate. I agree that no absolute statistics can be got. I will simply state what I believe to be the case. Let other hon. gentlemen who know the facts in their respective localities and may have better opportunities of ascertaining them than myself, let them state what they believe to be the total quantity of capital which is locked up at present in manufactures, and not returning profits to the owners. Now, I have made some enquiry, and collected all the information in all the quarters I could, and I have come to the conclusion that from \$8,000,000 to \$12,000,000, perhaps more, are at present locked up, unproductively, in manufactures throughout this Dominion. This has been brought about directly by the policy of the hon. gentlemen, and it is the usual result of any increased taxation for the purpose of protection. Now, the hon. gentleman would fain escape the responsibility of all this. The hon. gentleman would have us believe that by his policy of collecting together many thousands of poor workmen in the cities of this Dominion, he and his Government are not responsible, because, as always happens in these cases, when trade slackens, these poor people are thrown on the streets or compelled to work for half wages. Sir, I say the hon. gentleman is responsible. I say the direct result of his policy has been to gather together these men, and to keep them in such a position, that a trifling reverse may expose them to want, and throw them on the community for support. I say he is responsible for it; and as we are on this question of Protection, I say that the hon. gentleman, if he be really and sincerely an advocate of Protection, ought to have taken a great deal more pains and care than he has done to extend protection, not merely to the rich manufacturer, but to the workmen whom he employs. I say that his conduct with respect to the Factories Act alone shows how little he cared for the poor employee when the interests of the employé conflicted with those of the rich employer. He had the experience of the United States and the experience of England before him, he had the report of his own Commissioners to guide him; he knew right well that many of the persons employed in manufactures were unfairly dealt with, as they always will be unless the Government steps in to see that women and children, at any rate, are not pressed and driven beyond their strength. Yet five years after the introduction of his policy, he has not condescended to bring down and give the first reading to the Factory Bill intended to protect these poor creatures. Moreover, I say that those workmen have good right to complain of the policy of the Government in bringing here, at the public expense and in encouraging to come here, people to compete with them. If you are going to have protection at all, let it be thorough-going; protect the labourer, who needs protection quite as much as the employer; do not allow his wages to be cut down and competitors to be brought here at the public expense to underbid the men who are employed

in the subsidized manufactories of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman dwelt at some length on the state of the specially protected industries. I thought he might have remembered that we had long ago pointed out to him that so surely as you protect particular industries, so surely you do confer very great advantages on the men who, so to speak, are on the ground and have control of those industries for the moment; but the inevitable result, when you give these or any men an undue advantage by law, is to bring in a great deal more capital than is required, the ultimate result of which is invariably over production and depression, injury to the workingman and the employé alike. The hon. gentleman has intensified the evil. It is quite true that even when you have the whole world for a market, depressions will at times occur, but when you try to stimulate production by artificial means in a small community, disasters must happen, and probably will happen at a very early date, as they have in this particular instance. I repeat, in all this, the hon. gentleman has done great injury to the great mass of the manufacturers themselves; I repeat, that the manufacturers of Canada are hurt when capital is destroyed or locked up, and they are still more hurt when the great bulk of the people, who form their customers, are impoverished. Both those results have accrued from the policy of the hon. gentleman. Now, I observe that the hon. gentleman spoke on this occasion with very much bated breath, as to the magnificent surplus at his disposal. But I cannot quite agree with him, even in what he said on that question. He claimed he had \$7,000,000 last year from the increase of ordinary revenue over expenditure, and \$1,000,000 of additional surplus from the sales of land in the North-West; but I failed to hear the hon. gentleman say one word of the \$600,000 or thereabouts which he had spent and charged to capital account for surveys in the North-West, in connection with those very lands. Surely, if he claims \$1,000,000 as additional surplus on the one side, although it properly belongs to capital account, he should deduct the \$600,000 on the other side, which are charged to capital account for the survey of these very lands, a portion of which he has sold. The hon. gentleman's calculations may be correct or they may not, as regards the probable surplus at the end of the year, but one thing is clear, that whereas last year he had a surplus of very nearly \$4,957,000 on the 20th of February, he now has an apparent surplus of \$930,000, and no more. Now, if that goes on, as it appears to be going on, during the next few months, it is, to say the least, a matter of doubt whether the hon. gentleman will have any surplus at all. Perhaps it is as well he should not. It is clear the hon. gentleman's surplus tempted him into very unnecessary expenditure and to incur very undue liabilities; but I point out the fact to the House, because it is right they should understand how very seriously the revenue is being reduced and the expenditure is being increased within the past six or seven months, of which alone we can speak with perfect knowledge. Now I come to a question of the very gravest moment, to which the Government have on various occasions called attention. It is a question on which there is a very great conflict of statement between our own authorities and those of the United States. I might argue justly that Ministers would be estopped, at least some of them, from questioning the authorities of the United States statistics, because they invariably used them, and used them rather harshly, against ourselves, when we were in their place, but I do not regard that as a matter of much importance. What I do regard as of infinite moment, is to ascertain the actual facts of the case; and I propose to do so, not from any American statistics but from our own census returns and from our own various municipal returns. I have stated that one cause of the depressed condition of this country arose, in my judgment, from the fact that there

had been a very large emigration indeed from various parts of this Dominion. Now we cannot absolutely ascertain all the facts as to all the Provinces, but we can to a very considerable extent, at any rate, as regards the Province of Ontario, and I propose to do so. There we have got a tolerably accurate system of municipal returns, and we find from those, when properly checked, that although we cannot determine absolutely the population at any one moment, we can determine, with very considerable accuracy, the relative increase or decrease in the population, provided we apply the proper checks, by taking not only the number of persons who are returned as of school age but those who actually attended school. At the risk of tiring the House, I must call attention to the very remarkable statistics which have been produced by the Ontario Government in respect to this point. In 1878, we find there were in Ontario, between the ages of five and sixteen, 492,360 children; in 1879, 494,424; in 1880, there were 489,924; in 1881, 484,214; in 1882, 483,817; and in 1883 about the same number. We find that there were reported in actual attendance at schools 467,433, in 1878; in 1879, 461,845; in 1880, 454,395; in 1881, 459,826; in 1882, 457,178. Now, I call the careful attention of the House to this fact that, as I said before, I do not contend that those figures are absolutely correct, but I contend that they are relatively correct. It is impossible to suppose that several thousands of assessors throughout the country, during those four or five years, men at least, one-half of whom are probably supporters of the hon. gentleman, could have deliberately conspired together to falsify returns, and we are justified therefore in assuming those are relatively correct. What do they prove? They prove that by the test of the children of that age and by the school test, which affords a necessary and useful check, the school population of Ontario, from 1879 to 1882, had decreased by 10,670. Sir, that is a very serious matter. Here we have, first of all, a positive, absolute loss, ascertained in that fashion. We have, besides that, the loss of the natural increase of the population, which is considerable, and which I shall presently compute. We have also the displacement by immigration, be it large or small, because it is quite clear that the population having absolutely decreased, all the people who came in there as immigrants have been absorbed and have failed to make up the loss. Now, Sir, we will see, for these five years, what that amounts to. I find that the natural increase of Ontario, which possessed a population of nearly 2,000,000, according to every rule and according to all the information I could get, ought not to have been less than 40,000 a year. What the immigration into that Province may be can only be estimated, but if there be any truth whatever in the statistics furnished us by the Department of Agriculture, it cannot have been less than 20,000 in each of those years. So, if you add together, first of all, the positive, ascertained loss, as evidenced from the school registers, and the loss of the natural increase, and the loss by displacement measured by the number of the immigrants who came in from year to year, you find that, in 1879, we lost about 52,000, in 1880 we lost 80,000, in 1881 as many, in 1882, I am happy to say, a smaller number, about 62,000, and probably, as far as we can now ascertain, about 60,000 in 1883. Sir, that makes a total loss, including these three causes—because everybody, I think, will admit that, if the school population has really decreased 10,000, the total population, of which the school population forms a fourth, must also have decreased by four times that number—a total loss for Ontario in these five years of about 334,000. Now, it is quite true that a considerable portion of these people have gone to Manitoba. On looking at the returns brought down by the Minister of Agriculture, I find that, up to April, 1881, there were 19,000 persons in

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Manitoba and the North-West born in Ontario; by the same returns, I find that, in 1881, although that is of course including three months prior to 1st of April, and therefore, a little too much, 18,000 appear to have come from Ontario; in 1882, 32,000—I am taking his own statistics—and, in 1883, we believe about 25,000; in all, not quite 100,000 of these people may be counted as having left Ontario and settled in Manitoba and the North-West. Now, I speak for Ontario alone. I have no pretensions to speak for the depopulation, if it do exist, in Quebec or in the Maritime Provinces, but perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works, who formerly declared that it was a matter of the greatest possible importance to repatriate his countrymen, could speak as to the depopulation of Quebec. I heard an hon. gentleman, I do not know whether he is in the House or not, the member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), a few nights ago declare that he believed that 500,000 or 600,000 people had gone from Quebec to the United States. I would fain hope that that is altogether too large an estimate; but, if we are to believe that gentleman, if we are to believe the Minister of Public Works, if we are to believe the dignitaries of the church, who have made it a matter of comment in their pastorals, a serious depopulation has been going on from Quebec likewise. What would my friends from the Maritime Provinces say? What would the gentlemen from New Brunswick and Prince Edward and Nova Scotia say? Do they or do they not believe that numbers of their fellow-countrymen have left those Provinces within the last few years? I leave it for them to speak. I speak only of what I know; I speak only of what I have reasonable grounds for believing; I pay no attention to foreign statistics; I am basing myself exclusively on our own Census and on the municipal and the school returns of the Province for Ontario. Now, Sir, there are collateral proofs of this fact, and proofs which can hardly be disregarded. I have here a return of nearly 200 towns and villages throughout Ontario. It is perfectly notorious that, during the last ten years, our towns and villages grew much more than the rural districts in which they stood, as a rule. Every man who looks at the Census knows that. Now, what do these returns show? They extend over five years also, from 1878-79 to 1883. Well, they show these rather remarkable facts, that, out of 118 villages in Ontario, averaging about 1,000 souls, 79 were stationary or retrograde, and of the remainder, several had not increased as much as the natural increase would warrant. Of sixty-four towns, averaging 3,000, forty-one were stationary or retrograde, and several of the remainder had not increased as much as then atural increase would warrant. It is quite impossible for us to disregard plain, patent facts like these, which every hon. gentleman who chooses to examine the municipal statistics of Ontario can ascertain for himself, as I have done. But I will give one or two particular instances, which may impress the House more than these general statements. The other day, wishing to ascertain, as nearly as I could, the facts in this matter, I applied to the Mayor of the town of Goderich, the chief town of the constituency of my hon. friend behind me. In 1871, according to the Census, that town had a population of 3,954; in 1878, according to the municipal statistics, it had grown to 4,663; according to the last municipal statistics for 1883, supplied me by the Mayor of that town, it had shrunk in five years from 4,663 to 3,818. Sir, I say that it is a serious matter. Why, the county you yourself represent would furnish another illustration. In 1871, the county of Frontenac, according to the Census, contained 16,300 people; the natural increase ought to have brought that up to 20,000 souls, but the last Census shows that, instead of 20,000, the population of Frontenac was 14,993. Instead of gaining 3,000, as it should, it had lost about 1,400 souls.

For further proof, I caused the school population of eight townships in my hon. friend's constituency and my own, to be carefully gone over, and here again I must pray the indulgence of the House, because the subject is one of first-rate importance. I find that, in the space of six years, the school population of those eight townships had gone down as follows:—Beginning at 10,180, it had been reduced to 9,600, 9,400, 9,200, 8,600, 8,300, and finally to 7,570. It is possible, of course, that I may be mistaken here, and let me say this, that in this instance, I would be very glad indeed to have it proved that I was mistaken. I would be very glad if the Minister of Finance or any of his friends will show that these statistics which I have referred to tonight are erroneous, and how, and why. So far as I can see, these statistics deserve our respect, if they are properly checked. I have not contended that they are absolutely accurate; I do contend that they are relatively accurate.

Mr. POPE. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I shall preserve my own opinion until I see much better arguments than have been put in print, at any rate, by the hon. gentleman or any of his deputies. There may be arguments as yet unstated; I am open to conviction, and I shall be glad to hear them. Now, I want to call attention to certain facts connected with the immigration to this country. We have heard these hon. gentlemen declaring that they have brought, I think they said, 130,000 people into Canada within the last year, 112,000 in the year before, and 47,000 in the year before that. Sir, these people may have come. If they have come, then the displacement of our own population in Ontario has been very much greater than I supposed; but I shall presently show the House that, even if these people did come in with the intention of settling here, it is, to say the least of it, an exceedingly questionable matter whether they have stayed in Canada. Now, Sir, we have no absolute proof as to what has become of the men who have arrived since our last Census, but we have tolerably convincing evidence as to what became of the immigrants who came into Canada during the decade between 1871 and 1881. Sir, I find, on looking at the returns of the Census that the foreign-born population in 1831, was 609,000; I find that Ontario, in 1881, had 429,000 foreign-born population, while in 1871 it had 442,000. I find that in the four old Provinces in 1871, quoting from the Census, the foreign-born population was 593,000; in 1831 in the four old Provinces, it was 566,000. Now, Sir, I call attention to these facts. According to our immigration returns, 342,575 people have settled in Canada, as these returns allege, between 1871 and 1881. Now, I will allow as large a percentage for death rate as you can ask; I will allow, say for 120,000 deaths of foreign population, and what is the result? Why, Sir, we find that had those 342,000 people settled here, we ought to have had at least 222,000 more foreign population in the Dominion, in the four old Provinces, in 1881; instead of that, we have 27,000 less; so that it follows, beyond possibility of controversy, according to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture, that of the 342,000 who were said to have come and settled in Canada, not 90,000 have stayed. I suspect that the same result would come out, even if the figures are maintained in respect to the 112,000 or the 130,000 whom the hon. gentleman asserts to have settled in Canada of late. Now this is a very serious matter; I say the absolute loss to us is extreme. It is hardly possible to estimate sufficiently the value of the emigrants who leave Canada. First of all, a very large proportion of those who leave us, as every man of us can see who chooses to inspect an ordinary train leaving Canada, consists of men in their prime. In the next place, it is notably the fact, as far as Ontario is concerned, that almost all the men who leave Canada to seek homes elsewhere are possessed of very considerable capital. I

believe, Sir, if a fair average was taken, it would be found that each one takes in money, and money's worth, nearer \$2,000 than \$1,000 from this country. I know in the few cases concerning which I have taken the trouble to ascertain the facts, I have been astonished at the enormous amount of capital which was being removed from Canada to seek investment elsewhere. Now, Sir, what is the value of those men as compared with that of ordinary immigrants? Sir, I have no prejudice against immigrants. We can welcome all good, industrious immigrants, although we do not wish to see immigrants coming here unless they are prepared to better their condition; but, Sir, I say, in no spirit of prejudice, that one Ontario farmer, one Canadian farmer, possessed of reasonable capital, is worth, either as a tax-payer or as a producer, any half dozen foreign immigrants who may come into this country. I scorn to put a money value on my countrymen, although the American people are in the habit of calling every able bodied immigrant worth \$1,000 to the public; but, Sir, I decline to rate our brethren at so much a head. Still, I do say that those men who leave Canada in that way take away with them, and take from us, a most important element of national wealth and a most enormous amount of the capital of Canada. And these gentlemen want to arrogate to themselves that they are the only friends of Canada. Their policy, they tell us, is a policy of "Canada for the Canadians." What are the facts, as disclosed in the United States Census for 1881? Why, Sir, they show that 700,000 Canadians were then found in the United States, and I believe that if the census were taken to-day, it would show the number of Canadians in the United States to be nearer 1,000,000 than 700,000. Sir, it is no wonder the people of Dakota have a high opinion of the Premier, and are fond of declaring that Dakota needs no land agent while the present Premier of the Dominion has control of affairs. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not disposed to deny that this has gone on for a long time, but I think it has gone on with a vastly accelerated ratio since the hon. gentlemen came into power and introduced their present policy. Our own Census, as I have shown, proves conclusively, first of all, that the foreign immigrants who come here do not stay here, and next, that the total increase of the population hardly equals the natural increase to which we are entitled. More, what is true of Ontario is true also—I do not want in the least degree to disguise the fact—of the New England States, and to a great extent it is true of the State of New York. But, Sir, there is this all-important difference: when the New Englander, or the New Yorker, quits his parental home and goes westward, he does not cease to be a citizen of the United States, and to contribute to its wealth and importance; but when our people leave the older Provinces, the majority of them, I am sorry to say, do not find homes within the Dominion, but they go to swell the importance, the strength and the wealth of the people of the United States. A few weeks ago, I was conversing with a very intelligent gentleman, the editor of a large newspaper in the western part of Canada, and I asked that gentleman to examine his list and tell me how many subscribers he then had in the United States. After examining his list, he showed me that he had 300 subscribers who had formerly been inhabitants of Canada, but who, within the last two or three years, had become inhabitants of the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. Please name the paper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The name of the paper is the *Expositor*, of Seaforth, and if the hon. gentleman chooses to go and visit the editor, I have no doubt he will show him his list. Now, I do not deny that the drain of capital may, to a certain extent, be balanced. It is true we get back, in the shape of immigrants and the capital they bring, a certain percentage, but it is a most disadvantageous exchange to us. We give the very best, the prime of our

population, and we do not by any means get the best, nor is it all a prime population that comes to us. Sir, if it be true that of 342,000 immigrants who came within the last decade, only 90,000 at the outside have remained with us—I see no answer to these statistics that I have taken from the returns made by the Department of Agriculture and from the Census—if that be true, what impolicy it is on our part to bring these people here, to pay their passage, to have them come to Canada, and then leave Canada and report that they could not make a living here, and had to go elsewhere. Sir, I say our whole immigration system requires revising, from the top to the bottom, and I believe it would be better for us all if we adopted the policy of the United States. Diffuse information if you will, but certainly do not bring people here, as we have been doing, to compete with our own labourers in many walks of life, when, in all probability, three-fourths of them will find their way to the United States, and send word to their friends and relatives in England that they had tried Canada and could not obtain a living in it. Well, Sir, all this was bad enough in past times. But in past times there was an excuse for it. In past times, it was true, we had not practically at our disposal a great quantity of land, on which those people might be settled. It is utterly inexcusable now. Sir, a few years ago a most extraordinary opportunity was presented to the Government of Canada. It was one of those great opportunities which come but once in a century, and I may say, once in the lifetime of a nation. It was an opportunity, given to those hon. gentlemen, by which they might have fully redeemed all their other errors and blunders, and they were neither few nor far between. I have never contended that the fiscal policy of a nation is more than one factor in its progress. I admit, frankly, that such things have happened as that a prudent and economical administration has been combined with a very bad fiscal system. I admit it is possible we may have a good land policy and a bad fiscal system. Those hon. gentlemen, a few years ago, came into office to find substantially all the essential work done for their hands. Thanks to the patient toil of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) for five years, one great avenue to the North-West was all but opened. Thanks, to do them justice, to the enterprise and energy of the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway Company, another avenue had been opened for some time. That magnificent country was practically placed at their disposal. The people of Canada, and notably the people of Ontario, were most anxious to go there. All the pent-up energies of many years were seeking an outlet. Every man who knows our people is aware that for years back we had been looking for such a field for energy and capital as the North-West then presented. The men were there, the money was there. Outside capital was ready to aid them to any reasonable extent. Absolutely, all that was necessary was to leave that country alone and let the people develop it. And, absolutely, they could not even do that. The very best settlers in the world were flowing into Manitoba. I never in all my life saw men so thoroughly capable of, and so well calculated for developing a country as the settlers who were going from Ontario to Manitoba in the early years of the hon. gentleman's Administration. I say they chose deliberately to ruin everything. I say that was bad if done from ignorance; if done from any other motive, it was an iniquitous breach of trust. What were the requirements of the North-West? They were three. First, the people needed cheap land; second, cheap goods; and third, and most of all, cheap and abundant means of transportation. How did hon. gentlemen supply those wants? Do not hon. members know that every vexatious obstacle and impediment that could be conceived in the way of land regulations placed in the way of intending settlers? Large tracts of land were

Sir, RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

withheld from settlers—the very tracts which the people desired to enter upon. Faith was broken with them in every possible way; their small capital was reduced by heavy and excessive taxation, and all opportunity of getting cheap transportation, although the people were prepared to provide it at their own cost, was shut out. Two policies were possible. One was to construct a road as a Government road, run it cheaply for the first few years, so as barely to pay expenses, and adopt a liberal policy for side lines, a policy substantially the same as that which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) proposed to introduce, and which would have contributed enormously to the wholesome development of the North-West, if put in force either by those hon. gentlemen or by the late Parliament. Then, there was the other plan: to allow the utmost freedom of competition, as was the right of the people of the North-West, provided the Government did not choose to construct the road and run it in the way I have described. What did they do? They forbade all competition, and as soon as the Government road was constructed, they handed it over to a private corporation; they not only turned it over, but they resigned all control over it. No grosser outrage was ever committed on a free people than that which was committed, by the Government and Parliament of Canada in thus interfering with the plainest rights of the people of the North-West. I say, moreover, that there never was such a case of sacrificing ends to means as in that act. What use is the Canadian Pacific Railway to us? Why should we be burdened with the payment of \$100,000,000 for it, but for the opportunity presented of providing homes for hundreds of thousands of our people who are asking them at our hands? What hon. gentlemen opposite have done has been to deprive those people of the chance of settlement, to take away from them every possible inducement to go there. And the secondary results have been almost more important still. I remember well the position of the country in 1880. At that time, all kinds of railway projects were in agitation, and there was this remarkable feature about them. In old Canada it is not an easy task to devise railways which will prove profitable until after a long term of years. Very often the country opened up is of an inferior character and not likely to secure immediate settlement. But in the North-West it was scarcely possible for a man of ordinary judgment to plan a railway which would not in all human probability have brought in a large number of settlers and have become a reasonable source of profit to the promoters, within a short space of time. As I have said, no better settlers could be imagined than those who were rushing in from Ontario. There was perfect readiness on the part of outside capitalists to co-operate; and, moreover, such branch lines as were proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell, when he was Minister of the Interior, would really have been the best of all colonization schemes. The companies would not have been given, nor did the hon. gentleman propose to allow them, absolute control of the land; it was to have been retained under the control of the Government, and it would have been only profitable to the Company when they succeeded in placing actual settlers upon it. But all these projects were paralyzed by law. The right to construct such roads was taken away. What was the result? There was at once a complete stoppage of the influx of the best settlers; they would not go to a country where their rights were trampled on in that fashion. Capital that stood ready to develop that country, which its owners would have only been too happy to have invested in this manner, being thus debarred from its natural outlet, was directed into other channels, and there have been scenes in Manitoba and the North-West the like of which has scarcely been exceeded since the days of the South Sea Bubble. Moreover, all the branch lines which might have been and would have been constructed were

utterly abandoned. No man could venture to build railways in face of the conditions on which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were entitled to build their line. The whole country was plunged into a state of discontent, of which hon. gentlemen opposite are very far indeed from having heard the last. Now, Sir, had they acted otherwise, had they acted sensibly and prudently, had they allowed the people to do what the people were only too ready to do, to-day instead of having a paltry 150,000, or thereabouts, of people, strung along 1,000 miles of railway, we would have had, in all human probability, 500,000 settlers in Manitoba alone. We would have had from 2,000 to 3,000 miles of branch lines in active operation, and we would have been able, in place of the miserable export we now have, to have exported, in all human probability, at least 20,000,000 bushels of wheat in this very year. Sir, the Canadian Pacific Railway itself would have had an infinitely better chance of success than it has to-day. Instead of its being a costly, a hazardous and a doubtful experiment, that railway with such a Province to draw from would have stood infinitely higher than it does to-day, with all the backing which the hon. gentleman can give it. Now, Sir, it does not lie in the mouth of these gentlemen to say that I exaggerate when I assert that we might to-day, in 1884 or 1883, have had an export of 20,000,000 bushels of grain from that country. Did not the Minister of Railways himself say that he hoped to see an export of 600,000,000 bushels of grain produced by the 100,000 settlers who would soon be settled in that country? I will not say that even this was an extravagant or an extreme view of the case, but I do say that but for most unwise interference of the Government which prevented the people from securing the direct railway communication which they would otherwise have got, it is perfectly certain that there would have been 20,000 settlers in Southern Manitoba to-day who would have been in a position, in all likelihood, to have exported the quantity of grain I named. It has been done elsewhere. I am not speaking of an impossibility, but of a thing which has been done again and again in the United States, close beside us. Now, it is well for us to consider how all this came about. I am sorry the First Minister is not here, because to a very considerable extent I hold him directly responsible for the miscarriage. I certainly am not a blind idolator of the hon. gentleman, but I know him well, and I appreciate many of his qualities quite as much, perhaps, as hon. gentlemen opposite do. I admit that the hon. gentleman is a good tactician, that he is a wire-puller of the first force, but I say that the hon. gentleman has never, either now or in former years, shown himself to be a good and capable administrator. Out of his own mouth let me convict him. No man was louder or more outspoken in his condemnation of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) because he proposed at one and the same time to act as Premier of Canada and to take charge of a Department of the Government. But the hon. gentleman, when he entered office, took into his hands the charge of by far the most important Department of the Government, in conjunction with the task of performing the duties of Premier. Sir, he may have attended to his duties as Premier, but no other evidence is required than his own declarations on the floor of the House, when he was endeavouring to pass the Estimates through Parliament, to show that he did not attend to the duties of his Department. And in this very city, as I am informed, a few months ago, when cross examined on oath, he declared that though he was sworn to discharge the duties of Minister of the Interior, he knew nothing at all about the conduct of the most important branch of his own Department. I am glad that since that declaration he has ceased to hold that office, for no matter what a man may be, no matter what his talents may be, I say that he could not possibly discharge the duties of Minister of the Interior unless he originally possessed, or unless immediately after

entering office, he took pains to acquire an intimate personal knowledge of that country. And I say it is a great misfortune to Canada, and probably to hon. gentlemen opposite, that the First Minister should have, during all that time, chosen to occupy the position of Minister of the Interior. Now, Sir, one word as to the demands of the people of the North-West. Sir, I am heartily in sympathy with them; I say that those demands are substantially just. I say that it is in the highest degree in the interests of the Dominion of Canada that they should be conceded without delay. And as I have done before, I warn the Government, and so far as I can, I warn the people of Canada that unless they accede to the just demands of the people of the North-West, they will only have their own obstinacy and folly to thank for it, if the day should come, though I hope it never may, when Canada may lose the North-West, which it has so persistently discouraged. Sir, I utterly repudiate the idea that the people of the North-West are under any obligation or compliment to the people or the Parliament of Canada. On the contrary, I say the Parliament and Government of Canada have most grievously oppressed and maltreated the people of the North-West. Now, Sir, it may be that the lock-up of capital there is the smallest injury which Canada has sustained—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him to state what those just claims of the North-West are?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will tell the hon. gentleman. I say that the tyrannical monopoly should be abolished; that reasonable and fair, and just land regulations should be given and acted upon, and not changed from day to day and from hour to hour, at the caprice of a Minister at Ottawa, who knows and can know nothing about the interests of that country, who has never condescended to set his foot there—I mean, of course, the late Minister of the Interior—who never even condescended to go as far west as Chicago, who never, I believe, has put his foot on prairie soil in his life, either in Canada or anywhere else. If hon. gentlemen want to know more of these demands let them look at what the North-West Council, nominees, many of them, of the hon. gentleman, say of the claims of the North-West on the people of Canada. I was stating, Sir, that perhaps the lock-up of capital was the smallest injury, but that is great enough. Few of us perhaps know how widespread has been the desire of the people of Ontario, in particular, to acquire property in the North-West. I doubt if you could find a single hamlet in which there are not a considerable number of people who have some money in the North-West. I was at pains, at Winnipeg and Toronto, and elsewhere, to make a number of enquiries as to the amount of capital locked up there, and I believe I am largely within the mark in saying that, in all human probability, more than \$20,000,000, within the last three or four years, have been locked up in the North-West. I do not say that all that money is lost, though no doubt a good deal of it has been lost; but I say that it is locked up and fixed, and that to all intents and purposes it is locked up to the people of Canada for the time being, and, therefore, one considerable cause of the stringency and depression which, as I contend, does undoubtedly exist here now. Moreover, I say the House should not suppose that it is as easy to undo the evil we have done as to do it. Sir, the seed time has been thrown away, and years must elapse before we find ourselves in one half as favourable a position for developing the North-West as we were in a few years ago. The money is gone or locked up as I have said—the men have gone too, which is worse. And if hon. gentlemen want to know where they have gone, I can tell them where part of them have gone. Let them go to northern Dakota, and they will find that in one whole division of

that State, about 150 miles in length by 60 miles in depth, nine-tenths of the population in that district, are composed of Canadians, a very large number of whom, I grieve to say, went to Manitoba first, and afterwards crossed the border. Sir, if hon. gentlemen want to know what that means, I say that the area I have described would equal one-half of the whole western peninsula of Ontario. Draw a line from Toronto through London to Lake Huron and all the country south of that line, including twenty-three of the best Ridings of Canada—an area equaling the counties of Essex, Kent, Lambton, Bothwell, the Elgins, the Norfolks, the Middlesexes, Welland, Haldimand, the Wentworths, the Brants, the Oxfords, Monk, Lincoln Halton, and Peel would barely equal the territory of Northern Dakota, which is now occupied by Canadians who sought homes in Manitoba and—thanks to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite—were unable to find them there. Sir, I said there was also another loss. The hon. gentleman has added—intentionally or not—but he has added largely, despite what he may say to the contrary, to the cost of living in this country. The hon. gentleman knows—if he tries to retrench, he will soon find out if he does not know—that it is very hard indeed, for either nations or individuals who have become accustomed to a certain style of expenditure, to retrench that expenditure. Sir, I say any wise statesman to-day would shun, as he would shun poison, any legislation which would tend to increase the wealth of the few at the expense of the impoverishment of the many. I say that there is no greater danger, politically speaking, confronting society than the aggregation of large fortunes in individual hands; and the hon. gentleman, if he pays any attention to the movements of current thought, knows, or ought to know, that I speak the truth. I say that it is a thing which invariably produces corruption on the one side and misery on the other. I say it justifies socialism. We, in Canada, a few years ago, if we had not great wealth, had an exceedingly fair distribution of what wealth we had. The hon. gentleman's policy has contributed largely to alter that condition of things, and to cause this country to approximate the very condition in the Old World which has led so many people to leave the Old World and seek a home on this side of the Atlantic. The hon. gentleman can show no single instance anywhere, in which huge fortunes exist, in which there is not intense poverty at the other end of the scale. Now, let us see what the hon. gentlemen opposite can be held responsible for. For the poor harvest they are not responsible in one sense, inasmuch as they certainly could not avert it; although I say they are responsible in this sense, that when bad harvests overtook the country, during the Administration of my hon. friend, they falsely charged him with being the cause of it, and falsely pretended that if they were put in office they could do better. I say they are responsible for the excessive taxation which exists, for the amount of capital which is needlessly locked up in unproductive manufactures, for the capital which is lost by emigration, which is very large, for the capital which is locked up in the North-West, and for the general inflation and the increased cost of living in the country. Now, how do these hon. gentlemen propose to remedy all this? I did not hear in the statement of the hon. gentleman, any relief proposed now. He takes credit to himself that he was obliged to reduce certain taxes. Well, Sir, considering that he put on probably twelve or fifteen millions more taxes per annum, than were at all required, I do not think we owe him any great thanks for that. Still, as far as it went, it was good; but it was not by any manner of means what he ought to have done or what is called for by the present necessities of the country. Now, I had thought that I might take this occasion to speak of the Administration and the policy of my

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) more in detail; but that, I see, looking at the time, I must reserve for some other occasion. Still, I will say this, that I am prepared to show, if the hon. gentleman wants to have it shown, that the deficits which existed during my hon. friend's Administration—the deficits of 1876, 1877 and 1878—were due to the extravagance—aye, to the deliberate misconduct—of his predecessors. I say, Sir, that the deficits which would have existed in 1874 and 1875 were turned into surpluses by us. I say more—that the mischief which afterwards occurred was due to the neglect by hon. gentlemen opposite, of my hon. friend's warnings, and I say, that in spite of all, we had substantially mastered all those difficulties by sheer economy, and that, with the solitary exception of the sum required for sinking fund—which, as the hon. Minister of Finance truly said this afternoon, goes wholly to the redemption of debt—we had, before we left office, succeeded in establishing an equilibrium. More I say—our Tariff, had it been maintained, would have provided an ample revenue the moment trade revived. The Tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, as the statements of 1879 and 1880 show, wholly failed to afford a revenue until that revival took place. I say further—if, instead of having recourse to a comparison of my hon. friend's Administration in difficult times, with their Administration in prosperous times, hon. gentlemen opposite compare their Administration in a time at all approaching the stringency we had to face, my hon. friend has not the faintest cause to fear a comparison of his Administration with the Administration of Sir John A. Macdonald in former years of stringency. More, Sir—I say had our policy prevailed, the taxes and the expenditure of the country would have been many millions a year less to-day than they are now, and the taxation would have been infinitely more fairly levied. I say, as I have said before, that had the people been permitted, as we would have permitted them, to use the great advantages which presented themselves in Manitoba, that Province to-day would have contained half a million of prosperous and contented settlers, instead of being, as the hon. gentleman well knows, a mass of discontent. I say there would have been no tyrannical monopolies; and although there would have been undoubtedly a considerable removal from Ontario, that would have gone to swell the population of our own country, and not the population of the United States. Now, Sir, in all this I am not claiming very much. I am only claiming that affairs would have been administered with reasonable prudence, and reasonable economy, and reasonable discretion; and I say, that as much as could have been done in Manitoba, has been done again and again in the United States. Now, Sir, I do not want, as the hon. gentleman did, to enter on the realm of prophecy; I am not going to venture on any predictions. But I may recall the past. I may recall the fact that, in 1873, under somewhat similar circumstances, the hon. gentleman thought there was a long career of prosperity awaiting us; and I may recall to him the fact that, scarcely were the words out of his mouth, as scarcely were the words out of his mouth last year, before the fair prospect was overclouded. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman has a period of commercial difficulty before him—though I trust he will not be called upon to face any such commercial disaster as overtook the country during the Administration of my hon. friend—I ask him, and I ask the House, how he is prepared to meet it. Sir, our resources have been dissipated, while our liabilities have been indefinitely increased. It is quite on the cards, if the hon. gentleman's own policy should be carried out, and our imports should be reduced to the level of our exports, that instead of having \$30,000,000 or \$31,000,000 to rely on, he might find himself reduced to \$26,000,000 or \$27,000,000; while at the same time he has swollen his expenditure to such a figure that there is scarcely any reasonable ground

for believing that it can be reduced below \$30,000,000 or \$31,000,000. Now we have to confront, not only this grievous taxation, but an absolute reduction in the population of our richest Province, and there is this difference, at any rate, between the trouble which may overtake us now and the trouble which overtook us in 1874, that although it may be true that in both cases something was due to the extravagance of the people themselves, though more I think, to unavoidable misfortunes, which could not by any possibility be foreseen or prevented, still in the present instance when there have been no disasters of any real importance, we have nothing to thank but our own wilful imprudence for the position we are in to-day. We have nothing to thank but our own folly if the advantages of our position have been thrown away and prove insufficient to save us from serious reverses. Now, if I am to sum up the losses we have sustained, I feel some difficulty in doing it. I believe the excessive taxation to which the hon. gentleman has subjected this country, has involved a loss of not less than \$50,000,000 in the course of the last five years; I believe that the locking up of capital in manufactures has involved a loss of not less than \$10,000,000, and the locking up of capital in the North-West, a loss of not less than \$20,000,000. As to the loss we have sustained by the depletion of our population and the amount of capital withdrawn from Canada to provide Canadians with homes in the United States, that, I confess, I almost hesitate to compute. I know it to be very large and vastly in excess of all we have received from any immigration into this country, but how large it is, it is almost impossible for me or anybody else to calculate now. The hon. gentleman, besides by involving us, as he has, in an annual expenditure of not less than \$30,000,000 a year, has unjustly and improperly added \$5,000,000 to our annual expenditure. Let him capitalize that at 4 per cent. and see what amount that will represent. I say nothing of the additional millions which have not been paid into the Treasury but have been paid in subsidizing certain industries in this country. I will only allude to the hundred millions in money and subsidies which we have granted to a Company for the purpose of creating a railway monopoly through the North-West. We do not know if the \$100,000,000 will do or what further demands will be made. I have put down nothing for the last bad harvest, the shrinkage of stocks, the loss we have incurred, according to the hon. gentleman's principles, by the fact that our imports exceeded our exports last year by \$30,000,000 or \$34,000,000. If hon. gentlemen opposite choose to add all these things together, they may compute for themselves; they may compute what four or five years of those hon. gentlemen's Government has cost the country. For myself, I will not hesitate to say that, looking at the thing all round, I believe we would have done better if we had borrowed \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000 and thrown the money into the sea or had blown it away in fire works, as other nations have done, than allow these hon. gentlemen to control the Administration of this country. Five years of their government have done as much mischief to Canada, relatively to our population and resources, as four years of civil war did to the country and the people to the south of us. But though we may measure the material injury we have sustained, how shall we estimate the moral? I predicted in 1878, that if the people of Canada chose to restore those hon. gentlemen to power, three results would accrue. First of all, I said, and I repeat it now, that by restoring those gentlemen to power, after what they had been proved to have done, we would degrade and demoralize public opinion from one end of this country to the other. I said, in the second place, that by the system they proposed to introduce, if allowed to put it into effect, they would impoverish the great bulk of the people. I said, in the last place, that if they were restored to power, after what had occurred, all restraint and

wholesome control on the part of the people, over Parliament or the Government, would be removed, and that there would be no check on the extravagance and corruption which would ultimately prevail. I am sorry to say that the worst results I predicted have been fulfilled. We are confronted to-day with a Government which may be defined as a Government compacted of all the sinister interests in Canada. It is not, as its leader once said, a Government steeped to the lips in corruption, but a Government which is corruption incarnate. What have we seen within the last two weeks, within the last few days? What have we seen within the course of the last year or two? We have seen the whole representation of the Great Province to which I belong so villainously gerrymandered that one half of the electors are allowed to return two-thirds of the representatives to Parliament; that one-sixth of the people, to all intents and purposes, are practically disfranchised, and we saw that done by virtue of a Census which, itself, is a deliberate fraud and as to which you can only assert with confidence one fact, that it does not truly state the number of people who were in Canada on the day it pretended to be taken. We have seen worse than that. We have seen civil servants of that Government, who were proven to have conspired to defraud, or who, at any rate, were proven to have aided in causing their employers a loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars, restored to office and the act defended on the floor of this House; we have seen the judiciary prostituted by the appointment to a place on the Bench of a gentleman against whom suits were impending which, if proven, would have shown him to be utterly unfit to take his seat on that very Bench before which these actions were brought; we have seen contracts for large sums of money given away in deliberate violation of the law and in a fashion that justified the idea that the men who got the contracts were expected to render yeoman's service, by providing secret funds for electoral corruption; we have seen large tracts of valuable lands, the property of the public, secretly sold for about one-third of their value to the highest officials of the country, and not a word heard in reprobation from the gentlemen who used to be so loud in denouncing my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) if it were discovered that he, on any occasion, had allowed a contract to be given to one man for a few hundred dollars more than it had been tendered for by another; we have seen two Premiers, one of the Dominion and one the great Province of Quebec, unseated for shameless bribery and corruption, committed under circumstances which show that, if not equally, they were morally guilty of acting in connivance with the culprits; we have seen one great Province brought to the brink of financial ruin by the extravagance and corruption of those entrusted with its administration, to its great loss and the loss of the whole Dominion; we have seen other Provinces repeatedly deprived of their just and legal rights, in defiance of the former public declarations of the very men who vetoed those laws passed by the Provincial Legislatures; we have seen a deliberate plot on the part of the Federal Government, by means I shall not characterize, as they deserve to be characterized, to overturn the Local Government in Ontario. Sir, it failed, as it deserved to fail, and in this failure there is, perhaps, the best ground for hope that the people of Canada and the people of Ontario are beginning to understand and appreciate the mode in which those hon. gentlemen are carrying on the Government of this country. We have seen hundreds of thousands of the very choice and flower of our fellow countrymen driven into exile by the policy of these hon. gentlemen; we have seen \$100,000,000 of public money given to build up a railway monopoly; we have seen the taxation of this country raised to a point far beyond the taxation of the United States to-day, and equal to that with which the United States emerged from their great civil war; and we have seen all that done under a fiscal policy, for which the hon. gentleman is specially responsible, which is so contrived as to bear most

heavily on the poorest portion of the community, next, most heavily on the producing classes, and, by an exquisite refinement of folly, most of all and worst of all, on the very men who are now engaged in endeavouring to settle, to develop, and to make valuable the country to the north-west of us. Still, bad as all this is, I do not despair. In one thing I agree with the hon. gentleman—the resources of this country are great. Other countries have sustained equal injuries and have survived them, not without bitter suffering, but they have survived them, and I believe the resources of Canada are enough; I believe there is enough sterling honesty and ability among our people, if properly organized, to restore an honest form of Government yet. But, although I do not despair, I am not over-confident. I am aware that mischief has been done which it will take generations to repair; I am aware that the whole future of this country has been very heavily mortgaged indeed, and I do not cheat myself with the cheap philosophy that everything is bound to come all right somehow. Reason does not tell us that, history does not tell us that, experience does not tell us that. It may be that things will come right, but they will not come right of their own accord; they will have to be set right, and it may be after a long and painful struggle. More, Sir; I say it with regret, but I say that the people of Canada have deliberately retrograded; I say that the people of Canada have not shown, as a whole, that regard for their liberty, that jealous watchfulness of men in power, that is the price that every free nation must pay for being properly governed. I say that to-day, in Canada, to our shame and loss be it said, public morality is painfully low and public opinion is painfully weak.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; I say it. I am not afraid to say it. Our duty is plain enough, and we mean to do it. Our duty is not to shrink from telling unpleasant truths because we happen to stand at odds on this floor. We may be at the odds of one to two; we are at the odds of one to two, although our numbers here do not at all represent fairly and honestly our true following in this country. But I say this, be the odds what they will, so long as we have seats here, we will not cease to warn the people of their danger, we will not cease to call those hon. gentlemen to account. Sir, the hon. gentlemen have power indeed, they may have recourse to their old style of argument, they cannot answer our arguments perhaps, but they can pass Acts of Parliament to turn us out of the Legislature. That they can do, and that, if they choose to try it again, they are welcome to do; but, except by such arguments, they will not silence gentlemen on this side of the House; they will not silence them by any impudent assertions on their part that they are patriotic, and that we are to be denounced because we choose to call attention to plain and manifest facts. Was that the way in which the hon. the Minister of Railways used to conduct his opposition from this very seat? Was he afraid of stating unpleasant facts because he thought it might injure the credit of this country? If he concealed anything, Mr. Speaker, his concealment was the highest style of art, for no one on our side ever suspected him of doing it. I regret exceedingly that things are as they are, but I say it would be infinitely worse if, being as they are, we should hesitate to declare our opinion. I admit that we may be out-voted and that we may be out-numbered, but what I say to my friends behind me is, that so long as they are true to their own convictions, and so long as they are not afraid to defend them here and to defend them elsewhere, the Liberal party may, here in Canada, as it has elsewhere, be temporarily defeated, but the Liberal party cannot be beaten, and the Liberal party will be safe to win in the end.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before we adjourn, I wish to state to the House that the intention of the Government is not to proceed with the Franchise Bill on Tuesday.

Mr. BLAKE. I presume this debate will probably be proceeded with on Tuesday?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:45 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 3rd March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 108) to amend the Act respecting gas and gas meters.—(Mr. Costigan.)

### ADULTERATION OF FOOD AND DRUGS.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill intitled: "An Act for the prevention of adulteration of food and drugs."

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has moved for leave to introduce a Bill with a different title to that standing on the Notice Paper, which is: "An Act to amend and consolidate, as amended, the several Acts relating to the adulteration of food and drugs."

Mr. COSTIGAN. I now beg leave to introduce Bill (No. 109) to amend and consolidate, as amended, the several Acts relating to the adulteration of food and drugs.

Bill read the first time.

### REPRESENTATION OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in introducing Bill (No. 110) respecting the representation of the Territories in the House of Commons, said: Mr. Speaker, on the 8th day of May, 1882, a minute of Council was passed authorizing the dividing of a portion of the North-West Territories into four Provisional Territorial divisions, and in that minute of Council, a portion of which I hold in my hand, it is alleged that the division was made for the purposes of settlement, for the convenience of settlers, and to facilitate postal service. This minute of Council was passed and approved of by the Executive Council on the recommendation of the First Minister. It was submitted to Parliament, and sanctioned on the 16th May, 1882, and by it that portion of the North-West Territories comprised within the four Territorial divisions to which I have referred was bounded and named as specified in the minute of Council. There is the Territorial division of Assiniboia, containing

an area of about 95,000 square miles, and that Territory is bounded, according to the minute of Council, on the south, by the International boundary line; on the east, by the western boundary of the Province of Manitoba; on the north, by the ninth correction line of the Dominion Lands system of survey; and on the west, by the line dividing the tenth and eleventh ranges of townships numbered from the fourth initial meridian in the Dominion Lands system of survey. The District of Saskatchewan, contained, it is alleged in the minute of Council, an area of about 114,000 square miles, and it is bounded as follows:—On the south, by the District of Assiniboia and the Province of Manitoba; on the east, by Lake Winnipeg, and Nelson River, flowing therefrom into Hudson Bay; on the north, by the 18th correction line of the Dominion Lands system of survey; and on the west, by the line of that system dividing the tenth and eleventh ranges, numbered from the fourth initial meridian. The Territory of Alberta contains an area of about 100,000 square miles and is bounded on the south by the International boundary line; on the east, by the District of Assiniboia; on the west, by the Province of British Columbia; and on the north, by the 18th correction line. The District of Athabasca contains an area of about 122,000 square miles, as set out in the minute of Council, to which I have referred, and is bounded on the south by the District of Alberta; on the east, by the line between the tenth and eleventh ranges of townships in the Dominion Lands system before mentioned, until, proceeding northward that line intersects the Athabasca River, then by that river and Athabasca Lake, and Slave River to the intersection of the latter river with the northern boundary of the district, which is to be the 32nd correction line of the Dominion Lands system, and is very nearly the 60th parallel of north latitude; and on the west, by the Province of British Columbia. A reference to the map which accompanied that minute of Council will show, that a very large portion, perhaps a most important portion, of the whole North-West is covered by these Territorial districts. Now the minute of Council was submitted for the sanction of Parliament by the First Minister, then Minister of Interior. The hon. gentleman in submitting it for the approval of Parliament stated that the proposed divisions were in the public interest, for the public benefit, for the convenience of settlers as well as for postal service; that he expected that at no distant day a considerable population would flow into those four Districts, and that it would not be long before it would become necessary to erect those four Territories into four Provinces with, of course, all the rights which Provinces would be entitled to, including local self-government, and representation in this Parliament. Now, Sir, I may say that, to some extent, the hon. gentleman's statements and predictions have been verified. I know that a large number of immigrants have, within the last two years, settled within the Territories mentioned, and especially within the Territories of Assiniboia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan. I know, Sir, that in those Territories there are several fine, prosperous, growing villages and towns, some of them having a very considerable population. I know that in certain other portions of the Territories a very considerable number of immigrants have taken possession of lands within the last two years. I believe, from some knowledge of the region, especially the Territories of Assiniboia and Alberta, that the tide of immigration for the last year, at all events, if not the last two years, has tended in that direction, and I believe that the tide of immigration which we expect to flow into the North-West will, to a very considerable extent, be settled in the Territories of Assiniboia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. I believe, Sir, that with ordinary care and prudence, with an ordinarily capable management of public affairs in connection with the North-West Territories, inside of a period of three years, a very large population will be settled in the Terri-

ories to which I have just referred, and especially in those three which I last named. I know, Sir, that there are complaints, and serious complaints, coming from the people settled in those localities, as to the mode in which the affairs of the North-West have been administered for the last few years. I do not know to what extent the Government have set to work with a view of redressing the grievances and wrongs complained of by the settlers in the North-West Territories. I do know that from some three visits to these western regions, especially in 1882 and 1883, that the people settled in the villages and towns to which I have referred, are strongly in favour of having these Territories erected into Provinces, and of having representation in the Dominion Parliament. Now, Sir, in order in some measure to meet the desires of the people of the North-West, in order in some extent to give them the means which will enable them to come to Parliament to state their grievances and complaints, I venture to submit to Parliament a Bill having for its object the representation of the North-West Territories in the Dominion Parliament. I am aware, Sir, that an hon. member of this House has given notice of a motion upon this same subject. The motion on the Order Paper of this House reads as follows:—

"That in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Government take such measures as may seem to them most advisable for granting Parliamentary representation to the inhabitants of the Territorial districts of the North-West."

Now, Sir, that motion does not suit me; it does not go far enough. In fact, you cannot accomplish the object I have in view by a motion. I not only express the desire that the people of the North-West Territories should have representation in this Parliament, but I propose, so far as I am able, to give them representation here, and I propose that they shall have that representation at a very early period—at the next Session of Parliament. It is desirable to give the inhabitants of the North-West Territories representation in this Parliament. The sooner that object is accomplished the better, both for the people of that country and the people of the Dominion generally. I am aware that this question has been discussed in the Senate Chamber. I am aware that a friend of the Government there submitted a question to the hon. Minister of the Interior looking in the same direction as my Bill. The question submitted in the Senate was to the following effect:—

"Enquiry of the Government as to the advisability of granting Parliamentary representation to the inhabitants of the Territorial Districts of the North-West, and an enquiry whether the Government have taken or intend to take the same under consideration."

Now, the enquiry was proper enough, but an enquiry is a very empty thing. It can serve no good purpose but to ascertain from the Minister of the Interior, what policy the Government have on this subject. What was the answer of the Minister of the Interior to that question? Was it such an answer as would satisfy the reasonable desires of the people of the North-West Territories? Did he give them any satisfactory assurance that their request on this very important subject would be acceded to by the Government? The Minister, after having discussed at length, the condition of affairs in the North-West Territories, and having had the usual fling at the Liberal party and the Liberal press, for their attitude respecting that country, he makes the following statement:—

"I am sure it will be gratifying to the people of the North-West Territories to have their interest and institutions submitted to the House as they were by my hon. friend from Niagara, and discussed in this House so intelligently as they have been. It will show them that they are not, in their remoteness from the capital, forgotten by the legislators who sit in this Parliament, and it will, I am sure, impart a feeling of confidence to them, and increase the assurance which they feel that their interests and their feelings will be earnestly considered by the Government, and also by Parliament."

And then the Minister of the Interior winds up by saying :

"That is all that I feel called upon to say with respect to the enquiry of the hon. gentleman."

Now, Sir, this, I think, was, under the circumstances, a very extraordinary answer. It gave very little comfort or assurance to the mass of the people in the North-West Territories, who, for the last year at all events, have been crying aloud to the Government for representation in the Dominion Parliament; and it did not give much assurance to the North-West Council, who, I believe, represented to the Government the propriety of having the North-West Territories represented in the Dominion Parliament. What does the Minister of Interior say to them? Does he give them the assurance of the Government that their reasonable request shall be acceded to, and that representation in this Parliament shall be given to them? No, he does not say that. He says: "You must be grateful for the interest we take in your welfare; Senator Plumb, of Niagara, has set forth your claims in his usual able manner; it is true, you are very remote from the capital of the Dominion, but we like you all the same; your claims will in due time be considered; it is true, you pay taxes without representation in this Parliament, but then you must submit in the meantime to pay taxes and to obey our laws without having a voice in the passing of those laws or in the administration of public affairs in the country in which you live; it is true, you want representation in the Parliament which makes your laws and imposes taxes on you; but then you ought to be satisfied with your present condition, because the Government will consider your case." And then the Minister winds up by saying: "That is all that I feel called upon to say with respect to the inquiry made by the hon. gentleman from Niagara." Now, I say that is not sufficient to allay the discontent which I know exists in the North West Territories upon this question. It does not meet the fair demands of the people who have gone up there from the older Provinces, and of the immigrants from the old country. The men who have settled there are the pioneers of the country, and are opening up to the extent of their ability, the vast and unbounded resources that exist there. I know that these indefinite promises, these vague assurances, will not satisfy them; they will only be satisfied by the Government dealing fairly and honestly with the matter, and giving them the representation in this Parliament that they ought to have. We tax them and impose laws upon them, and we expect them to pay those taxes, to submit to those laws, and to render a hearty allegiance to the country under whose flag they live; and yet we do not give them any voice in the passage of the laws which govern them. Sir, I propose, in the Bill I am about to introduce, to release the people of those Territories from what I consider a condition of tutelage. They are living there in the position of Crown colonists. They have nothing that can properly be called a Government, and nothing that can properly be called representation. I propose to remedy that condition of affairs by giving them a representation in the Parliament of Canada. At present, the settlers, in our North-West Territories are in a position inferior to that of the settlers in the territories of the United States. I propose in my Bill to put them in a superior position. When any portion of the United States is formed into a territory, it is given a territorial Government and representation in Congress. The people of the American Territories send delegates to Washington, who can express the wishes and wants of the people they represent on the floor of Congress; and Congress pays more attention to them than it does to men who merely speak after having knocked about the country for a while. Now, if I were a resident of the North-West Territories, I would not be satisfied with the kind of representation

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

given to the American Territories. We know that the general Government there have unlimited control over the Territories; they appoint the Governor, the Executive, and the Judges of the Territory. It is true, the inhabitants of the Territory, when they reach a certain number, have a right to have constituted a territorial Government, and the right to send a representative to Congress; and when they reach a certain other number, they have a right to be erected into a State, with all the rights, powers, and privileges of a free sovereign State. By the fourth article of the American Constitution it is provided that Congress shall have the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States. The power of Congress over the Territories every one who is familiar with the Constitution of the United States knows is of two kinds. First, the power that affects the Territory itself, the management of it as property, to guard and improve it as such, and to prepare for sale and sell it; and second, the powers which concern the government of the people who reside within the Territories. Before the Territories are erected into States, Congress establishes the Government of these Territories, assumes full responsibility for their Government, appoints Governors, Judges and executives for the Territories and controls their public domain. It is only when a certain population is known to exist in any particular portion of the land in the United States, that it can be constituted a Territory, and it is only when a much larger population is resident in a Territory that it has a right to become a free and sovereign State. These Territories of the United States have the right to send representatives to Congress who have all the powers and rights and privileges of representatives from regularly organized States with the exception that they have not the right to vote. - I presume that the representatives from our North West Territories shall hold all these powers, advantages and privileges enjoyed by the representatives of the United States Territories and shall have in addition the right of voting in this Parliament. The principle is a sound and good one that when we find the population in our Territories large enough to be capable for self-government, we ought to give them self government; when their population is large enough to justify our giving them representation in Parliament, they ought to have that right. It is a sound principle that no portion of our population should be compelled to pay taxes without being represented in Parliament. Taxation without representation, it is said, is tyranny. We impose our laws on the people of the North-West, but we do not give them any voice in the framing of those laws; we impose taxes on them, but we do not allow them to come here and vote and be heard on the subject of those taxes. The condition in which they are placed is anomalous and unjustifiable, and the quicker it is changed the better it will be not only for the progress and prosperity of the North-West Territories, but for the progress and prosperity of the Dominion at large as well. The Government of the United States, as a general rule, keep abreast of the times, and when there is a population—it may be a sparse and limited population—in any portion of their public domains, that portion is constituted a Territory. The population may be large or small, but such populated portions are constituted into Territories, and they have the power to have territorial general assemblies; they pass their local ordinances subject to the approval of Congress and which may be vetoed by the Federal Congress. Still, they have all the powers they require. The principle or ground upon which the United States erect their public lands into Territories is worth considering. The Statesmen's Year Book for 1833 shows that the following Territories were organized since 1850:—

	Area	Population
New Mexico 9th Sept., 1850 .....	124,450 83 miles	61,547 in 1850
Colorado, 1861 .....	105,517 "	34,277 in 1865
Nebraska, 30th May, 1854 .....	122,007 "	{ 10,716 in 1850 12,519 in 1863

In that State, the population from 1850 to 1863, thirteen years, had only increased about 2,000; I venture to say the population in our North-West Territories has quadrupled that in the last two years.

	Area.	Population.
Washington, 2nd Nov., 1853... ..	71,300 sq. miles.	11,063 in 1850
Utah, 9th Sept., 1850 .....	109,690 "	133,693 in 1850
Dakota, 1861 .....	152,500 "	14,181 in 1870
Arizona, 1863 .....	130,800 "	9,658 in 1870
Montana, 1864 .....	146,080 "	25,595 in 1870
Wyoming, 25th July, 1868.....	97,800 "	9,118 in 1870

I venture to say that each one of our Territories, especially the Territories of Assinibolia, Alberta and Saskatchewan have more than double the population of any of three-fourths of the Territories that I have just referred to had when they were erected into Territories. If that is so, there is no reason why our Territories should not be erected into Provinces with all the rights and privileges of free, independent, and sovereign Provinces, and be represented in this Parliament. You will recollect that when British Columbia was admitted into our Confederation, her population was estimated then to be about 12,000 white people; yet we gave her six representatives in this Parliament and three Senators. When Manitoba joined Confederation, her population was estimated at from 12,000 to 15,000. The exact number of people residing in Manitoba was unknown, but the gentlemen who spoke during the discussion on the admission of Manitoba into the Dominion give this as the closest estimate. We gave Manitoba an independent existence as a Province; we erected it into a sovereign state with all the advantages, rights, powers and privileges of sovereign states. We gave it representation in this Parliament to the extent of four members, and in addition the right to send two representatives to our Canadian House of Lords. The importance of our Territories is now so great that it will justify Parliament in, at once, dealing with this question. The hon. Minister of Railways the other night when speaking on the Railway Resolutions, pointed out—and, in my opinion that was the best portion of his speech—the great importance not only to Manitoba but the North-West Territories to the Dominion. He pointed out the enormous increase in the money received from Customs, not only in Manitoba but in the North-West Territories, as well as the increase of immigration in 1880-81, 1882-83; during these years the immigration amounted to 141,560. I venture to state now that the larger portion of the immigration from our western country is settled in the Territories outside the boundaries of Manitoba, that is the population that has made its way there within the last three years. The hon. gentleman stated that \$3,000,000 was brought into Manitoba and the North-West Territories during the last three years. I make bold to say that he underestimated the amount; I believe a larger sum has gone into these Territories from the older Provinces, and that now, Sir, the importance of the Territories has become so great that representation in the Dominion Parliament appear to me to be an absolute necessity. I say that representation in this Parliament will encourage the settlers there. Most of the settlers in the Territories are people who have come from the Province of Ontario, where they have been accustomed to free government, where they have been accustomed to free institutions, where they have been accustomed to manage their own affairs in their own way, and to have their representatives upon the floors of Parliament advocating their interests; and I believe that the Government could take no more popular step than to give the people of the North-West Territories representation, and to give it at

once. I tell the hon. gentleman that his Government never did, or could not possibly do, a more popular thing than to give the North-West Territories representation in this Parliament—I do not mean in this Session—that cannot be done—but to pass a law to enable the North-West Territories to send each one representative to this Parliament, to be here at the next Session. The government of the North-West Territories is a peculiar kind of government. It is not a free government. They have not representative institutions there in the true sense of the term. They are governed by a Council. One-half of that Council are nominees of the Crown, the other half elected by the people. The Council consists of the six appointed by the Crown, six elected by the people, and the Lieutenant-Governor; they all sit in the same Chamber, I believe, and take part in the discussions. They are dealt with purely as a Crown colony, the nominees of the Crown rule, and, naturally, people who are accustomed to free institutions will not be satisfied with that condition of affairs, and the sooner it is remedied the better. What is the remedy? I know it may be said that the population there is sparse, is not large, and that therefore it would not be wise or judicious to give them representation in this Parliament until we know what the population is. I know it is a difficult matter to ascertain with correctness what the population of the North-West Territory is, but I am bold to say that the population, especially the population of Assinibolia, has not been over-estimated. The estimate of the population there is between 20,000 and 30,000. I believe there are fully 25,000 people who are now residents, permanent residents, in the Territory of Assinibolia. If that is so, is there any reason in the world why they should not have representation in this Parliament? They are quite capable of exercising the franchise. They are men who have gone there from the hon gentleman's constituency and from my constituency, they are men who all their lives from the time they come of age, have been accustomed to exercise the franchise in their own country, and they are men who feel it to be a wrong and an injustice that laws should be imposed upon them in the passing of which they have no voice. I know that in the Territory of Assinibolia there are large and important centres of population, such as Broadview, Troy, Regina, Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat, Qu'Appelle, and a large settlement along the east shores of Long Lake. There is also a large settlement on the north shores of the Qu'Appelle River. A large settlement went in their last fall and settled north of the town of Regina, and, if the lands had been open south of the railway belt, there would have been a large settlement south of Regina within the 24-mile belt, and even south of the 21 mile belt. The entries in the agent's office in Regina are, I think, as large as those in nearly all the other offices together. I believe there were 2,000 entries for homesteads made in that office up to the 1st January in the present year. If that is so, can there be any reason why the people of the North-West Territory should not have representation in the Dominion Parliament? I say their condition is not a satisfactory condition. It is not a condition which a single member of this House would tolerate for a day without making a solemn protest to the Government against that anomalous and unsatisfactory condition of affairs. It is a matter of justice, not only to the people of the North-West Territories, but to the people of this Dominion. It is a matter of justice to this Parliament, and a matter of justice to the Government of this country. When we are dealing with questions affecting the North-West Territory, how many members of Parliament are there here who know anything about the country, except what they have heard from people who have visited that region, and one gives one account of it, and another gives another account of it.

No man can properly and successfully govern that country without knowing something of it, without being conversant with its wants, without visiting it, going among the people there, and ascertaining exactly what the wants and desires and wishes of the people of the North-West really are. Every Session of Parliament, every day of every Session, large, important, complicated, difficult questions are cropping up here with reference to the government of the North-West Territories. Is there anybody here who knows anything about it? Will the First Minister say that, for the years he was Minister of the Interior, he knew the first thing about the North-West Territories? He knows perfectly well that he did not, and he had the candour to admit that he did not. He told us, I think, in 1882, that he had never read the report of his Department until it was submitted to Parliament, and I feel certain that the gentleman who has succeeded him knows, if possible, still less. Now, the men who live in that country, the men who make their homes there, the men who intend to live there and intend to grow with the growth of the country and prosper with its prosperity are the very men of all others whom the First Minister ought to have upon the floors of Parliament to consult with him, to advise him, to advise this Parliament, and to give advice as to what is best to be done as to the management of the North-West Territories. And these men are not here. These men could tell us something about the wants of the country, but they are not here. I propose that they shall be here, and that they shall be here during the next Session of Parliament, and I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman will be able to get from the North-West Territories men who will be a credit not only to the country they represent, but to this Parliament. I read the other day, and I extracted it from a paper published in the North-West Territories, an article on this question, which I propose to trouble the House by reading. It is a well written article, which deals with this question in a generous and liberal spirit, and deals with the Government in a generous and liberal spirit. The article goes a little farther than my Bill goes, but it goes no further than I would like the Government to go. The article impresses upon the Government not only the propriety of giving representation in this Parliament to the Territories, but it advocates, in the interests of the Government and in the interests of the North-West Territories, the propriety of having the Minister of Interior a resident of the North-West Territories. Now, I cannot by Act of Parliament prescribe the mode in which the First Minister will select his Cabinet. That is in his discretion; but I tell the hon. gentleman that, in my judgment, no wiser or better step could be taken than to have some man from the North-West Territories administering the affairs of the Department of the Interior. It is a local department. Every law we pass here affects those people personally, immediately, and directly, and no one could administer the affairs of that Department better than a man who is conversant with the country and knows all about its wants. The article is in the following words:—

"From a theoretic point of view it would seem as if the only sound principle were the broad one that the best men should be sought for the high and responsible duties of members of the Dominion Government, quite irrespective of lines of longitude. But the question has another side. The science of government is essentially a practical science. And this is more emphatically true when the country to be governed is one stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and embracing almost every variety of habits and industries. The simple fact is that a sober, intelligent people, such as Canadians are, need very little government except that of a local character. They are quite capable of governing themselves and in the main prefer to do so. In this respect they are in the van of the world's political progress. Local self-government is the predestined goal of free peoples. The trend of modern national movements is all in that direction. (There will, of course, always be need of solidarity in certain matters of national concern, and these must be kept exclusively within the sphere of the central authority.) But those matters are after all comparatively few, especially while we have no national status and, consequently, no direct negotiations with foreign nations. The chief work of a Canadian Government, then, partakes

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

more or less of the character of local administration, and, the Department of the Interior becomes in the nature of things almost a North-West Department. Reason and justice demand that it should be filled by a man well versed in North-West ways and wants. So long as the administration of the public lands of this great country is in the hands of the Central Government, so long should the Departmental Administrator be a man thoroughly versed in the affairs and closely identified with the interests of the North-West. Nor will our readers think us altogether deficient in respect for administrative genius when we add that it would not be very difficult to find a score of men in Manitoba and the Territories as competent to fill such an office as three-fourths of the present aspirants for Cabinet honours in either political party."

Sir, I agree with every word of that article. I think it is an article just to the point, and I only hope that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches will pay some attention to it, and to the wants, requirements and interests of the North-West Territories. Sir, I propose by this Bill, so far as I can, to remedy some of the grievances under which the people of the North-West Territories are now suffering, and to that end I propose to give them representation in this Parliament; I propose in the interests of the North-West Territories that each shall send one representative to this Parliament; that that election for the Territories shall take place before the 1st of December next, and that the representatives thus elected shall occupy seats on the floor of this Parliament during the next Session, so that we may have the benefit of their advice on all that concerns the great North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman can see the great advantage we now enjoy in having representatives from Manitoba who are more or less acquainted with that Province, and the advantage will be still greater when we have representatives from the Territories themselves. I therefore say that it is of the first consequence to the well being, prosperity and growth of the North-West Territories that their claims in this respect should be recognized by the Government. I know my Bill cannot pass unless it receives the assent of the Government. I have introduced it, and have drawn the attention of the Government to it, and now on their shoulders rests the responsibility. On my last trip to the North-West I promised some of the leading men there, and some of the strongest supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, that one of the first things I would do during this Session would be to introduce a Bill giving the people of the North-West representation in this Parliament. I waited for some time to see if the Government proposed dealing with this matter, but so far they have given no indication that they intended to do so; and from an answer given to the Senator from Niagara in the other House I am led to believe that the Government do not intend to deal with this question this Session. In order that the matter may be promptly drawn to the attention of the Government I venture to submit this Bill, and I now move for leave to introduce a Bill respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the House of Commons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It can answer no good purpose to discuss this subject until we see the hon. gentleman's Bill. Of course, we grant him the usual courtesy of introducing it, though from its terms, as the hon. gentleman substantially states, it is a measure which must be under the guidance of the Government of the day. However, when the Bill is introduced we will see what its provisions are. I merely wish to add, Mr. Speaker, and call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this—we do not know whether it is in the Bill or not—but from the remarks of the hon. gentleman it is quite clear that he intends to be the next Minister of the Interior. He says he is strongly in favour of the Minister of the Interior living up there. Now, my hon. friend has made large investments in the North-West, and I am glad to learn, proper investments, and it is therefore quite clear that my hon. friend is going to live there. We must therefore consider this measure of his as an insidious attempt to take possession of the ground, and to cut out any of the hon. gentlemen opposite from the chance of being the

next Minister of the Interior. I hope he will be as fortunate as any of my hon. friends on the other side. I wish him all prosperity when he is there. In the meantime we will consider my hon. friend's Bill.

Bill read the first time.

#### THE ST. CLAIR FRONTIER TUNNEL COMPANY.

Mr. HALL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the St. Clair Tunnel Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend proposes to add a clause of some considerable importance, which we have not had an opportunity of considering. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the Bill to stand until we have an opportunity of considering this clause, as I think it will be more convenient to take it up before the Bill goes into Committee.

Bill allowed to stand.

#### THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the time and passed:—

Bill (No. 40) to amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 67) further to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 53) to incorporate the Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

#### DREDGES AND TUG FOR USE IN CANADIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) enquired, Has the Government during last year entered into a contract for the construction of one or two dredges and a tug for use in Canadian territory? If so, who is the contractor? Where does he live? What is the contract price? Who is superintending the construction? Where does such superintendent reside?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, contracts were entered into for two dredges and tugs. The cost of one dredge is \$13,800, and of the other, \$17,000. The cost of one of the tugs is \$10,775, and of the other \$12,000. The contractors are Morgan & Sutton, of Lockport, and the superintendent is Mr. J. R. Arnoldi, Mechanical Engineer of the Department of Public Works.

#### THE ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX.

Mr. KIRK enquired, When was the elevator at Halifax finished? When was the first cargo shipped through it, and how many cargoes have been shipped through it since?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The elevator was finished in the spring of 1883. The first cargo was shipped through it on the 17th of May, 1883, and three cargoes have been shipped through it since.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, What was the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway line: 1. From Winnipeg to a point 45 miles east of the Saskatchewan? 2. From that point to Calgary? 3. From Calgary to the summit of the Rocky Mountains? 4. From Callander to a point 40 miles west of Callander?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have received a communication from the Secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to the effect that it is not possible to give all the details asked for, but they will be ready by Friday.

#### LIFE-BOAT BUILDING AT WELLINGTON, ONT.

Mr. PLATT enquired, What was the total cost to the Government of the life-boat building at Wellington, Ont., and to whom was the amount paid? Was anything paid for the site of said building, or for the superintendence of the work of construction? If so, what amounts, and to whom paid?

Mr. McLELAN. When the hon. gentleman put the question the other day as to the tenders, I forgot to mention that four offers had been made for the construction of the house, varying from \$1,000 to \$550. Upon the advice of the engineer of the Department, all these were declined, and the work was done under the superintendence of Mr. Garnier at a cost of \$451. An additional sum of above \$350 was expended in providing means for launching the boats speedily into the water. Nothing was paid for the site. Mr. Garnier was paid \$55 for superintending the work.

#### TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Mr. VAIL enquired, Does the Government intend this Session, to introduce a Bill to increase the travelling expenses of the County Court Judges of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who now have to travel over three or four counties to hold their County Courts; so as to approximate more nearly to the allowances of the County Court Judges of Ontario, for travelling to hold Division Courts over one county.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the hon. gentleman knows, the latter part of the question is rather irregular, as it contains a statement of fact. I may say, however, that the whole question of Judges salaries and allowances is now under the consideration of the Government.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF MR. SKIFFINGTON.

Mr. BLONDEAU enquired, Whether Mr. Skiffington heretofore a detective of the city of Quebec, is employed on the Intercolonial Railway? If so, by whom was he recommended? What are his instructions and duties? How long has he been employed? What is his salary?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Skiffington is employed on the Intercolonial Railway. He was recommended by the superintendent of the railway; his duties are police duties in connection with that road; he has been employed since January, 1880, and his salary is \$70 per month.

#### BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) enquired, Why the mackerel fishermen engaged in trap-fishing on the coast of Nova Scotia are not paid the bounty allotted to other fishermen, and whether it is the intention of the Department during this year to make any change in existing regulations, so as to enable this class of fishermen to draw their proportion of the bounty.

Mr. McLELAN. As the hon. gentleman knows the bounty was paid to fishermen who were affected by the terms of the Washington Treaty, and we considered that we should not interfere with that arrangement. I may say, however, that we may find it necessary to make some change in the regulation of the Department in that respect, but I am not prepared to say what changes should be made.

#### AUTOMATIC BUOY IN LOCKPORT HARBOUR, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) enquired, Is it the intention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to place an automatic buoy, during the coming season, at the entrance of Lockport Harbour, Nova Scotia.

Mr. McLELAN. This is a matter at present under consideration. These buoys are found to be very expensive, and lately we have lost a number of them. It is to be considered if some other means of giving warning might be used, which would be certain, more permanent, and less expensive.

#### THE GOODWIN CLAIM.

Mr. FLEMING enquired, Has any claim been preferred against the Government, for extra work, upon the wall or fence separating Wellington and Bank Streets from the Parliamentary grounds, by James Goodwin, George Goodwin, or the estate of James Goodwin, since 1879? If so, what were the nature and amount of such claim, and has it been paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a claim preferred against the Government for extra work upon the wall separating Wellington and Bank streets from the Parliamentary grounds, by Jas. Goodwin, Geo. Goodwin, or the estate of Jas. Goodwin. That claim was made on the 21st June, 1879, and the details were sent by Mr. Goodwin to the Department on the 26th of June, 1881. It was for extra excavation in earth and rock and masonry. The claim was carefully considered by the late chief architect, Mr. Scott, and the present chief architect, who both considered that the sum of \$5,374.46 was due to Mr. Goodwin. This amount Mr. Goodwin accepted, and it having been placed in the Supplementary Estimates of 1882-83, it was paid when it became available. No further claim has been made.

#### CLAIM OF H. J. BEEMER.

Mr. FISHER enquired, Has any award been made to H. J. Beemer on account of his claim for extra work in connection with his contract, or contracts, for work on the gates and fortifications of the city of Quebec? If so, what amount has been awarded and how much paid on account thereof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Beemer made a claim of \$16,230.94 for extra work and losses sustained through delays, &c. The chief architect, having reported that Mr. Beemer was entitled to \$5,000, that sum was offered to him and accepted by him as payment in full of all claims, provided Council consented to it. The matter is now being considered in Council. It will not be paid without the sanction of Parliament.

#### CLAIM FOR GAS LEAKAGE IN OTTAWA GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Has the Ottawa Gas Company presented any claim to the Public Works Department for gas leakage in connection with supplying of gas to Ottawa Dominion Government Buildings? If so, what is the amount of such claim?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Ottawa Gas Company has not presented any claim for gas leakage.

#### APPOINTMENT TO MILITARY COLLEGE STAFF.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) enquired, Whether any appointment has recently been made to the staff of the Military Colleges? If so, whether the party appointed was a graduate of the Royal Military College? If not, why?

Mr. CARON. I am not in a position to answer the question of the hon. member. I do not know exactly what information he desires to get. Appointments are being continually made to the staff of the Royal Military College. If the hon. gentleman will specify what appointment he refers to, or the date of it, I will give him the information he requires.

Mr. ROBERTSON.

#### THE GRAVENHURST-CALLANDER RAILWAY.

Mr. O'BRIEN enquired, Is it the intention of the Government, in view of the proposed completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the end of the year 1885, to take such measures for the immediate construction of the line from Gravenhurst to Callander as to insure its being ready for traffic by the 1st day of May, 1886?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to say that it is the intention of the Government to take proper measures to secure the construction of the line from Gravenhurst to Callander.

#### CHARGES AGAINST THE POSTMASTER AT WHEATLEY.

Mr. LISTER moved for a copy of the report of the Post Office Inspector in London to the Postmaster General, made during the year 1883, on charges made against a Mr. Cox, the Postmaster at Wheatley, in the County of Essex, and investigated by the said inspector or his deputy, together with all letters and other papers to the Department relating to the same. He said: I desire to say, without wishing at all to prejudice the case of the gentleman who occupies the position of postmaster at Wheatley, that it has been represented to me that this postmaster during the year 1883, in the course of his duty, received a letter containing \$500; that that letter was proved to have come into his possession; and that no trace of it was ever found afterwards. It has also been represented that in the sale of stamps there was also a deficiency in his account. I understand that these charges have been investigated by the Post Office Inspector at London, and that the postmaster has refunded the \$500. Be that as it may, if these statements are true, and this man was a defaulter, he should have been dismissed. I am told that he was an active politician. I hope it is not the case that his political services have saved him from this crime, if he has been really guilty of it; because, if people throughout the country are given to understand that their offences will be overlooked on account of their political support, I can only say that it will demoralize the whole public service. I trust that the hon. Postmaster General will be able to deny these representations. If they are true, the man ought undoubtedly to have been dismissed. I shall refrain from saying anything further until the papers are brought down.

Mr. CARLING. The postmaster's name is not Cox, but Fox, and the amount of money that was said to be in the money letter was not \$500, but less than \$100. The only document I have on the subject is a confidential report made by the Inspector to the Department, that this money letter was missing, and that it having been proved that the letter had been posted at the Wheatley post office, the postmaster made good the amount of money. There is no correspondence, and there are no reports but the confidential report to which I have referred.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has said nothing about the stamps.

Mr. CARLING. There is nothing in the motion in regard to stamps, and I have made no enquiry in regard to them. I understand that the postmaster was in good standing at the time, and the only charge against him was with regard to that money letter.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman refuse the report?

Mr. CARLING. I certainly refuse to give the House the confidential report from the inspector. I think all confidential reports by inspectors to the head of the Department are for the Department and not to be made public.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose there will be some reference to stamps in the report, confidential though it be.

Mr. CARLING. I think not.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand the postmaster has placed himself in this position, that a money letter was lost, either through his fault or under such circumstances that it has been found necessary to propose to him that he should refund the money. In such a case the circumstances should be made public. If they were such as not to inflict any stigma on the postmaster, it is better they should be made known; if, on the other hand, they were such that the postmaster ought not to be retained, the public has an interest in knowing that fact. If such circumstances have existed, as the Postmaster General says have existed in this case, Parliament ought not to be deprived of an opportunity of judging the action of the Government in retaining the postmaster in the public service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is absolutely necessary for the efficient performance of the service of inspectors who feel themselves called on to report rumours, impressions and everything that will inform the head of the Department as to any particular enquiry or enquiries, that these reports should be confidential and not made public. That rule is I think invariable. A motion can be easily formed so as to warrant the Postmaster General in stating the full facts why he came to the conclusion that this postmaster should not be removed, but it is absolutely necessary for the efficiency of the service that confidential reports should be treated as confidential.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Postmaster General has already stated, that in consequence of the report of the inspector, this officer was called on to refund the money. If that is the case we are entitled to see the report.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Postmaster General can bring down a full statement of the facts, either of his own motion, or take an opportunity to-morrow before the Orders of the Day are called, to explain why this officer is now postmaster.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) misunderstood me. I do not think I said the postmaster was called on, in consequence of the report, to refund the money, but the attention of the Department was called to the fact that a money letter had been mislaid or stolen. The inspector enquired into it, and found it was not for \$50, but for less than that, and the postmaster said that if he had evidence that the money letter had been posted and that the amount in it was that represented, he would make it good, on the parties giving their affidavit to that effect.

Motion withdrawn.

#### SWAN CREEK SURVEYS.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury), in moving for copies of all reports of surveys made with a view of improving the navigation of Swan Creek and Swan Creek Lake, Sunbury County, N.B., by dredging or otherwise, and all correspondence referring thereto, said: I have made this motion for the purpose of ascertaining what the report is. I am aware surveys have been made at this point by the engineers of the Department and I am anxious to get the report.

Motion agreed to.

#### MAIL SERVICE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria), in moving for copies of petitions and correspondence between the Dominion Government and any person or persons upon the subject of a daily mail service between Port Townsend, in Washington Territory, and Victoria, in the Province of British Columbia, being substituted for the semi-weekly service at present existing, said:

I am perfectly aware that when British Columbia came into the Union, we only applied for a fortnightly mail between Victoria and San Francisco, 750 miles, and for a semi-weekly service between Victoria and Port Townsend, 38 or 40 miles; but it must be apparent from the returns that have come in every year since Confederation to the hon. members of the Ministry that the importance of British Columbia is vastly increasing. The export of gold, lumber and coal cannot be over-estimated, and I think that in view of this increasing commerce, more frequent mail communication should be given us, so that we may be placed in precisely the same position as any other Province in this respect. I am not aware that any other Province in the Dominion—with the exception of Prince Edward Island for a brief period last winter, when there was a temporary cessation in the mail service owing to the ice—that has not daily mail communication and frequently several mails a day. All that British Columbia asks is, that as now we are labouring under a great number of disadvantages from our connection with the confederacy without deriving any of the corresponding benefits which accrue to the eastern Provinces, we should have the same facilities as those which the other Provinces enjoy. I dare say it is in the memory of the Administration that three years back, a petition was sent in to the Privy Council in these words:

"That it is highly important to the commercial and general interests of the Province that more frequent and regular mail communication should be maintained with the United States, in order that Canadian and foreign correspondence may be facilitated to the utmost: and whereas daily communication has for some time past been in operation to Port Townsend, on Puget Sound, distant some thirty-five miles from Victoria, where mails destined for British Columbia, remain on storage from two to three days each week, until a steamer crosses the Straits twice a week, to convey them to this Province; whereas, your petitioners are informed, and believe that for a slight addition to the subsidy at present paid to the carrier of the mails on Puget Sound, daily mail communication with British Columbia can be established. Your petitioners therefore humbly ask, the attention of Your Excellency's Government to this matter, in the hope and belief that the disabilities under which the mail service now labours, will be speedily remedied."

This petition was signed by a very large number of the influential people in Victoria City, Victoria District, New Westminster, Esquimalt, Yale, Salt Spring Island, Quesnelle, Saaniche, Clinton, Stanley, Barkerville, Soda Creek, Kamloops, Spence's Bridge, and Cache Creek, and, if it were not a matter of saving time, it would have been signed in many other places. I mention this to show that it is not essentially a Victoria matter that I am advocating, but a matter which is necessary in the interests of the whole of the Province of British Columbia, that we should have more frequent communication, and that daily mail which I now advocate. I cannot too strongly impress upon the Government the advisability of giving this their very earliest attention, so that what I now advocate may be established at a very early day.

Motion agreed to.

#### CITY POSTMASTER FOR VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria), in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and any person or persons upon the subject of appointing a city postmaster in Victoria, B.C., separate and distinct from the office of Post Office Inspector; as also of all matters in connection with improvements to said post office and increased efficiency of that department, said: I regret, Mr. Speaker, that all my motions come together, as it looks as if I desired to occupy unnecessarily the attention of the House, but that is not my intention. I desire this information particularly, for I am led to believe that other influences have been brought to bear to capsize, so to speak, representations made by my colleague and myself. We advocate that, inasmuch as the city of Victoria has now

attained to such proportions as to entitle it to a city postmaster, distinct from the Post Office Inspector, it would be to the interest of the Department to have those two offices separate and distinct, so that the duties of the Inspector might be satisfactorily performed, which could not be done if he were stationed at the city of Victoria. We advocated, as the hon. the Postmaster General will bear me out, that the office of inspector should remain, and that we should have a city postmaster appointed. Provision was made, in a certain way, in the Estimates, for this change then advocated by my colleague and myself, and we went away feeling confident that this change would take place. I have reason to believe that there has been some other influence brought to bear, that there has been some other representation made to the Department at variance with the representations which we made. We are here to represent the people, and to state to the various Departments what we consider necessary, not only to the different constituencies we represent, but to the Province of which we form a part of the representation. Therefore, I am particularly anxious to find out from whom the recommendation came to make the change which has been made; and, when the papers come down, I hope to have the information I desire.

Motion agreed to.

#### MASTERS AND MATES CERTIFICATES.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria), in moving for a return showing the names, rank, present positions occupied, length of service at sea, of each individual who has received a certificate of either competency or service, under the Act passed last Session making provision for the examination of masters and mates of coasters and inland waters, from the passage of said Act to the nearest possible date, for each and every Province of the Dominion; as also a statement giving dates, and names of applicants who have been refused certificates of service, and whose certificates have been, for some reason, withheld, and the reason for such refusals or retentions, said: I would only say in this connection that, being a nautical man, I take a great interest in everything that pertains to navigation and the examination of masters and mates. I have, therefore, a desire to see what effect the Act of last Session has had, not only in my own Province, but also in the whole Dominion, and I also desire to find out who the people are who have applied for certificates of competency and service under the Act passed last Session.

Mr. McLELAN. There is no objection to give the hon. gentleman all the information connected with the return except the great amount of work it will impose upon the Department. A very large number of certificates have been issued, and from thirty-five to fifty are being issued every day, and the whole staff of that branch of the Department are occupied in the preparation of those certificates. It is therefore a very unfortunate period to impose upon that staff the duty of preparing all these returns. I think it would be better for the hon. gentleman to delay his motion for some time, until we get through with the work of issuing the certificates, and, in the meantime, any information the hon. gentleman may require from the Department, he can have by calling. We would be most happy to furnish him with any information as to the workings of it, and the results of it; but, if he wishes a full return, it would be better for him to delay his motion for a period until we are in a better position to comply with it.

Mr. BAKER. I shall be very glad indeed to comply with the request of the hon. gentleman. My only object is to obtain the information, and the particular time is not of so great consequence. What I should like, at an early date, is, the small return which I ask for in connection with my

Mr. BAKER.

own particular Province. That would not take much time. I think it will only take about half an hour.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, that can be granted. The motion may pass with the understanding that some delay may be necessary in complying with it.

Motion agreed to.

#### INSPECTION OF VESSELS ON LAKES SUPERIOR AND HURON.

Mr. DAWSON, in moving for a return showing what vessels navigating the waters of Lake Superior and Huron were inspected during the past season of navigation, under the authority of the Government, with the names of the inspectors; also, a statement of vessels lost or stranded on those lakes, within Canadian waters, showing the localities where disasters occurred, and the number of lives lost in each case, during the season of 1883, said: I would amend this motion by adding the words "during the season of 1883," so as to give the Department as little trouble as possible in making out the return. In making this motion, Mr. Speaker, I may say that I drew attention last year to the losses on the Great Lakes, and I am sorry to say that that record has to be supplemented with another list of losses during the past summer. Last year I drew attention to no less than twelve steamers that had been lost during the three years previous, involving a loss of life of nearly 300 persons, chiefly my constituents, who were drowned in the waters of the Georgian Bay, or lost their lives in burning steamers. I considered it my duty to draw the attention of the Government to these circumstances in order that some remedy might be applied. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries last year promised to bring down a Bill which would, as far as possible, provide against the occurrence of such losses and the burning of steamers, by a better mode of inspection and by preventing vessels from going out when they were overloaded or unseaworthy. I hope the hon. Minister has not given up the idea of legislation in this respect, and that the Bill will yet be brought down. The following vessels were lost within the past three years: The *Wabano*, lost on the Georgian Bay; the *Simcoe*, foundered in Lake Huron; the *Jane Miller*, foundered in Georgian Bay; the *Northern Queen*, wrecked; the *Winnipeg*, burnt; the *Columbia*, foundered; the *Manitoulin*, burnt; the *Asia*, foundered; the *Josephine Kidd*, burnt in sight of Wiarton; the *Vanderbilt*, burnt in the north channel of Lake Huron. The reason why I make this motion is to draw attention to the further losses which have occurred during the past year, and which ought not to have occurred. In the beginning of December last, there was a steamer going down from Port Arthur along the coast, and she took in tow an old schooner, the *Jane Hurlbert*, loaded with supplies, and having a large crowd of men on board. Everybody knew that schooner to be unseaworthy. She had been thirty years on Lake Superior, and was only used during fine weather, in moving from one point to another. Well, that heavily-laden schooner was put in tow of a small steam tug to go down the coast about 150 miles, with these men and supplies on board. All went well with them until after passing Silver Islet, some distance. They kept too far out, and a squall arising the steam tug captain, getting alarmed, cut loose from the schooner. The schooner got into the trough of the sea, and she had neither sail nor a man on board who knew how to manage her. There was simply a crowd of men who were trusting entirely to the steamer to tow them safely to their destination; and in the storm the whole number, some twenty or twenty-five, at least—and some say a good many more—went down with the schooner and were lost. Now, surely this is a thing that ought not to have occurred. Surely there ought to be some authority

at the harbour or port that would say, after an inspection of a vessel of that kind: "You shall not go out with such a vessel in weather like this; you shall not risk the lives of these men and take them out where the chances are about equal whether they will get ashore or perish in the waves." But that is not the only case. Another vessel called the *Enterprise*, through mismanagement, went down with seven souls on board at the Straits of Missisnagna and all perished. There have also been other disasters and losses which I need not particularize; but I will say it is necessary that some measures should be adopted to prevent unseaworthy and overloaded vessels from going out. The fact is that old hulks that have been in use in other waters are sent up to Lakes Superior and Huron, and they come to grief in stormy weather. There is another point to which I would refer. Very good vessels have been lost through the cargos of wheat they carry, shifting its position. Now, ocean-going vessels are obliged to have shifting boards, or to put the wheat in sacks, which cannot shift, but on these lake vessels there is no regulation whatever. They load the wheat in bulk, and when the vessel gets into a heavy sea and rolls from side to side, the wheat shifts and down the vessel goes. That was the case with the *Simcoe* on Lake Huron, when she went down with twelve people on board. A very good law was passed last year providing for the examination of masters and mates of vessels, which, I have no doubt, will do a great deal of good. But some means ought to be taken to see that vessels are properly constructed. Some vessels have such heavy works on deck as to render them top heavy, and in a gale of wind they are turned over and go down. In all cases I think it would be necessary, as in ocean vessels, to have a summer line and a fall line, so that the vessels should not be loaded beyond a given depth; and then there should be inspection at the ports to prevent them from carrying a load on deck in stormy weather. Captains sometimes put the load on deck in order that they may throw it off more easily when they come to a port, and this exposes the boat to great danger in case of a heavy sea. I think the Customs officers should attend to such cases, or that the harbour masters should exercise some oversight in reference to them. A departmental return was brought down last year in reference to these losses. It contained a great deal of information, but the Department was not in possession of the details of all the disasters that had occurred. Here is a letter with that return from a Mr. Mackenzie, of the Port of Prequ'Isle, near Owen Sound, and he says, in regard to these losses:

"With regard to my views and opinion of the loss of the *Jane Miller*: I am fully convinced she was lost by being in a damaged condition previous to loading and then over-loading in that state. She had run on Olub Island the previous trip and had to be scuttled to keep her from going to pieces, and after having been raised was leaking badly and loaded in that state without any repairs. I place the following as my opinion in the matter.

1. The *Jane Miller* was in a damaged state before loading from being on the rocks at Olub Island, and was leaking.
2. Overloading without repairs; in fact she was loaded too much for any condition and weather.
3. Incapacity of her captain.
4. Recklessness of her captain in not paying attention to the weather. He would pay no attention to storm warnings, when it was well known all the best captains had the fullest confidence in the correctness of the storm warnings this season."

That is Mr. Mackenzie's view. Here is the view of Inspector Risley of Toronto, in regard to the *Asia*. He says:

"It is evident from their number, there is something wrong somewhere, either in the build of the vessels, their loading or their management, perhaps all three contribute. The startling feature of them, the total loss and great loss of life also points in the same direction, that there is some radical defect that should be removed. I would therefore recommend that the Minister appoint two persons to assist me in the investigation into the loss of the *Asia*."

It is Mr. Risley's view that there is some radical defect; and certainly, in my opinion, the Department of Marine and Fisheries should take measures as soon as possible to have some system established by which there will be some regulation so that vessels cannot go out over loaded in the fall of the year. It is chiefly from over-loading that these losses occur. I may be excused from calling attention to this matter, as it is within the waters of the constituency I represent that these disasters have occurred. Within the last few years no less than three hundred of the people of Algoma or more have been carried to the bottom of the Lake or been burnt on burning steamers. Moreover, these people were not of the class known as navvies going up the lakes, but were men settled in the country, traders and capitalists who are the most active in building up a new country. We lost the two leading men on Manitoulin Island—Mr. Tinkis of Manitowaning, and Mr. Robert Henry, of Mudge Bay, one residing in the middle and the other at the end of the Island. These two men had built up large villages which are growing into towns, and the loss of such people is no ordinary loss to a new country. Under these circumstances, my constituents have urged me to press strongly on the Government the necessity of some inspection being enforced in order to prevent such disasters from taking place; in my remarks I have enumerated fourteen vessels lost with a terrible sacrifice of life.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I think the importance of the motion which has been made by the hon. member and of the subject he has brought before the House can scarcely be exaggerated. I, like the hon. member for Algoma, represent a constituency which adjoins the waters of Lake Huron, and I am besides specially interested in the matter to which he has referred, because he has adverted to a report which was made with reference to an unfortunate man who is now no longer alive to defend himself. I refer to the late captain of the *Jane Miller*, a vessel which was lost within sight of the windows of my own house. The captain of that vessel, so far from being an incapable man, as is represented in the report alluded to, was a man of notorious capacity, of the very greatest energy, possessing the fullest knowledge of his profession and at the same time almost infinite resource. In fact if there be one reason more than another which probably brought about the loss of the *Jane Miller* on the night referred to, it was because the captain was so specially capable and trusted too much to his resources. It is notorious in that neighbourhood that he was an exceedingly skilful man. The *Jane Miller*, according to the opinion of all those in that neighbourhood, was lost from this cause: From over-loading and improper loading, and from the peculiar form of the vessel, and those are matters which have been brought before the notice of the House by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). I think it is impossible to press too strongly on the consideration of the Government the importance of having some definite step taken in order to overcome the danger arising from those sources. So far as over-loading is concerned, I think if something of the nature of the Plimsoll mark were adopted, and a circle placed on the broadside of each vessel, it would have a very beneficial effect in saving life on the lakes. In England every vessel going to sea bears on her broadside a circle, and through the middle of it there is drawn a horizontal line, so that everyone can see if the vessel is loaded below the line or not, and in that way notice is given to the public by the officer sailing the vessel whether or not he is infringing the law. It is a simple provision, and one which has been found to work very well in England, and I do not see why it might not be adopted here. Then again, as the hon. member for Algoma has pointed out, it is very necessary that there should be some

definite measures adopted to prevent improper loading, which is a different thing from overloading. In many cases vessels are lost by reason of their carrying too much deck cargo, as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, and I believe in the particular instance referred to, that of the *Jane Miller*, this was one of the reasons why she was lost. Cargo was piled high up on the deck, and when she was turned in towards the land to get some firewood, the supply having been all burnt up, she listed and the centre of gravity being too high she turned right over. It is quite clear that the accident occurred very suddenly, for she was lost within a few yards of the shore and no one got to land. It was a severe night, there was a snow storm, but the water was perfectly smooth, and as the accident occurred so suddenly there was not time for those on board, who were no doubt all under cover, to get clear and get to shore. At all events every soul on board was lost within two or three hundred yards of the shore. If the vessel had been built decently, not like a two-story house placed on a saucer, she would not in all probability have been lost; but the vessels now navigating our waters and carrying passengers are built on that principle. They draw scarcely any depth of water, they carry high superstructures, built on a shallow base, and so soon as they get into the trough of the sea they become perfectly unmanageable. This great superstructure acts as an unmanageable and untrimmable sail, and when it begins to blow, and when she is paying off the wind a little too much or carrying too much weather helm, there is no possibility of doing anything to save the vessel, and she is entirely at the mercy of the elements. Until we have stringent regulations in operation disasters will occur on the lakes; and I hope the Government will address itself to this serious question, because it is in point of fact to those traversing our lakes a matter of life or death.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad the hon. member for Algoma placed this notice of motion on the paper because it gives hon. members another opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister of Marine and of the Government to the very large number of lives and the large amount of property lost annually on the inland waters of Canada. For several years there has scarcely been a season without some record of loss either of life or property on Georgian Bay, Lake Huron or Lake Superior. As the navigation of our inland waters increases, the subject grows in importance. A few years ago the small number of vessels to be found on our lakes made it possible that only a small loss could be sustained, compared with what occurs to-day. But as year after year the trade on those lakes increases, as well as the number of people who travel by water, the larger these losses seem to become, and the greater the amount of property that is destroyed and the number of lives lost. Last year in one port on the Georgian Bay we find that no less than 767 vessels entered and departed, and that was the only port out of a large number on Lake Huron and Georgian Bay into which boats of these various lines entered. We find also that at that one port the tonnage of these vessels amounted to no less than 320,755 tons, so that from these facts we can estimate the importance of the subject before the House. It is true that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been making amendments to those Acts within the past few years, and he has thereby done much to mitigate the dangers to the travelling public, as well as the liability to loss of property. I think those late amendments are in the right direction, and the only objection that can be taken to them is that they do not go far enough, and that there are other amendments which I think, it would be desirable in the interests of life and property, should be made. The first amendment which he made provided for the inspection of boilers, and it has done a great deal of good.

Mr. McNEILL.

It has removed from use a large number of boilers which might be expected at any time to explode or to lead otherwise to the destruction of life and property. The next amendment provided for the inspection of hulls, and when we learn that the hull of one of the vessels which went down near Parry Sound was said to be so rotten that the wood could be pulled in pieces, I think that is sufficient to show the importance of that amendment. Then we have a Bill for the examination of Masters and Mates, and one whose importance, I think, cannot be overestimated, because it is essential that none but competent men should be put in charge of those vessels. But, as I said before, I think we might go further. Last year when this question was under discussion in the House I suggested if possible an amendment should be made which would compel the inspection of cargoes, not only as to their quantity, but as to the manner in which they are distributed on the boats. I still think that such a provision is necessary. I think we should have some competent officer appointed to see that vessels leaving their ports are not improperly loaded. I understand that there is a law which would prevent vessels from leaving port overloaded, but the difficulty, as I am informed, is that no person seems to have power to stop these vessels when they are overloaded. I think it would be a decided improvement if some competent person was assigned the duty of looking after these vessels, with imperative instructions that no vessel should leave port when it was overloaded, or the cargo distributed in such a way as to endanger life or property. Again, I think that inspections should be made more than once a year. One of the vessels, as mentioned by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), was considered seaworthy in the early part of the season, but after undergoing the dangers of the season she was not inspected again, and the result was that she made another trip, in which she lost her cargo and her crew. Then again, I think before vessels go out an inspection should be made as to whether they carry all the life-saving apparatus that is necessary. A boat may be laden lightly at one time and not require so many of these appliances as when she is heavily laden, or when a larger number of passengers are carried. I think, therefore, it should be the duty of the inspectors to see that the number of these appliances should bear some proportion to the number of passengers who may be upon her on a particular trip. I think that in view of the increasing trade on the upper lakes, in view of the large number of vessels that have been lost, and the large number of lives that have been sacrificed, the Minister of Marine and the Government should not consider it out of place to make more stringent laws in reference to these matters, and by so doing they will earn the respect of the people of the country, and do a great deal in preventing the loss of life and property which now take place.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This is a matter in which my constituents are largely interested, as many of them have to do most of their travelling by means of such vessels as have been described by the hon. gentlemen. Some of these vessels belong to a class of old hulks which, though they may be fit enough to navigate the Welland Canal, are totally unfit for sailing in the more dangerous waters of Georgian Bay and the Upper Lakes. Their square shape and their high sides, standing high out of the water, render them perfectly unsafe when storms arise on these waters, and especially along the rocky shores of the Georgian Bay. I suppose it is not thought of much consequence whether these vessels are suitable for such a service or not, considering that so few wealthy people, members of Parliament, and people of distinction, travel by them, and that because only settlers and fishermen and that class of people are lost, these calamities do not amount to much. I think if members of Parliament, or a Minister or two, had to travel on

them, we would soon find the law amended. As to the cargoes they carry, the difficulty is not, perhaps, so much about the weight of the cargo as the manner in which it is loaded, as it is considered convenient, in going from one port to another, to put the greater part of a cargo on the upper decks. The build of these vessels is exactly as described by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and it is such as to make it utterly impossible for them to resist a storm of any severity, especially when the wind is aft. They are built altogether too high, and the upper works are too light in proportion to the lower works, so that they are liable to every sort of accident. I hope that either by some law or some system of inspection, measures will be taken, before another season, to prevent a recurrence of such accidents. If something is not done, I think a very heavy responsibility will rest upon those who are in charge of this matter. I speak strongly on this subject, because during the last two or three years many families in the constituency which I represent have not only lost their property but their lives, or their relatives have been sacrificed by these accidents. The danger is not so great on the class of vessels which ply from Sarnia and other ports, to Duluth, because the owners of these lines are interested in building them and fitting them in such a way as to render them suitable for the service; but it is on the smaller routes, such as those from Midland and Penetanguishene, that we find the worst class of vessels. It is true they are chiefly employed in navigating among the Islands where there is no great risk, but at the same time, they have frequently to navigate the open waters, in which they are exposed to great danger. I hope the Minister will take the matter into consideration, and that he will regard himself as being under a heavy responsibility in the matter, for the country will look to him to provide some remedy for the evils which have been indicated.

Mr. ALLEN. The experience of those who have had anything to do with the vessels which are navigating Georgian Bay has been really disheartening. I can endorse every word that has been said by the hon. member from North Bruce, especially with regard to the vessel called the *Jane Miller*. I had the honour of being a partner in another business with the captain of that vessel, and a more honourable man, or a better seaman could not be found. He is a man thoroughly acquainted with every corner and every bay on the lake. There is not the least doubt that that vessel was lost through overloading, and I hope the Government will make arrangements for preventing vessel owners and captains and mates from overloading their vessels, especially in the fall of the year. It is a melancholy fact that a great many of the vessels now lost on Georgian Bay and Lake Huron have been lost from this cause. I hope the Government will adopt such measures as will not only necessitate the proper inspection of vessels, to see that they are seaworthy, but as will also prevent overloading.

Mr. LISTER. I wish to say just a few words on this motion. Living on a lake port, and being somewhat familiar with shipping on the inland waters of this country, I agree with all that has been said by the gentlemen who have preceded me. There is no doubt whatever that some legislation is necessary at this time. We must bear in mind that within the last two years the inland shipping of the Dominion has grown to enormous proportions. We also know that many of the ship-owners of the Province of Ontario have done everything which they possibly could do to protect the lives of the sailors who may be in their care for the time being; but we were also aware that many vessel owners have not taken that care which was incumbent upon them. On the Upper Lakes—Lake Huron and Lake Superior—it is notorious that vessels are sent out loaded, which are entirely unfit for the voyages for which they are intended, as well as improperly loaded; and the result is,

that within the last two or three years, there has been an appalling loss of life. It is time the Government should take this matter into their own hands and introduce such legislation as will protect life on the great inland waters of this country. I hope, now that the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine has been called to this important matter, he will not fail to take some active steps in the interest of that neglected class, the sailors of this country. It is true they have no representative here to speak for them, but they are under the care of this Government as much as any other class in the country. I hope that the present unsatisfactory state of affairs will soon cease, and that the Government will take care to protect the lives of sailors by seeing that unseaworthy vessels are not permitted to go out, and that all vessels are properly loaded.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. McCALLUM. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject have pointed out the importance of caring for the great interest of the marine of this country. Well, Sir, the present Government, I consider, has dealt justly with that interest. A very large amount of money has been spent to build harbours to provide for the safety of life and property, as well as to erect lighthouses, in order to guide vessels at night and keep them out of danger; we have also a life-boat service in the interest of the sailors. I believe the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) said that the sailors had no friends in this House. I say that all Governments in this country have looked after the interests of the sailors. We have an inspection of steamboats. Formerly the inspection of vessels was done by the underwriters: but it was only last year, I believe, that we provided for the inspection of hulls. I know that the class of vessels formerly built in this country were not the best class for heavy weather; they were too light. Some hon. gentlemen have spoken of the danger of overloading; but the principal trouble with a vessel is when she is light. Many of our vessels have been built to carry a large cargo on a small draught of water, owing to our shallow harbours and canals; but there will not, of course, be any more of that class built, as our harbours and canals have been deepened and enlarged. With regard to the loss of life on our inland waters, hon. gentlemen must not forget that so long as we have men employed in the carrying trade of this country, there will be more or less loss of life. So far as inspection is concerned, I consider that we have a good class of inspectors; but the trouble is that, with most of our vessels, there is more danger when they are light than when they are loaded. There is no man who has more interest in having a vessel properly loaded, than the man who sails her and risks his life upon her, and he is the man who should see to the loading of that vessel; and scattered as we are on these inland coasts, it would cost a large amount of money to maintain a sufficient number of inspectors to look after the loading of vessels. Therefore, hon. gentlemen have not given due consideration to this matter when they say that we should have vessels loaded under Government inspection.

Mr. STAIRS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say one or two words to the House on this matter, though somewhat against the argument adduced by the hon. gentleman who has preceded me. I wish to caution the Government to be very careful in anything they do to provide for the inspection of vessels in the Lower Provinces. I agree with all that has been said before as regards the importance of the Government doing everything that can be done towards the preservation of life and property on the lakes and also on the sea-coast of this Dominion, but I think the experience of the Maritime Provinces does not tend to

show that, with respect to the coasting, any great risk is run. An inspection would only show that, on the whole, our sailing vessels in the Maritime Provinces are well and thoroughly built and are manned by men who perfectly understand how to sail them, most of these having navigated such small vessels around the coasts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick from the days of their boyhood. They are practical seamen, who have grown up in the service and thoroughly understand all the ins and outs and all the intricacies of coast navigation. Taking the average of a large number of years it has been found that very little loss of life has occurred on or along the coasts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick through these coasting vessels, nor as to the question of overloading, have there been many accidents from this cause; very few accidents have occurred in the case of vessels engaged in the coal trade in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick through overloading. The Government should be very careful in this matter and should not apply the inspection on any very strict laws to these vessels, unless it be found absolutely needed, and experience has shown that such an inspection is not needed. I will say, however, that should, after enquiry and examination, the Government find a strict inspection necessary, I would, in the interest of life and property, be very willing to see a careful inspection carried out.

Mr. GUILLET. This is a very difficult matter to proceed with, one involving very important interests, and the Government in this matter should move very carefully and slowly. We have nothing before us to show that there is not already sufficient protection to life and property, as regards vessels navigating our sea-coasts and inland waters; we have no petitions from the Sailors Unions or from the sailors themselves or the people themselves. The sailors have had their interests looked that after by this Government, which was careful to see the wages of the crew were made a first lien on the vessel, and that payment of wages could be enforced by the sailors on their going before two magistrates in any port. As regards overloading, it will be very difficult to fix a loading line. The most scientific ship builders have had difficulty in this, especially with vessels built entirely of wood, the conditions of which are constantly changing. This suggested inspection would also involve the placing of an expert inspector in every little harbour, in many of which the fees would not, by any means, be sufficient to afford him an adequate salary. As to the carrying capacity of vessels, that varies with the different kind of cargoes carried. There are great differences in cargoes. A vessel can, with safety, carry a much larger tonnage of coal than of iron, at least 25 per cent. more. It will be seen, therefore, that it will be very difficult for the Government to apply a rule. Such a course would probably do more harm than good to the trade of the country. As regards mercantile vessels engaged exclusively in the carrying of merchandise, there is no necessity for an inspection; as regards vessels carrying passengers I will not undertake to say, but we have no complaint of any loss of life or unnecessary risk on that account. In the Upper Lakes the loss of life has been chiefly caused by ignorance of the character of those lakes, through shoals and sunken rocks not being marked on the charts, but the Government are now having surveys made, especially in Georgian Bay, in order to show more clearly the dangers of navigation. The Government deserve great credit for the protection they have given to navigation, by the erection of lighthouses and the building of harbours of refuge wherever they may be placed with advantage, particularly in inland waters.

Mr. PAINT. Reference has been made to the Plim-soll Act. It is not as applicable to this as to the old country, where a great many owners of ves-sels command and control their own property. In

Mr. STAIRS.

England the Plim-soll Act was intended to reach parties who loaded old vessels very deeply and sent them to sea with the intention of wrecking them. Many of these men were not able to insure such ships in England, but patronised the insurance companies on the con-tinent of Europe where they were not known. The great danger arises, even in our own Dominion, from overloading, at our coal ports, and where stone cargoes are carried; but this might be remedied to some extent by a careful Port Warden, who would dictate to what extent a ship would load, or if she were too deeply laden, would compel her to discharge a part of her cargo. Our ships in the Lower Provinces are built under inspection, but this has not been the custom, I understand, on the lakes heretofore. Our Lower Province ships have been more seaworthy, and have been classed under Lloyd's Survey, the French Bureau Veritas or the American Lloyd's. This inspection is applied to all vessels over 150 tons burden. Our small fishing vessels have not yet come under the inspection; but they are substantially built. It has been found, I must acknowledge, that at times even a high premium of insurance has not deterred owners and shipmasters from overloading their vessels. Although great vigilance is exercised by the underwriters in the different ports, owners of cargo and bottoms have not assisted them in this direction. Of course it will be a very proud thing if this Dominion should possess the best merchant shipping Act in the world, which might justly be expected of us, inas-much as we are acknowledged to be the fourth country as regards the owning of ships. We should aim at perfecting the building and controlling the sailing of our mer-chant marine to the utmost extent possible. I trust that if there is anything done in connection with this matter, the Act will be made to extend to British Columbia as well, as there they make large shipments of coal and lumber; unless the shipping trade should be relegated to the Chinese. In that case, of course, there would not be so much cause for anxiety.

Mr. DAVIES. If I understood correctly the remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved this motion, he appealed to the Ministry to make the Inspection Act a little more stringent than it is at present, and I understood him to have spoken with reference to facts in the part of the Dominion from which he comes. There is no doubt a good deal to be said from his standpoint. However, there is such a thing as legislating in too great a hurry, and without proper regard to the interests of the large lumber of those who have their money invested in ships in this Dominion. The Inspection Act, which has been the subject of conversation for the last hour or two, is stringent enough, and too strin-gent in many respects. I had occasion, at an early part of the Session, to call the hon. gentleman's attention to its stringency, and its unfair stringency, in view of its vesting arbitrary power in the hands of an inspector who is practi-cally irresponsible, and I was in hopes, from what I then said, and from the facts which I knew to be in the hon. gentleman's knowledge, that he would have seen fit to con-sider the question of granting a Court of Appeal, to which an injured ship-owner could appeal in cases where the inspector used his powers in an unfair or arbitrary manner. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has made up his mind in that matter, but I do think there can be but one answer to the demand made on the part of ship-owners, that their property should not be subjected to an arbitrary inspection without their having the right to appeal. There are one or two respects in which I think the Act is defective. It does not apply to steamers which trade between the United States or any port in the United States and the Provinces. There are several of these lines and some of them are of a very excellent character. There is the line between St. John and Eastport, which has been running for many years, and I

believe has never had an accident. Then, there is the line between Boston, Halifax, and Prince Edward Island, and other lines, and, while these steamboats are not subject to an inspection at all, our own are subject to inspection. I do not condemn the Inspection Act *per se*. I think that, if it is applied to our own boats, it should also be applied to these foreign boats, or boats running to a foreign port. I desire, however, to call attention to the controversy which has been going on in England for the last six months between the shipowners and the energetic president of the Board of Trade there, Mr. Chamberlain. Although the shipowners in England have a right of appeal, which they have exercised successfully in many instances, in the protection of their own interests, they are not satisfied, and insist on going further; and the claim they make has been put forward with such ability, and has been backed up by such an array of facts, that the Board of Trade, as I gather from the remarks of its president, is about to provide that the inspector shall not alone, of his own mere motion, be allowed to make an order, but shall be accompanied on his inspection, when he inspects a ship, by a representative of the shipowner. Now, with us, the inspector comes down alone, and goes when he likes—and I do not object to that, of course—on board of the steamer, unaccompanied by any one on the part of the shipowner; he makes his report, and from that report there is practically no appeal whatever. No matter what loss or inconvenience the shipowner is subjected to by it, he must abide by it. I think there is no other branch of our law, in which interests so tremendous are involved, that are left to the decision of a practically irresponsible judge. I would submit to the hon. Minister that, instead of proceeding in the direction of making the Act more stringent in the cases to which it now applies, he should proceed more in the lines in which the Government of England is proceeding, that is, that the shipowner shall have the privilege, when the inspector makes his inspection, of having a representative of the shipowner on the inspection, having an equal voice with the official inspector, and, if they do not agree, let the appeal go to the Minister. If it goes to the Minister now, as in form it is provided in the Act that it shall go, it goes on the report of the inspector himself, and the Minister can make but one ruling on the facts which are presented by the inspector, because no one supposes that the inspector will report facts which will justify a reversal of his decision—he will rather report facts which will justify its being confirmed. The Minister has no means of getting other facts. He is practically, as I said before, a mere puppet in the hands of his inspector. He must necessarily be so; he has not a personal knowledge of the vessel inspected; he cannot have that personal knowledge. He only obtains it through the mouth of his inspector, whose report he will be bound to support. The Minister seemed to think there would be a difficulty in constituting a Court of Appeal, owing to the necessary expense, but I do not think there need be much expense. The Court of Appeal might be a very simple one indeed. But I would read to the hon. gentleman the remarks made by Mr. Chamberlain, president of the Board of Trade, to the shipowners of Liverpool upon this very question, not limiting the rights the shipowners already had, but rather extending those rights and giving them the privilege of having a representative at the inspection itself, so that their rights might be properly guarded at the outset:

"I ask you to remember what happens now. The Board of Trade official is really witness and prosecutor, if you please, and judge in the case himself. He goes down to your ship, and thinks it is overloaded or that certain repairs or alterations should be made in it. He requires them to be made, and in the great majority of cases—for there really have been very few appeals indeed—you make them, not, perhaps, because you agree with him, but in order to save trouble and further expense; and you make them upon his sole authority. That is the position now. Now, what do I propose? I propose that my officer should no longer be able to stir a step in the first instance without he was accompanied by one of yourselves, and that he should have with him at every step a

representative of the shipowners, with an equal vote. The result of that would be to give to the shipowners an absolute veto upon all the preliminary proceedings of the Board of Trade, unless we thought the matter of such serious importance that we carried it to the Court of Appeal. See how that would work. I presume you would elect as your representative an honest and honourable man. Our surveyor would think a ship was overladen. He would go to the shipowners' representative. The whole matter might be settled in half an hour. At any rate, there would be no delay. They would go down to the ship together. They would hear what the owner of the ship had to say to the matter. The Board of Trade surveyor would have an opportunity of knowing, which he has not now, whatever reasons the owner had to allege against the proceedings the surveyor was anxious to take. He would very likely be convinced, and if he was not, he could not proceed without the authority of the representative of the shipowners. The matter would then have to come to the Board of Trade. I believe it would come in very few cases. I believe there would be such an understanding that the interests were common interests between the representatives of the Board of Trade and the representatives of the shipowners, that in the majority of cases the matter would be settled on the spot."

Even in England, where a Court of Appeal exists, the President of the Board of Trade suggests that it would be more in the interests of shippers that the inspector should be accompanied by a representative of the shipowner at the inspection in the first instance, so that justice might be done from the start. Now the inspector is unaccompanied, and, unless he asks the shipowner's agent to accompany him, he goes alone and inspects the vessel, he makes what report he pleases, which is practically unappealable from, and I submit that this has worked, and is calculated to work, great and grave injustice. I believe that, if any change is made in the Act which now exists, and in respect of the property now subject to the Act, it should be made in the interests of the shipowners, to give them a right to be represented when the inspection is being made, and if that is not done, that they most assuredly should have, as every other subject has when his property and rights are invaded, the power to take an appeal to some independent tribunal.

Mr. McLELAN. I have to thank the hon. gentleman who introduced this subject, and who has been the means of eliciting the expressions of opinion which we have heard from various members of the House who feel a deep interest in this matter. This question has, to a large extent, engaged the attention of the Government, and, as head of the Department specially entrusted with the management of these affairs, I have taken a great deal of interest in it and given it very careful consideration. I have listened with attention to the observations that have been made by different speakers on this subject, in order to ascertain the opinions of those who represent those interests in various parts of the Dominion. It is quite true, as has been said by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), that all Governments have given consideration to this question, and all may be said to have been the friends of the sailors and to have done much for their benefit. As has been said by my hon. friend, our coasts have been lighted, and are now as well lighted, perhaps, as any marine coasts in the world; we have endeavoured to buoy all the shoals and dangerous approaches on our coasts; we have provided fog-signals at the principal points, in order that the sailors may know where danger exists; and we are now engaged in the survey of the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron, that have not been heretofore sufficiently surveyed. It has been brought to the attention of the Government that rocks and shoals exist in the lakes that were not laid down on the chart. When this matter came to my notice, I brought it to the consideration of my colleagues in the Council, and received authority and instructions to make arrangements for a survey of those lakes, in order that the dangers existing there might be more clearly defined and made known to the mariner. Parliament was good enough to authorize an expenditure for that purpose. I may say that we were not able to obtain from the Admiralty, at an early date, the appointment of a man to undertake this work until the season was considerably advanced; however, he had time to spend several months in the

Georgian Bay and ascertain the exact bearing and locality of a number of shoals, and these have been laid down on the new charts which have been issued by the Admiralty this winter. That survey will be continued during the coming summer, and as the work progresses from year to year, the results will be laid down upon each new chart that may be issued by the Admiralty. I know there has been considerable loss of life upon these Upper Lakes; but I do not know that there has been more loss there than in the navigation of other waters. The trade is very large upon those lakes, and is increasing; still, I do not think the proportion of loss has been very much more than upon the ocean. It ought to be very much less. I admit that if proper care were taken in the construction of ships and in the management of vessels, the loss of life would be much less. About the time I came to the Department, there had been two or three very serious disasters upon the lakes, that turned my attention specially to that subject. I had reason to believe that the cause lay, to a considerable extent, in the construction or form of the vessels. I obtained the services of a practical man and sent him to examine quietly the construction of the vessels that were employed upon the lakes, and to give me privately the result of that investigation. He found in that investigation that many vessels were engaged in carrying passengers, which were properly described by some hon. gentleman here as mere saucers, with a large superstructure, that perhaps four-fifths of the tonnage of the vessel consisted in the houses on the deck and the superstructure which rendered them top-heavy; in other words, they were like so many sails that could at no time be furled, and the force of the winds took entire possession of the ship and they became unmanageable. These vessels were mainly engaged in carrying passengers. I then felt that it was necessary that something should be done in order, if possible, to control the use of such vessels through which, I have had no doubt, considerable loss of life was occurring. For this purpose a Bill was introduced and passed in the Parliament of 1882, providing for the inspection of the hull of all passenger vessels. We had previously provided for the inspection of the boilers and machinery of steamboats, but there was very little inspection by competent and practical men of the hulls of steamboats. In that Act, it is provided that properly qualified inspectors should be appointed from whom vessels should obtain a certificate. It was provided that these inspectors should make an inspection of the vessels, and that, together with the Inspectors of Boilers and Machinery, they should fix the number of passengers that a vessel would be permitted to carry upon a certain route. It has been stated by some hon. gentlemen that we should have gone further and have provided for the inspection of all steamers and all vessels engaged in the freight trade as well as those engaged in the passenger trade. We felt, however, that it was perhaps unwise to attempt too much at the outset, and that our first duty was to consider and provide, as far as possible, for the safety of passengers. The inspectors of the underwriters largely attended to the inspection of all freight vessels, whether of sail or of steam; in the same manner, as it has been stated here to-night, in the Lower Provinces, and in sea-going ships, the inspection of English Lloyds and French Lloyds is given, and is demanded, by all shippers of freight for all vessels upon which they wish to ship cargoes. Now, in the Upper Lakes we found that shippers of goods had their own inspectors; shippers of cargoes and insurance offices had their own inspectors to look after freight vessels, and therefore it was not so necessary or so imperative that the Government should take upon itself the inspection of all freight vessels. The Act of 1874 is an Act against overloading or sending to sea unseaworthy vessels. That Act is sufficiently stringent, but so far as I am aware, it has not been acted upon. I do not

Mr. McLellan.

know whether the Act is too cumbersome or the machinery too costly, but I know it has never gone into operation. Under that Act it is provided:

"If complaint is made to the Minister that any ship registered in Canada is, by reason of the defective condition of her hull or equipments, or by reason of her being overloaded or improperly loaded, unfit to proceed to sea, or on any voyage on any waters within the limits of Canada, the Minister may cause such ships to be surveyed by a person appointed by him—first exacting from the complainant, if he thinks fit so to do, a deposit of money to defray the expenses of the survey. . . ."

Other provisions provide for the condemning of the ship and contain a declaration that any person who sends such a vessel to sea, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. That Act, as I have said, has not been acted on since I took charge of the Department, and it may be said to be inoperative. Looking at the disasters that have occurred on the lakes, I had it under consideration to present to Parliament a short Bill to make it necessary that all vessels should have a load line, as has been suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite. One of the great dangers in navigating the class of vessels sailing the lakes, is the form of their construction. The engines are placed far aft and bring down the stern and force up the bow, and unless care is taken in loading, vessels often go to sea in an unworthy condition. I had it under consideration to provide that no vessel should go to sea unless drawing a certain depth forward, that depth to be defined by the Inspector. In endeavouring to mature the plan, I found many difficulties arose in the way of having it properly carried out, and a law which cannot be properly executed and for which sufficient machinery is not provided, is worse than useless. I acted on what the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) advised, that we should not be in too great a hurry to legislate. I left the matter under consideration, to see whether I could devise any proper machinery by which we can obtain a proper inspection of vessels when leaving port. The steamers trading on the lakes have many points of call. In the morning, a steamer may start out properly loaded, but at ten o'clock in the morning she may have put off some freight and taken aboard other freight, and be quite out of trim, and as the vessel may call at three or four points during the day, she may be in different trim on leaving each port. So the House will see that there is great difficulty in devising machinery by which vessels can be compelled to leave port in proper condition. The matter, I say, has been left in abeyance, to see if it is possible to devise proper machinery to carry out the plan I have suggested, or whether the injury inflicted on trade and navigation by the attempted enforcement of such a law, would be greater than the benefits that would be derived from it. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has referred to the English Act, and to the fact that we go further than that Act, and has said that there is no appeal in this country. I would inform the hon. gentleman that there is an appeal from the inspector to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that the Minister is not in any case, as the hon. gentleman supposes, the puppet of the inspector. The duty of the Minister is to enquire into the facts, and if the facts presented appear to him not to warrant the withholding of a certificate, it is in the power of the Minister to make proper arrangements for the running of the vessel. The hon. gentleman has also stated that we do not require the inspection of vessels trading outside the Dominion. All vessels registered within the Dominion and plying to any port within or outside of the Dominion, come under the Inspection Act. It is provided that vessels registered in foreign countries, and trading in Canada, are subjected to the inspection laws of the country where they are registered. I do not know there are any other observations made by hon. members which require explanation on my part. I have only to say that all papers connected with the matter will be laid before the House, and all possible information given to hon. members; and I have again to thank the hon. member for Algoma

(Mr. Dawson) for having introduced the subject and elicited the opinions of the various members who have spoken in regard to it.

Mr. BRECKEN. When the question was before the House some ten or twelve days ago, with respect to Prince Edward Island, I did not speak on it; I do not intend to speak at any length now. I have listened with great attention to the remarks of the hon. Minister, and from the little experience we have had in the Island of the effects of the Act as now worked, with respect to the inspection of steamships, I had hoped that the hon. Minister would take a different view of the law as it now stands. I do not agree with my colleague when he says that the Minister is a puppet of the inspector; but, judging from the inspection in the Island, it would be a great boon if the inspector were accompanied by a merchant representing the shipowner. Our steamers were stopped running last autumn, just when the great bulk of our carrying trade was commencing, and notwithstanding the remedy of an appeal to the Minister of Marine. It was a great injury to our people, and they have not yet stopped complaining about the effect of the law. I would submit, with great deference, as I am not a nautical man, that it would be a very great advantage if the Act were altered so that the shipowner should be represented at the time the inspection takes place. I know it is the duty of the Government, and the Minister in charge of that important branch of the public service, to see that vessels are seaworthy, and that the lives of passengers and crew are properly protected; but judging from what has taken place in Prince Edward Island, it is quite possible that the working of the law, as it now stands, might operate in a way in which the Government would not like to see it operate. It is worthy of consideration as to whether a Court of Appeal should not be provided; at all events, it is of great importance that the condition of the vessel should not be left to the arbitrary decision of the inspector at the time.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member will allow me to explain. I brought to the notice of the inspector the fact that complaint had been made that he examined the vessel without the knowledge of the owner. I understood from him that part of the inspection had been made in the presence of one of the members of the steamship company, that he had spent altogether parts of two or three days in the inspection, that he had made a voyage on the steamers, and had inspected them, both at Pictou and on the Island. I think it is a rare exception rather than a rule, that the owners of the steamship are not present with the inspector when he makes the inspection. I believe that in all cases which have been brought to my notice, excepting this one instance, no inspection has been made in which the steamboat owner was not present at the time.

Mr. DAWSON. I may be permitted to remark, that in reading the statement of Mr. Mackenzie, who is the keeper of the observatory at Presqu'Isle, near Owen Sound, I had not noticed that he had made some reflections upon the captain of the *Jane Miller*. I take this opportunity of saying that I knew the captain well. He went down with his vessel, and I knew him to have been a most excellent and worthy man. He was mate of the steamer *Ontario* a long time, and he stood very high in the country and among the navigators of the lakes. I may say that the case of these lake vessels is entirely exceptional, and that the same description does not at all apply to sea-going vessels, as to the class to which I have been referring. The number of these vessels that are lost is quite out of proportion to the losses anywhere else, because of a whole fleet of vessels which were plying on the Georgian Bay five years ago, I believe not one remains, except a small vessel, the *Maganetawan*, plying into Parry Sound, and another small vessel called the *Warton Belle*, which

plies near the coast. In fact, the loss of a fleet has been three times repeated, and the loss of life has also been very great, so that, as I have already stated, the case of these lake vessels is exceptional. The Minister of Marine is perfectly correct in saying that these losses are in a great measure due to the construction of the vessels. There is no doubt that the boats which have been taken to these waters were entirely unfit for navigation. As to the navigation itself, it is probably the safest and best in the world. This is proved by the fact that steamers which are properly appointed, and properly provided, meet with no accidents. The Sarnia steamers have been running for twelve or fourteen years, and not a single loss has occurred, or a single serious accident. The same remark is true of the Collingwood line. The difficulty is in the class of vessels used, and what I suggested was, that some authority should be given to the Custom House officers, or to some other officer at the port—without adding too much to the expense—to prevent these vessels going out overloaded. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), says the captain is the best judge of when his vessel is overloaded. I believe he is perfectly right, but the trouble is that it is never left to the captain to say when his vessel is sufficiently laden. He comes with his boat to a place where a load is waiting him, and he is not consulted as to whether he can take it or not, but he is compelled, in most cases, to take it. I know of instances in which captains refused to overload their vessels, and they saved them in consequence. There can be no doubt that the hydrographic survey of the coast which is just now being carried out, under the direction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, will do an immense amount of good. It was very much needed; it was called for for years, and I am happy to know that the Department has sent a very able officer to do the work—one who was commended by the Imperial Government. He was at this work last summer, and so far he has been most indefatigable in carrying out his duty. That the coasts are gradually getting to be well lighted, there can be no doubt. New lights are being put in every year, and they are having a very beneficial effect in allowing vessels to run at night, where otherwise they could not. I think, however, that this improvement might be carried further. I think the Sault Ste. Marie River might be lighted so that vessels could be run at night, as thereby an immense saving to vessels, generally, could be effected. I may say, in conclusion, that I am glad so many hon. gentlemen have taken part in this discussion, as it will draw attention to the matter, and I am happy that the attention of the Minister of Marine has been called to it, and that he has manifested so much interest in the matter.

Motion agreed to.

#### MONEY ORDER REGULATIONS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of the regulations affecting the Money Order Branch of the Postal Department, prior to the change recently made as to the regulations for payment of money orders, and copies of the regulations now in force, with dates, said: I may briefly explain that the cause of this motion, as I explained privately to an official of the Post Office Department, was a communication I received relative to the increased delay and certain precautions taken in the payment of money orders in the neighbouring city of Hull, in which some four days' delay took place, under the arrangement now in force, as compared with the former arrangement. As I have reason to believe that no recent regulations have taken place, it may have occurred from some general regulations which differ as to the relative importance of the place. However that may be, I make the motion, and I shall be glad to know what is the explanation of the delay to which I have referred.

Mr. CARLING. I am not aware that any change has been made in the regulations of the Department upon this subject. If, however, the hon. gentleman will allow the motion to pass for the present, I will make enquiry and give him the information.

Motion agreed to.

#### LOTTERY FIRM AT ST. STEPHEN, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. WELDON, in moving for a statement of the receipts of the Post Office at St. Stephen, N.B., during the years 1879, 1881, 1882 and 1883; also, a statement of the value of postage stamps sold at the said office; also, copies of any correspondence, statements or memorials in reference to posting of circulars by a lottery firm or company at St. Stephen, N.B., said: My object in making this motion is to call the attention of the Government to what has been going on, as far as we are informed, in the town of St. Stephen. A lottery firm there has issued a large number of circulars, which are sent, not, I believe, through the New England States, but through the western States, and the United States Government are powerless to stop them, because, under the postal arrangements, they are obliged to forward postal matter to its destination. If these circulars were posted in the United States, they would be stopped at once, but, as it is, no doubt a large amount of fraud has been perpetrated, and the firm are reported to be growing rich. I find that a larger revenue is collected from stamps and postage at St. Stephen than at St. John. Though St. Stephen has only a population of 2,500, I find that the revenue is \$36,189, while in St. John the revenue is only \$35,891.47, Fredericton, \$9,510, and Moncton, \$6,815. This shows that the number of stamps sold at St. Stephen is quite abnormal, and I have no doubt that the large sale is accounted for by this extensive fraud which has been carried on. My object in making this motion is to call the attention of the Postmaster General and of the Government to this matter, and to urge that some steps should be taken to put an end to it. I believe a large amount of money has been paid in, but as for prizes being drawn, no such thing has taken place. The whole affair is a fraud, by which some persons are rapidly becoming rich.

Mr. CARLING. There is no objection to giving the amount of the receipts for the different years mentioned, as well as the value of the postage stamps sold during those years; but as correspondence has taken place between the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice, and also between that Department and the Local Government, I am not in a position to submit it at present. The other information will be brought down without any delay.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman is not able to give us more information on this subject. We have all noticed in the newspapers, for a considerable time past, statements with reference to this fraud which has been going on in St. Stephen. A number of years ago—in 1878, if I remember rightly—we had a discussion with reference to the advisability of giving sufficient powers to the Post Office Department, with the view of stopping just such frauds; and singularly enough, if my memory does not deceive me, the shocking example brought forward was that of St. Stephen, N.B. It was explained that St. Stephen, which is just across the boundary, was made the retiring place to which the promoters of this fraud went, and from which they deluged the country with those stamps. The House was reluctant to apply the usual remedy, namely, that under certain regulations the Postmaster General should have power to have these suspected letters opened; but a tentative remedy was adopted, giving the Postmaster General power to order that the circulars should be stamped as suspected to be frauds, and sent in that way

Mr. BLAKE.

to their destinations. I should like to know whether any effort has been taken to stop these frauds by the use of that remedy, or whether this law on the Statute Book has been allowed to be a dead letter, and these wages of iniquity allowed to be gathered in without an effort being made to stop this thing.

Mr. CARLING. I think I stated that the Department had called the attention of the Minister of Justice to the matter, and that the Minister of Justice is now in correspondence with the Attorney-General of New Brunswick with reference to it. It is not for the Department to carry out the law, but to call the attention of the Department of Justice to the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. This law has nothing to do with the Department of Justice. It is entirely for the Post Office Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume that the Postmaster General, in the exercise of discretion, called the attention of the Minister of Justice to this matter, in order to get his opinion and assistance in the way of prosecuting any frauds. I remember the discussion which took place some years ago in regard to these lottery frauds, which were really a scandal. As I understand, correspondence is now going on with the Attorney-General of New Brunswick, as the speediest way of putting an end to these transactions, and therefore my hon. friend cannot well bring it down until it is complete. I hope it will be completed before the end of the Session, so that my hon. friend can bring it down, and measures may be taken to stop the frauds complained of.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend has misunderstood me. I did not allude to any prosecutions at all or to anything that took place in the Department of Justice. I alluded to the law of the land, which gives the Postmaster General the power to say these letters should be stamped as suspected of fraud. I would like to know whether that law has been put into force.

Mr. CARLING. I will enquire and give the House the information.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### CLAIMS OF JOHN ROBERTSON.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for all correspondence, reports, departmental orders, orders of the Land Board, and other papers connected with the disposal of the west half of Section 6, Township 2, Range 14, west of the principal meridian, Manitoba, and particularly of all papers connected with the claims of John Robertson and of one Wallace, to the said lot, said: I make this motion in consequence of a communication which I received from Mr. John Robertson, who forwards me some portion of correspondence that passed between him and the Department of the Interior. A letter of his to that Department, dated 24th October, 1883, says:

"On the 8th November, 1882, I procured a homestead and preemption entry for the west half of Section 6 in 2-14, and during the winter I hauled building timber for a frame house and log stable, and fence timber. Prior to May 9th, 1883, I commenced breaking and preparing to build. Owing to the burning of two saw mills in the neighbourhood, I was unable to procure lumber until the wet season was over, when I could haul it from Brandon. During the month of June and the early part of July, I got over thirty acres broken and partly back-set and frame of house up. I then hauled lumber from Brandon, and other material for completion of house. After having house nearly enclosed and stable walls up, I received notice from Nelson Land Office that an application had been filed for the cancellation of my claim. I made out a statement, by way of defence, and had eight affidavits attached in support of the same. This was about the middle of August. Some time afterwards, the inspector, Mr. Aitman, came and inspected my claim. Since that time, up to the 22nd of this month, I had no further information regarding it. On the 22nd I received a letter from Nelson Land Office, a copy of which I herewith enclose. From the favourable report the inspector made of my improvements, I supposed there would be no cancellation granted by the Land Board

and went steadily on with preparing for the winter. I was residing on my claim for some time prior to the Inspector's visit, and have been since, having completed my house so as to be habitable. I have over sixty bushels of potatoes stored in cellar for winter use, between forty and fifty bushels of seed grain, also a quantity of grain for feed. I have also put up hay and prepared a stable for wintering stock, and have no other stable in which to winter them, and at this season of the year, with winter just on, to have my improvements taken from me by the Land Board to gratify personal spite, seems, to say the least, very unfair, and I take the liberty of writing these facts, hoping you will interfere in my behalf with this decision of the Land Board and give me fair play, as I am a *bona fide* settler and doing my best to make a home in the land. I might just say here that the parties applying for the cancellation of my claims are the same Allens who have given my sons so much trouble regarding their claim, particulars of which you will get in another letter. In reference to my improvements, I would just say that I have a good house, 14 by 18, finished with pine lumber, tar papered and shingled, with good cellar; also, a log stable, 18 by 22, and have just burned lime and got ready for finishing my house for winter. Your early attention and reply to this will oblige,

"Yours respectfully,

"JOHN ROBERTSON."

The answer to this is dated the 16th of November, 1883:

"SIR,—I have the honour, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated 25th ult., setting forth the facts and circumstances connected with your occupation of the west half of Section 6, Township 2, Range 14, west of the Principal Meridian, and stating you have received notice from the Land Board that your entries having been cancelled, the land is to be sold by tender within thirty days from the 16th October, the date of the notice to you. In reply, I am to inform you that the subject of your letter has been communicated to the Dominion Lands Commissioner, at Winnipeg, for his report thereon.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"JOHN R. HALL,

"Acting Secretary."

Mr. Robertson states:

"Afterwards, I visited the Land Board at Winnipeg, but got very little satisfaction, as Mr. Walsh was then at Ottawa. All that I learned was that the highest tender was by Mr. Wallace. I have got no official information since, but have heard from another source that it was awarded to Mr. Wallace. As I have no other land in the Province on which to build a home, and as farming is the business of my choice, I wish to know, before spring opens, if I shall have to look in a strange land for that which is denied me in my own, or, in other words, do as hundreds have done, go to Dakota and swear allegiance to the Government at Washington, a move at which my British blood revolts. Nevertheless, having a wife and eight children, duty demands and necessity compels me to try and provide them a home."

Mr. CHARLTON. Very unpatriotic.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me this is an instance in which it would be well for the House to receive some explanation of what seems to be somewhat arbitrary conduct. A very considerable delay occurs in affording information, and conduct of this kind demands explanation. Mr. Robertson writes to headquarters, the 24th of October, and receives an answer the 16th November, simply telling him that his letter has been referred to the Land Commissioner at Winnipeg for report. He gets no further information, although it is now March and the winter passing over; and while in this state of uncertainty, some information was conveyed to him from outside quarters, that his land has been sold over his head, but he has no accurate information as to what his position is or anything on which he can base his future arrangements. The hon. gentleman stated the other day that there was no instance of a *bona fide* settler having been evicted. Mr. Robertson has not been evicted, but stands in a fair way of being evicted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Robertson, as the hon. gentleman opposite said, is certainly a most unpatriotic individual in threatening to go to Dakota and taking away his eight children because he says the Land Board, through private spite—though what private spite the Land Board can have against him I cannot see, nor does he show it by his letters—have proceeded against him. Mr. Robertson forgot to tell you that he is a land jumper, and that he got his land by informing on the man who had settled on the land before—by informing that he was not a settler, and was

not improving the land. Robertson got that man's house and lot, and having done so, ought to have gone on the lot himself, but he did not do so. He says that it was put up to tender, and that Wallace got it, but he forgot to tell the hon. gentleman that he was one of the tenderers himself, and did not get it because Wallace gave more for the land. In this case, John Robertson obtained an entry for the half-section as a homestead and preemption by procuring the cancellation of the entry of the person in whose favour an entry had already been made, the grounds of cancellation being that the said person was not a *bona fide* resident on his homestead and was not fulfilling the conditions required by law. Subsequently, application was made to cancel Robertson's own entry for the same reasons, and in the course of the investigation made by the Land Board, it was proved that Robertson was not a *bona fide* resident on his homestead but a keeper of a hotel or stopping place in the village of Cartwright. His entry was thereupon ordered to be cancelled. Against this Robertson protested, and the case was kept open for a long time in order to give him the opportunity of showing cause why the decision of the Board should not go into effect. Finally, Robertson failing to furnish the required evidence, the Commissioner, finding the half-section to be much more valuable than the ordinary homestead and preemption lands, offered it at competition, the person offering the highest bonus to be permitted to take the land, subject to the usual homestead conditions. Robertson was invited to tender for it, and did tender. But one Wallace offered a higher bonus, and on the 20th December last the Minister of the Interior decided that Wallace's offer should be accepted—Wallace to pay Robertson the value of improvements on the land.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman misunderstood the statement of Mr. Robertson. Mr. Robertson did not impute any private spite to the Land Board or the office at Ottawa. He said: I do not know what private spite the Land Board could have. This proposal to Council was made by some individual out of private spite towards him. He did not impute any private spite towards the officers. What he did impute and does impute, and what I now repeat is, that there seems to be great remissness in announcing the decision of the Board to Mr. Robertson, who had not, at the period this letter was received a while ago, been enabled to obtain any information of the decision of the office in response to his application, made so long ago as the 25th October last. I do not know whether there was any other communication to Mr. Robertson from any other quarter than has been stated to me, but it is clear that the communication he received in answer to his letter of October, by the letter of November, did not ask for any other information or evidence, but told him simply that the matter had been referred to the Land Board at Winnipeg, and he seems to have received no further information from the office.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think any one who was so imprudent, under existing circumstances, as to go to live in Cartwright, might have expected such treatment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like, apart from the interesting question my hon. friend has raised, if the First Minister can state what is the usual policy of the Government, supposing this statement made by this person to be so far correct as that he had erected what, in that country, is supposed to be a reasonably substantial cottage on the ground. Is it the habit of the Land Board, after some considerable amount of money has been spent, to put it up without allowing any compensation whatever for buildings erected upon the premises, independently of any ground that may have been broken up? That is a point, I think, the hon. gentleman might perhaps inform us upon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This land was awarded, on the 20th December, by the Minister of Interior to Mr.

Wallace. I did not wish to be understood to say that private spite was charged against the Commissioner, but he said that the Commissioner had decided the matter on private spite. I said I did not see how any private spite could affect the decision of the Commissioner or the Board. It was no interest of theirs; they are appointed for the purpose of doing justice and carrying out the law, and I have no doubt they did so. This man made his tender, he offered for it, and it is because he did not get it that he makes this complaint. I dare say he need not run away to the United States with his family, if he has a good hotel to live in in the village of Cartwright. The practice, when any person fails to carry out the homestead law, is this: For instance, if a person goes on and ploughs up some land and is not a resident, the Act is imperative. The party must be a resident, and, by professing to break up a little land or commence to build a house, he does not acquire any right under the Statute. It was attempted last Session to alter the Statute, and provide that persons who made improvements, without residence, would thereby establish a claim, but the House, very properly in my opinion, rejected that idea, because that is just what speculators would do. They would see a fine property they wished to get, an eligible lot, and would commence to make improvements without any *bond fide* intention of becoming settlers. The only true and satisfactory evidence that a party is going to settle on his homestead, is residence on the homestead, and not improvements. Parliament decided that such a qualification was not sufficient, but the party must be an actual resident. But the general rule is that, if the party has made improvements, the homesteader who goes on and takes advantage of these improvements shall compensate him for them. Mr. Wallace, who in this case got the place at public competition, will have to pay compensation for those improvements.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that a part of the terms, or is it simply that the hon. gentleman means to see that that is done?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is part of the terms on which Wallace bought.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That he was to make compensation for improvements on the lot?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

#### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE, in moving for all correspondence between the Government of British Columbia and the Government of Canada, on the subject of Chinese immigration into said Province, said: I have no intention of detaining the House with any lengthened remarks, but would simply express the hope that the Government will cause the papers to be sent down at an early date, as I intend to bring this subject before the House in a few days.

Motion agreed to.

#### ASSISTANCE TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. MULLOCK, in moving for a statement showing the respective amounts of Dominion, provincial and municipal money, either by way of bonus or otherwise, paid towards the construction or equipment of railways (other than the Canadian Pacific Railway), since Confederation, with dates of such payments and names of the respective railways so aided, said: It will be remembered by all hon. gentlemen in this House that a few nights ago, on the 20th February, the hon. the Minister of Railways, in addressing the House on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway, intimated that

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

it might be proper to recoup to some Provinces moneys expended in aid of railways, where the character of those railways was not wholly of a provincial nature. I am not prepared to express any opinion whatever on that point, nor, in making this motion, do I wish to be considered as assenting to, or dissenting from the view so foreshadowed; but it appears to me that, in order to fairly deal with such a question, it would be proper for the House to be fully informed as to what moneys have been expended by the various Provinces, either directly by the Provinces or by municipalities, in the construction of railways which are of a Dominion character. We know that this House, last Session, passed an Act declaring that a great many railways were railways for the general welfare of Canada. The Act amending the Consolidated Railway Act removed from the jurisdiction of the Provinces a great many railways that had been incorporated by the Provinces, that had been aided by municipal and provincial moneys and whose entire cost, I may almost say, was borne by money derived in this manner. Now, if a scheme of recoupment is to be entered upon, it appears to me it would be proper that the scheme should be a general one. The remarks made by the hon. Minister of Railways indicate that not one Province alone but several Provinces are referred to—he speaks of “Provinces” in his remarks. I know that, as far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, I can point to railways that certainly seem to be Dominion in their character, railways constructed largely with public moneys, designed to connect that Province with the great North-West, and with Provinces east. When we have this information which is asked for, and we have the system of railways disclosed that are now in existence, we shall then, and not until then, be in a position to determine how the recoupment, if any, shall be made. The information asked for in the motion, appears to be necessary to a proper consideration of the question in any respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to the motion; that is to say, the Governor General will be asked to get this information, but he will have to apply to the different railways, and perhaps to the different municipalities, in order to get returns—certainly to different railways.

Mr. MULLOCK. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is required to get the respective amounts of Dominion, provincial and municipal money given in bonuses, or otherwise paid towards the construction of railways.

Mr. MULLOCK. The Lieutenant-Governor of each Province is supposed to be an officer who would be obliged to obey the order of the Governor General; he is appointed by the Governor in Council. A communication directed to the Lieutenant-Governor of each Province would, I think, receive the attention asked for. But, inasmuch as one of these Provinces—British Columbia—is so remote, and there might be a great deal of delay before getting that return—

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is no railway there.

Mr. MULLOCK. Then the return need not wait a reply from that remote Province.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman refers to the statistical report furnished to the Department of Railways, he will find the information there—only, if I remember aright, not divided. At great pains, during the Administration of my hon. friend from East York, Mr. Brydges commenced a collection of this information, and that has been going on since, and the information thus obtained is in the office of the Minister of Railways. The totals of public and municipal moneys granted for each railway will, when

looked at and dissected, enable the hon. gentleman, from his own departmental records, to see how much has been given since Confederation, which is the only thing my hon. friend who makes this motion, wishes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is this difficulty: In 1875, I think it was, I gave directions to have the statistical account prepared, and circulars were sent to the railway companies and to the Local Governments, and information was obtained in that way, of a complete character. But in Ontario, particularly, and I think, also, in Nova Scotia, and to some extent in New Brunswick, some further operations have taken place since that time; and I doubt very much if circulars have been sent since then to obtain additional information from municipalities or railway companies. It might be necessary to send circulars again if the returns are to be made complete.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection in the world to getting these returns. I understand from the hon. gentleman opposite, that most of them can be obtained in the Department of Railways. If so, they can easily be dissected and severed—the various items of bonuses, and the railways to which they are given.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is all there is. These statements show the amount obtained from the Government, or the amount obtained from the municipality, whether as a bonus, a free gift, or otherwise, and the total amount expended on each road. The information is pretty complete as it is, except, as I stated, what has been done since these circulars have been sent out. I do not know whether these circulars have been sent out again or not.

Mr. MILLS. I have no doubt the Minister of Railways has obtained this information, and I supposed the First Minister would have been cognizant of all the facts, because, I think, by the General Railway Amendment Act of last year, he has been given control of a large number of railways that were chartered by the Provincial Government of Ontario, at all events, and subsidized by that Government. The hon. gentleman certainly does not intend to take control of these railways and exercise dominion over them on behalf of Canada, without compensating the Province to the extent of its contributions to these railways. There is no doubt whatever that when the Government of the Province of Ontario aided these railways it intended to control the policy upon which they were operated, and the aid was given, and could only be justified on the ground that it was of provincial advantage. Now, the hon. gentleman has taken control of these railways, he has made them corporations of the Dominion of Canada, and it is very extraordinary if the Government which he leads has done that without considering all the consequences which must necessarily flow from adopting such a policy. The hon. gentleman certainly must have considered, or at all events his colleague must have considered, the question of the obligations that were incurred in consequence of this policy.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I move that the words "or grants of land given" be inserted after the word "money," in the second line. I know one or two railways that are of a provincial character, and which have been aided by grants of land from the Provincial Government.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton). Would it not also be advisable to amend the motion so as to include any amounts due to the Dominion by railway companies at Confederation, and also what has been remitted to such companies?

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### HOME OR SUPPLY FARM ON PINCEP CREEK, N.W.T.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for: 1. Copies of all Orders in Council or Departmental Orders and correspondence and

documents respecting the sale, lease, or other disposal of the Home or Supply Farm on Pincer Creek, N.W.T., to Messrs. Christie, Stewart, Tupper, Pope & Co., or any of them, or any other person; 2. The number of acres ploughed and under cultivation on said farm, when sold, or disposed of; 3. The quantity of land so sold, leased or disposed of; 4. The buildings on said farm and the costs thereof; 5. Copy of all applications for the purchase or lease of said farm, and a copy of the conveyance, lease or other writing respecting such sale or lease; 6. The price or rent obtained therefor, and how paid or payable; 7. The names and residence in full of all applicants for such purchase or lease, and of the grantees, lessees or purchasers; 8. A statement showing whether said farm was disposed of by public or private sale; 9. A statement showing the quantity of stock, plant, farming implements and utensils on said farm, when disposed of, and the disposal made thereof. If sold, to whom, when, and at what price, and on what terms disposed of; 10. The number of horses, mares and cattle on said farm. When disposed of, and how; 11. The costs expended on said farm for ploughing, cultivating, fencing, building and all other improvements. The cost of plant, farm implements and machinery of all kinds, describing the particular articles or things; 12. All correspondence between the Department of the Interior and any person or persons respecting the sale or other disposal of said farm.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I ask the hon. member to what farm he refers. I answered his question about Pincer Creek farm the other day.

Mr. CAMERON. This is in regard to the farm of which I spoke the other day; I want the applications made for leasing or purchasing it, and I understand there were applications for both; I want a copy of the agreement with Mr. Stewart. The hon. gentleman stated that he had a lease of it on shares.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I said Mr. Chipman.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman said Mr. Stewart, in the answer he gave me, and I am told that Mr. Stewart is claiming the right to this farm. A person from the North-West, of the highest responsibility, has written that Mr. Stewart is on the farm and is claiming to be the lessee of it in the meantime, with the right to purchase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The truth of the matter is, that the hon. gentleman is making these motions without knowing sufficient of the facts to warrant him in doing so. There are two farms on Pincer Creek, one an Indian farm and the other a Mounted Police farm. Which does the hon. gentleman mean?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I referred to the Indian farm.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Chipman has got that for a year.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the hon. gentleman will refer to his answer he will find, according to my recollection of it, that he said Mr. Stewart had it. Does the hon. gentleman now say there are two supply farms on Pincer Creek. There is no such report in the Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are under two different Departments. This is the answer I gave the hon. gentleman. It is in writing from the Department, and I read it. It is as follows:

"Pincer Creek Indian farm was leased on shares on 8th March, 1893, to James L. Chipman, for one year, from 1st April, 1884. The lessee is to have three-fourths and the Department one-fourth for that year. The stock, plant and farming implements were transported to the Indian reserve in the McLeod district. The lease was a private transaction and was not made by auction."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Is there a Capt. Stewart occupying any one of the supply farms at Pincer Creek?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has now found out that there is another farm.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I say it is impossible to find out, from the reports, what we have in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indian Department has nothing to do with one of these farms.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Give me information in regard to both the farms?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give the hon. gentleman an answer in regard to both. I have already given an answer in regard to the Indian supply farm. With respect to the Mounted Police farm: this farm covers about 300 acres; it has been found a source of expense instead of profit, and the Stewart Ranching Company were permitted to occupy the farm buildings and dwelling house on condition that they took charge of the horses without charge; this arrangement to continue for one year; it expired in the fall and proved a very satisfactory one. The Company have still charge of the farm and are maintaining about 100 head there; the Government will resume possession in the spring. There are some conditions which I cannot well read to the House, but I will send the lease over to the hon. gentleman and he will ascertain all the particulars.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Both the farms are under lease, on shares?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Chipman farm was under lease last year and the lease will expire in the spring. The Stewart lease expired last August. The Company wish to give up the herd, finding that, except at great expense and by keeping a detachment of police there, they are unable to keep them. So on the condition that it suited the Ranch Company to occupy the house, it was handed to them on a lease of one dollar for the whole place, on the conditions I have mentioned, and sundry other conditions which the hon. gentleman will find in the paper I shall send him. There was no sale, no attempt at a lease, no lease, except the occupation for one year, as it suited the Ranch Company to get possession of the buildings for their purposes, and it suited the Department to hand them over the care of the cattle under the clauses of that lease for a year.

Mr. TUPPER. In this rather mixed up motion, I notice the name of Tupper among the different parties who are said to be interested in that farm. I notice also that in the notice of motion on the order paper, that the name appears "Stewart Tupper." I enquired of Mr. Stewart Tupper whether he was interested in the farm, or ever had been, and I ascertained that he knew nothing about it, had no interest, direct or indirect in it, and cannot understand this reference to his name. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman means by including the name I have referred to in his motion?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the hon. gentleman will wait till the papers come down, he will find out all about it. I put the notice on the paper from what I conceived to be reliable information, that a person by the name of Stewart, and a person by the name of Tupper, had something to do with it.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman hears that some one of the name of Stewart, and some one of the name of Tupper, had something to do with it, and he puts the two names together. I think the hon. gentleman, before bringing the names of private individuals before this House, should endeavour to take the trouble to sift the information he gets and see if it is reliable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) If the hon. gentleman will read the notice he will find that it is Stewart and Tupper.

Mr. TUPPER. It is correct on this paper, but on the journals of the House it will appear as I have stated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is trying to make a little political capital for a week or a fortnight against two of my colleagues, one Mr. Pope, and the other, Mr. Tupper, and he puts these names in the paper when there is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) The hon. gentleman has no right to make such a statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have the right.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I received information which I believe to be reliable, that some person by the name of Stewart, and another person by the name of Tupper, and another by the name of Pope, were connected with this matter, and relying on that information—which I now have in my desk, and which I have no objection to show the hon. gentleman—I put the notice on the paper. I say that in doing so I am fully within my right, believing my information to be reliable, and I say that I shall never hesitate to exercise my rights to ask such questions, nor for such information as I am entitled to ask.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the original motion the name appears "Stewart Tupper."

Motion agreed to.

#### LIQUOR LICENSE ACT OF 1883.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Government and any of the Local Governments of the Provinces, respecting the Liquor License Act of 1883, said: I think it is pretty generally understood that some correspondence has taken place between the Dominion and the Local Governments on the subject of this Act. I know from the public press, at all events, that very strong protests were made by the Province of Quebec in regard to this Act, insisting upon the Government not enforcing it. In Ontario, the Local Legislature, in Session assembled, protested strongly against it, and

"Resolved, that it is the duty of the Government to take all necessary steps to firmly maintain the constitutional and legislative rights of the Province to regulate and control the liquor traffic."

I know that the public men of both sides there have practically taken the same view. I notice that in a discussion which has taken place lately in the New Brunswick Assembly, the same view is repeated by leading men on both sides. I believe that there are difficulties which have arisen under the Act of 1883, and that representations have been made to the Government on that subject by one or two of the Provinces, at all events. I am desirous of getting that information, and therefore I make this motion.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE GOVERNMENT HERD IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for: 1. Return showing all Orders in Council and Departmental Orders respecting the sale of Government herd cattle in the North-West to any person or persons or company; 2. All applications made for the purchase of such cattle to the Government or any officer thereof; 3. All notices of sale or tenders called for by the Government for the sale or other disposal of such cattle; 4. A statement showing the price paid for such cattle, cost of maintaining the same since purchased, the price obtained therefor, to whom and when sold, a general account, with dates and items of the expense of said cattle since purchased and the net proceeds of sale; 5. All correspondence respecting the sale of said cattle. He said: Some

days ago I put a question to the hon. First Minister with respect to the Government herd of cattle in the North-West, asking whether they had been disposed of; if so, to whom, how and at what price; what the cattle originally cost, and what the cost of maintaining them was until they were disposed of. The hon. First Minister answered the questions as follows:—

"The Indian herd of cattle has been sold. There were 599 head, consisting of: cows, 188; two year old heifers, 312; steers, 40; bulls, 30; and calves, 32; making 599. These cattle were sold by private sale on 23rd July, 1883, to Col. DeWinton, at \$35 per head, and \$1,000 additional for right to claim any stray cattle belonging to the herd; in all, \$21,965. This amount is payable as follows:—Cash payments, \$5,490; on 23rd October, 1883, \$5,490; on 23rd January, 1884, \$5,490; and on the 23rd of April, 1884, \$5,495. All these amounts have been paid, except the last, which will be paid on the 23rd of April next."

Now, in this the hon. gentleman tells us that 599 cattle were sold at \$35 each, aggregating \$21,965; and he tells us further that \$1,000 was paid for the right to claim any stray cattle belonging to the herd. The hon. gentleman did not tell us how many cattle were missing from the herd, or how many strayed away. It is an extraordinary thing that these cattle should have strayed. The hon. gentleman did not tell us how many were in the herd originally. I am told that 1,200 were bought and brought into the country some years ago. There must have been some considerable increase since then; and yet, only 599 of these cattle could be got together. I want to know what has become of the balance. It is stated that a person was in charge of this herd for some time at \$300 a month, that he was dismissed, and that another person, Mr. Ives, was afterwards put in charge of them at \$200 a month. When were the cattle lost? When the first person was in charge or when Mr. Ives was in charge? Now, I should like to get all this information. What I especially object to in the disposal of any of our property in the North-West, whether of this description or real property, is that it should be disposed of by private sale. The hon. gentleman complains that these charges are constantly made; but one has only to read the hon. gentleman's answer to see that there is ground for them. Why should these cattle be sold to Col. DeWinton at private sale? No person knew that they were in the market except Col. DeWinton. I have been told, and I have been informed by letter, that several persons in the North-West wanted to buy these cattle, and were willing to give more than the Government got for them; but they had no opportunity, because the Government took care that the cattle should be sold by private sale. I complain of the whole policy of the Government with respect to the disposal of public property in the North-West Territories. Just look at how many cases of this kind have come to our attention this Session. The hon. gentleman admitted that the Pincer Creek supply farm was sold to the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec by private sale; he admitted that a grist and saw mill was sold by private sale; I am told that a valuable timber limit was also granted by private sale; and the hon. gentleman told us the other night that a valuable contract was granted by private arrangement. All these sales were made without public notice, and that is what I object to. I make this motion with the view of getting information on the subject.

Motion agreed to.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT FORT McLEOD.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for: 1. Copies of all Orders in Council or Departmental Orders respecting the erection of any public buildings at or near Fort McLeod, North-West Territories; 2. A statement showing the nature and kind of such buildings, the estimated cost thereof, the purpose for which to be used, the plans and specification thereof, a copy of the notice or advertisement calling for tenders for the erection of such buildings, the

tenders, the contract, a statement showing the names of the contractor and the sureties given for the completion of the contract; 3. All correspondence respecting the same. He said: On this matter I submitted an enquiry a few evenings ago to the First Minister, and received from the hon. First Minister the following answer:—

"The only buildings I am aware of are the new police barracks we have erected, to accommodate 100 men and 100 horses at Fort McLeod. These buildings have been erected by the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, at a cost of \$45,000. The contract was entered into in August last. Tenders were not invited. The annual report of the Commissioner of the Mounted Police, which is now in the printer's hands and will be presented to-morrow or next day, deals very fully with these buildings and their construction."

Now, this is an extraordinary position. Here are public buildings erected for the accommodation of the Mounted Police in the North-West Territories without tender, without any competition, and by whom?—by builders? No, Sir, by a coal and navigation company. Now, I want to know what a coal and navigation company has to do with erecting public buildings for the Mounted Police? Who compose this company? What authority has it under its charter to erect public buildings? It is said that Sir Alexander Galt is the president of this company. I searched in the library for the charter of this company, but could not lay my hands on it. But it does appear an extraordinary thing that a contract of this kind should be given to a coal and navigation company. Surely there are carpenters and builders in the North-West who would gladly undertake such a contract. The late High Commissioner is said to be the president of this company. Has it come to this, that the late Lord High Commissioner of Canada has come down to erect stables for the Mounted Police? I trust that the present Lord High Commissioner will not return to the humble occupation of "stable builder." The contract was given to this coal and navigation company for \$45,000 without competition, although there were many mechanics and builders quite willing to tender for and undertake the work, had they known such a building was to be erected. We have fair ground for complaint that these contracts should have been given without tender, and especially that, in this latter case, the contract for the erection of the Mounted Police Barracks, should have been given to a coal and navigation company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am really very sorry that this transportation company, headed, it is said, by the late Lord High Commissioner, should have so degraded themselves in the aristocratic mind of the hon. member for West Huron, as to build a barracks. Sir Alexander Galt and his son, were up there looking after this building. They are not above earning an honest penny in putting up buildings and making themselves generally useful, but I am sorry that Sir Alexander Galt has come between the wind and the hon. gentleman's nobility. I will write him that in the mind of the hon. member for West Huron, he has degraded his order, the equestrian order to which he belongs, because he contracted to build a barracks and a stable. Why was it not advertised? advertise it at Calgary, at Fort McLeod. There were carpenters up there, says the hon. gentleman, to build establishments for a hundred men and a hundred horses. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has been at Fort McLeod, if he had, he would know that the present barracks, last autumn, were in imminent danger of being washed away, that they were hanging on by the skin of their teeth to the bank of the river, and it was necessary to put up new barracks. It so happens the coal and transportation company were the only persons there who had a saw mill and a timber limit, and the contract was given to them. Perhaps it will be some consolation to the hon. gentleman to know that there has been a most severe punishment inflicted on Sir Alexander by the fact that he is going to lose a great amount of money through this contract.

Mr. MILLS. Was the timber limit given by private contract too?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was given as all other timber limits in the North-West were given, when I had not much to say about it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would ask the hon. member for Simcoe the way of giving contracts for timber limits.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The first thing the right hon. gentleman did on coming into office was to cancel the license to the hon. member for Simcoe, on the ground that it was not in the public interest to do such things.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was on the ground that the day before the Administration resigned, they granted this timber license.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it was rightly given, it should not have been cancelled on that ground.

Mr. MILLS. In this case, which the hon. gentleman presents to the House as a precedent, I did grant to certain parties a timber limit which had been applied for months before, and only stood over in consequence of our having been engaged in the elections. It was granted on precisely the same terms as those on which others had been granted for several years, and the reason we adopted the course of granting timber limits by private contract was, that provision had been made for timber limits on public tender, but in the early days of settlement of the North-West we found there were no parties to tender. The difficulty was to get people to accept limits and erect mills for the accommodation of the public. At the time that limit was granted, with very proper restrictions in order to prevent any abuses or attempt to select land specially well timbered, there was but one mill on the Saskatchewan from which the people from Prince Albert or other points where settlements had taken place could be supplied. They were paying upwards of \$100 per thousand feet, or thereabouts, at the time that timber limit was granted for the express purpose of creating competition in the public interest. I do not think that is the condition of the North-West to-day. Many persons are engaged in lumbering there now, many mills are erected there, and there are many men there who would be only too glad to have an opportunity of purchasing timber limits. The hon. gentleman undertakes to assign an instance which he declared he disapproved of, and which he disallowed, in my opinion, improperly and against the public interest. But there is no reason for continuing that system, now that the condition of things is entirely changed. The right hon. gentleman knows well that timber limits are sold in Ontario by public auction. He knows well that the same system was adopted in the North-West, but was abandoned on account of the impossibility of carrying it out when the country was new and circumstances different from what they are now. But the hon. gentleman continues his system, obviously, from all we can learn in the papers, in the interests of certain parties. There are instances where timber limits were sold by the hon. gentleman at \$5 a square mile to parties who were not engaged in the lumber business at all, but who were merely speculators, and who turned around and sold those limits at \$2,000 a square mile. Now, the hon. gentleman assigns as a reason for giving this contract to the transportation company that they are in possession of a timber limit in that country. How did they come in possession of it? How came it about, if timber is so scarce that other parties cannot supply it, that the Government should have placed themselves in that condition towards this company? Has it come about by adopting, in this particular case, with regard to the timber, the policy he has pursued in reference to the contract for this particular building?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understand the hon. gentleman gave as a reason for cancelling the limit grant in this case that the license was issued the day before we left office.

Mr. MILLS. Not so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If it were so, the hon. gentleman should not forget that the day before he left office, when a vote of want of confidence was pending against him, he appointed his colleague, the hon. Minister of Finance, to a Governorship, another colleague to a Judgeship, another to another Governorship, and besides, during the week in which he was under the ban of the House altogether, he appointed five or six hundred people besides. Had we taken the same course, the hon. gentleman's followers would have been scattered right and left. Perhaps it was a mistake that we did not; perhaps we were mistaken in our leniency. The hon. gentleman has certainly done enough to open our eyes in the course he has pursued.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad anything is able to open the hon. gentleman's eyes to the mistakes he has made. It has taken him a long time to open his eyes; but do you expect, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a discussion scattered all over the North-West on this very harmless motion of the hon. member for West Huron? The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) says we made all kinds of appointments before we resigned in 1873. There was a most indignant remonstrance, a most able State paper, which I do not think has ever seen the light, from the hon. gentlemen opposite, pointing out the iniquities of the Government in having done what the hon. gentlemen complain of now. After the elections of 1878, up to the very moment they left office, hon. gentlemen opposite did exactly the same thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will put a motion on the paper, we will discuss it, and I will bring down that important paper, that ably drawn paper, and we will compare how far the remonstrances, the indignant remonstrances, made against their predecessors in 1874 comported with the action of the Government in 1878. I am quite willing to go into that whole subject. The hon. gentleman says I am quoting this as a precedent. No; I did not quote it as a precedent—that is, the case of the hon. member for Simcoe—but, in answer to the hon. gentleman who made this motion, who said that in all cases there must be competition, that everything must be put up for public tender, timber limits and all, I simply said that we followed the example of our predecessors. He says, "Oh, to be sure, we did that; we were right when we were in, but you are not right, now you are in," and he says the circumstances of the case have altered. And so they have altered, and what is the course of the Government? The Government exacts, when a party goes and explores, and applies for a timber limit, that he should bring a plan. If it is within the district within which timber limits are granted, as a reward for his exploration survey, on producing his map to show that he made an exploration survey, he gets his limit for a bonus and a fixed stumpage rate. I think both the bonus and the stumpage are reasonable. They have been always the same, I think. But, if there are more than one applying for it, the limit is put up to competition, and the person who makes the highest tender gets it.

Mr. HESSON. It occurs to me that the hon. member for Bothwell has not drawn a fair distinction between the action of the present Government in reference to the timber limits, and the action of the Government when he was Minister of the Interior. I recollect distinctly that the hon. member for Bothwell granted no less than 200 square miles of timber limits to Mr. Cook, a friend of his own at that time. That hon. gentleman would have

obtained a monopoly, and yet it is said to be objectionable for the parties who are now building the Government buildings at Fort McLeod to have a timber limit and a mill. Well, Sir, we have four, where the hon. member would have given the country but one huge monopoly, controlling 200 square miles. The present Government adopted a different policy and limited the quantity to be granted to any person or company to 50 square miles. I think that is an important consideration, and likely to prevent anything like huge monopolies in timber limits in the North-West.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I wish to remind the member for East York, who spoke of the Judges and Governors who were appointed by the Government of 1873, that they appointed them before any adverse vote was given. No adverse vote was ever given in this House, and therefore they enjoyed, under parliamentary usage, the confidence of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. What does the hon. member for Bothwell say? If he wishes to correct me, he can stand on his feet and correct me in the usual way.

Mr. MILLS. I said nothing. I never said a word.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He never does.

Mr. WOODWORTH. But the Mackenzie Government, when the verdict of the 17th September, 1878, was given, which routed them, according to the common saying, horse foot and artillery, from the Pacific to the Atlantic, knowing that that verdict was so overwhelmingly against them, appointed judges in this country. They appointed Judge Wetherbe, in Halifax; they appointed him to the Supreme Court Bench. I do not know that any governors were appointed. I do not know that there was any vacancy, but I have no doubt that if there had been any vacancies, they would have carried out the same policy.

Mr. BOWELL. They appointed Custom House officers.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Certainly, they did as much as they could, when they knew that the fiat of the people was pronounced at the polls against them; while the Conservative Government, which resigned in this House when no adverse vote was given—and it is not known to-day whether any ever would have been given against them—appointed to office, when they had the reins of power and were sustained by a majority in this House and the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wish to say one thing more to the hon. gentleman opposite. Perhaps he will say the circumstances were different. The buildings at Battleford cost \$90,000—no tenders. At Fort Pelly, they cost over \$60,000—no tenders. But, of course, the circumstances were different.

Mr. BOWELL. They were on this side; that is the difference.

Motion agreed to.

#### MAJOR-GENERAL LUARD.

Mr. MULOCK moved for copies of all letters of complaint respecting the conduct of Major-General Luard, at Cobourg, or elsewhere, sent by Lieut-Col. A. T. Williams, M. P., or any person or persons to the Government, or any member thereof, together with copies of all replies thereto, and of all documents and other correspondence in the possession of the Government relating to such matters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the hon. gentleman to let that stand.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course I must yield with a good grace, but this is the second time it has stood at the request of the Government, and I was advised the last time to renew

the motion, and I have been compelled myself to allow it to drop once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will take care that the hon. gentleman's motion will get a fair chance.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose this is the last time of asking? Motion allowed to stand.

#### THE CASE OF DETECTIVE SKIFFINGTON.

Mr. BLONDEAU, in moving for all copies of all reports, letters and documents whatsoever, in relation to the action brought by one Skiffington against Thomas Michaud and Florian Dumais, of St. Pashal, in 1881, before the Justices of the Peace, together with copies of the complaints, orders, evidence, judgments and bills of costs; also of charges made against the said Skiffington, or respecting him, as to the non-payment of the costs attending the actions by him instituted and dismissed with costs against him; also of all correspondence on that subject between private individuals and the Department of Railway, and between the latter and the said Skiffington; also of all documents in relation to the complaint of Auguste Martin, of St. Pascal, Clerk of the said Magistrates' Court, against the said Skiffington, charging that the latter did not pay him his fees and expenses; and of all documents connected therewith, said: To oblige my hon. friends who may not understand French, I will try to explain in the English language my reason for making this motion, although in doing so I must beg the indulgence of this hon. House, as I am not using my native language. In 1881, Mr. Skiffington, the so-called detective of the Intercolonial Railway, applied to the Secretary of the Justice of the Peace at St. Pascal, for two warrants to have Thomas Michaud and Florian Dumais arrested for trespass on the line of the Intercolonial Railway. Of course these two men, who are very peaceable citizens, were greatly annoyed, and in order to protect themselves they employed a lawyer to defend them against the charge brought against them by the said Skiffington. I suppose Skiffington expected to have everything his own way, but when he saw the lawyer championing the case of these two men, he judged it prudent to drop the case against Michaud. As that gentleman does not speak a word of French, and as he had to deal with French people, he had to employ an interpreter through whom to make his proposition to Michaud. The proposition was, that if Michaud would pay the expenses he would withdraw his prosecution against him. But Michaud refused, saying that his case was in the hands of his lawyer and he was ready to proceed with it. When Skiffington saw that he could not get out of his difficulty without proceeding with the cases he had to go on with them, and these two cases were disposed of by the Magistrate, who dismissed both actions with costs against Skiffington. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, you would expect, of course, that Skiffington had to pay the expenses of these two warrants, but such was not the case. Having vainly applied to him many times, finally the secretary to the Justice of the Peace, Mr. Martin, asked me if I would present his bill to the Railway Department. I did so, Mr. Speaker, although this Mr. Martin is not a political friend of mine, and I endeavoured to obtain justice for him just as if he were one of my political friends, and I say that justice must be done in the present case. I myself presented that bill to the manager of the Government railway a year ago, and after having called upon him many times to see if there was any decision, I am to-day no further advanced toward a settlement than I was then. At present, however, Skiffington pretends that he does not remember that he had two peaceable men brought before the Magistrate at St. Pascal, but he says now that two men bearing the same name had been arrested at Rivière du Loup as thieves. Well, Mr. Speaker, what can you think of a man that is trying to conceal the real facts, that is trying to

evade the question, and who is trying by one means or another to get rid of paying the costs of his blunder. Sir, I am at a loss to understand how it is that such a man is appointed to so high a position. If we are to judge him by his actions, he can do what he pleases, and have peaceful people arrested and put to heavy expense to defend themselves against his tyranny. How is it that this man does not report his doings to some of the high officials of the railway? If we require any information about his conduct we cannot get it. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is giving too much power to a man of his reputation. How is it that that man, who has been dismissed from the police service of the city of Quebec, has succeeded in obtaining the responsible position he now holds on a Government railway? I do not believe that there is any necessity that such a position should be given to a man of his character. It ought to be given to a man of good reputation, one who can command the respect of the employees of the road and of the public. I do hope that the hon. Minister of Railways will see that that case is settled and not allow any more delay to intervene in the matter. Although I have been told that these papers were to be referred to the hon. Minister of Justice, to see if the Local Government were not obliged to pay these expenses, I must say that, in my humble opinion, the Local Government has nothing to do with the folly of that detective. I hold the Government, or rather the Department of Railways, responsible for the acts of their employees. I claim that justice ought to be done at once by the dismissal of that officer, for he is a black spot on the Department of Railways, and dishonours the position he occupies on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BILLY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to address this honourable House still less to make my first speech to-day, but the question raised by my hon. friend, the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Blondeau) is one in which my own county is so greatly interested that I will take the liberty of making a few remarks on the subject. These remarks will be as follows: Facts similar to those mentioned by my hon. friend, took place in the county of Rimouski. In 1881, Mr. Skiffington had four farmers' sons, very quiet and law-abiding people, arrested for obstructing the track of the Intercolonial Railway, in the parish of St. Flavie, in the district of Rimouski. As I then had the honour of sitting as a Magistrate for the district of Rimouski, the accused were brought before me and evidence was taken. The examination held on the first day was not sufficient to commit the prisoner, for trial. The examination was adjourned to another day, and when that day arrived other witnesses were heard, with the same result. There was a second adjournment; then a third, and finally the fourth examination brought to light the fact that there were no witnesses to prove the charges made against the accused. I was therefore obliged to discharge the prisoners, and the examination involved a large amount of costs, which were never paid. The clerk of the court applied to the Quebec Government, who refused to pay them. He then applied to the Federal Government, with about the same result. The Province of Quebec holds the plaintiff responsible for the costs of preliminary examination, when such examination fails to establish the guilt of the accused. Furthermore, when it is proved in the preliminary examination that the charge is well founded, the Government of the Province of Quebec only pays the bailiff's charges. Now, if we apply to Mr. Skiffington for the payment of the costs, he will answer: Personally, I have had nothing to do with that; I was an employé of the Government and it was as such that I made the deposition which has caused the arrest of the persons in question. I think that if we examine the Act of British North America, of 1867, we will see that by clause 91, section 17, the Federal Government alone has the right to enact laws concerning criminal offences and the

Mr. BLONDEAU.

procedure connected therewith, the Provinces having only the power to constitute the courts. Now, I submit that if the Federal Government alone have the right to enact criminal laws, they should pay the cost of carrying out those laws, just as the Provinces pay for the administration of civil justice. That being the case, it seems to me that the Federal Government ought to pay the cost of the administration of criminal justice, and it is for that reason that I call the attention of the House to that question, being, on the other hand, well satisfied that if the Federal Government should take upon themselves the cost of criminal procedure, the Province of Quebec, for one, will not regret it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Minister of Railways is not in his seat, because he would have been in a better position to give the explanations asked by my hon. friend. However, I will not fail to submit the question to him and to draw his attention to it. And I have no doubt that he will do all he can in the matter. There is no objection to granting the motion.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE CASE OF ROGER AMERO.

Mr. WOODWORTH, in moving for a copy of despatches in reference to the arrest, detention and indictment of Roger Amero, a French Acadian, belonging to Digby, N. S., discharged from custody on an indictment for murder, in the State of Massachusetts, United States, said: The facts are simply these: A man of the name of Roger Amero, belonging to Digby, N.S., a French Acadian by birth, had the misfortune to be arrested in Digby by two detectives from Massachusetts, United States, on a charge of murder. On evidence, which I think altogether insufficient, he was extradited and taken by the detectives to Massachusetts. That was some time last March, and he was put in jail and kept there until a short time ago, making some nine months altogether, I understand, in jail. It was then found that instead of his being connected in any way or having anything to do with the murder of a woman by the name of Mrs. Etta G. Carlton, at Watertown, Massachusetts, he was in the town of Gloucester at the time the murder was committed, and for a week afterwards, a fact which ought to have transpired long before it did. So heated was the public mind in Massachusetts at the time of this foul and atrocious murder that, had the trial taken place last June, he would, no doubt, have been hanged, and yet he was perfectly innocent of any crime. The detectives, whose duty it was to gather all evidence, and the prosecuting attorney, whose duty to a stranger was to see that he had a fair trial, failed to perform their duty. The Attorney General, I think his name was Sherman, instead of doing that, gathered all the circumstantial evidence that was possible against the prisoner, kept him in jail during all the time, and it was not until Governor Butler, who is best known as General Butler, was asked by counsel, Messrs. Crowley and Gale, to place detectives at their disposal to look up the evidence and see if the prisoner was really guilty, and whether he had any connection with the crime or not, that two detectives were detailed by him, at the expense of the State, and placed at the service of the counsel to defend Amero. They went to Gloucester, and found that he was at Gloucester at the time of the murder, and could not have any connection with the crime which was committed at Watertown, a good many miles distant. Even then, Attorney General Sherman, in the court, refused, until a few days ago, to complete the discharge of Amero, and enter a *nolle prosequi*, and the Judge told him he thought it was his duty to do so, as there was not one tittle of evidence against the prisoner. It was not until then that

Amero was released. I understand the pretext for that un-British, unmanly, inhuman conduct on the part of the Attorney General in Massachusetts was that the real culprits were still at large and; if he kept Amero, this poor French Canadian, in jail, the minds of the real culprits would be relieved, and it was supposed that it would thereby be more easy to secure the real criminals. It is broadly stated in the papers of the United States that this was the pretext on which they kept this man in jail. Amero, after being released, became a maniac. His two sisters, who were in Digby at the time of his arrest, became also insane, and have gone to an asylum. The family is broken up. There is a mortgage of \$300 on the place, and a foreclosure is threatened. I do not wish to inveigh in improper terms against the conduct of Attorney General Sherman, or against the two detectives; but it seems to me that the Extradition Act must be a little faulty if it permits detectives to come from the United States, or any other country, and take from our shores any person on such flimsy pretexts as they took Amero. There was a reward of \$3,500 offered to anyone who would secure the conviction of the guilty party. This was a very great temptation, and those men were bound to convict Amero. And I must here say that the thanks of Canadians are due to Governor Butler for the humane and Christian conduct he evinced on that occasion. It was not his legal duty—and everyone knows he is an eminent lawyer—to detail detectives to help the defence to work up their case, but he did it for humanitarian reasons, and as a philanthropic and humane man; and I understand from good authority and from reading the newspapers as to what took place in court, that the Attorney General complained of the action of the Governor, and sent a note to the Governor, saying, that while he was on one side of the case the Governor was on the other; to which the Governor replied that he had doubts in regard to the case, and was resolved to obtain the full evidence in regard to it, so that they might be able to decide whether Amero was guilty or not. So we have the fact that Amero was in jail nine months, and that on being released he had to go to a mad house; also that his father was in jail eight months, for the laws of the United States allow the confinement of a witness until the day of trial, unless he can give proper bonds for his appearance. Then we have the fact that the two sisters became insane. Too much praise cannot be given to Judge Savary, of Digby, who was most indefatigable in his efforts to give Amero a fair trial. Day after day and week after week he continued his efforts, and he even solicited subscriptions to have the prisoner properly defended, and the bar of Nova Scotia subscribed so that counsel might be obtained. To show you what was thought in the United States of this terrible miscarriage of justice, this outrage, as it proved to be, I will read what is stated in this newspaper, which is called the *Lynn Bee*. The article is headed, "Detectives and Rewards:"

"The public will clearly remember the facts connected with the brutal murder of Mrs. Etta G. Carlton, at Watertown, Mass., and the subsequent arrest, confinement and extradition of Roger Amero for the crime. The public will also call to mind the peculiar and romantic particulars of his arrest by Detectives Wood and Wiggin, the confession of his uncle, and the seemingly strong and conclusive evidence that was collected by those enterprising officers. So great was the public stir that fears were entertained of lynching, and every precaution was taken to prevent such unlawful proceedings. Amero has been incarcerated in prison for nine long and weary months. The public have impatiently clamoured to have him tried and, if guilty, executed, and could not understand why there was delay in having him brought to justice. To-day the whole matter is explained by the announcement that the case against Roger Amero for the murder of Etta G. Carlton, is *nolle prosequi* for lack of evidence. To-day this poor ignorant Frenchman is turned adrift penniless, broken in spirit and character, to go home half crazed by the accusation of the terrible crime of murder—home where two sisters are said to have gone mad from brooding over his unjust arrest—home to his old associates, to have the finger of scorn and slander pointed at him as a man accused and arrested for the most horrible crime in the criminal annals. Why is this? It is solely and simply because there was \$3,500 reward offered for the conviction of the murderer of Mrs. Carlton. Whatever explanation may be offered, the detectives in charge of this case must long

ago have known that this man was innocent. When it comes to be understood that they did not dare bring the case before an intelligent jury, the public will realize on what slender evidence they have made this poor fellow's name a by-word. It is a burning shame, a disgrace to the detective profession, an insult to humanity and an outrage on justice: Amero may be and probably is a poor, ignorant and shiftless fellow—

I may say that this is a mistake, as Amero was an industrious, sober and hard working man—

"but to barter what honour he had, to craze people with grief at his danger and disgrace, to sell his life for \$3,500 reward, is a business compared to which the slave trade and robbing graveyards for gain is honourable and respectable. We submit that the rich and prosperous State of Massachusetts has allowed a dastardly wrong to be committed against a poor and unoffending man. There should be some redress for him. If he had been rich and powerful, the whole country would have been ablaze with his wrongs. But poor and penniless, he is allowed to be wronged and ruined with feeble protest. Let an example be made of those responsible for the injustice done this innocent man, that detectives may not be so fast in the future to manufacture evidence to secure a liberal reward."

I think, Sir, that representations, possibly, ought to be made by this Government, or that, at all events, some remuneration should be made to this man and his family for this arrest—made it is true under the guise of law, but without sufficient evidence, and with this reward staring the detectives in the face. He was cruelly kept in jail, when the detectives either should have known that there was not evidence against him, or else there was a dereliction of the plainest duty, which was, to find if the evidence was sufficient, to find, at least, that Amero was in Gloucester when the murder was committed in Watertown. I think that thanks are certainly due to Governor Butler, but for whose humane action this man, I believe, would have been imprisoned, if not hanged.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This case, detailed so feelingly by my hon. friend, who has made the motion, is pitiable in its details—I never heard a worse case—and pressed as it has been before this House, it requires the most searching investigation. Of course it is a matter upon which the Government, I do not think, can directly intervene. This person, who appears to be innocent—who, at all events, has been discharged for want of evidence against him—was surrendered under the Treaty of Extradition—handed over, as in other cases, to the American authorities—the Canadian Government placing implicit trust in the good faith that the extradited persons should be justly treated when they are surrendered. That is the conventional arrangement between every two nations who have an Extradition Treaty, having confidence in each other's laws and in their administration. If there be in this case such a sad departure from all the rules of just and right, I think it might be well to consider it as an exceptional case, and that extra efforts should be made to compensate, so far as can be, this unfortunate man for the domestic and family ruin which has been caused by the proceedings in this case. The papers will be brought down at once, and then, perhaps, some further action will be taken upon them.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Return of a detailed statement of the amount paid Mr. Joham O'Brien on his contract for building the *Princess Louise*, with the respective dates and the respective amounts paid, together with any certificates upon which the same or any portion has been paid.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Return showing the length, in miles, of the Intercolonial Railway, between Rivière du Loup and Moncton, and the original cost of constructing the same; also the length of said road between the boundary of New Brunswick and Truro, together with the cost thereof, not including the rolling stock.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.)

1. Copies of all Orders in Council or Departmental Orders respecting the reservation for a town site at Fort McLeod; 2. Copies of all orders or regulations respecting the said town, the terms and conditions on which it is proposed to dispose of the same; 3. Copies of all claims made for any portion thereof by squatters or others, all rulings of the Department in respect thereof; 4. Copies of all correspondence on any of the said points.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Copies of all correspondence, tenders and accounts in connection with the purchase of moccasins by the Department of Militia and Defence during the year 1883.—(Mr. Somerville, Brant.)

Correspondence regarding the purchase of tents during 1883, by the Department of Militia and Defence.—(Mr. Somerville, Brant.)

Return showing the amount paid for drawback on cotton duck used for sails for ships and fishing boats, under the authority of the Customs Act of last year; Return to show to whom paid, the amount paid to each, and whether for sails of ships or fishing boats.—(Mr. Kirk.)

Statement showing the amounts derived from the sale of buildings on the Intercolonial Railway, between Hadlow and Rivière du Loup, inclusively; by whom sold, the name of the purchaser and the price paid for each building.—(Mr. Blondeau.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:10 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### PRAYERS.

### FRAUD IN RELATION TO CONTRACTS.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that an order was made some time ago referring the Bill for the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys to a Special Committee, and that owing to the fact that no quorum of that Committee has been obtained no report has yet been made. Perhaps the House would order that a new Committee be struck, or that the Committee should meet for the purpose of making a report, or perhaps some other course might be ordered by the House in order that we may arrive at a conclusion. I make this suggestion in order that the Government who have the guidance of the House in such cases may decide what course they will adopt in the matter. I confess, for my own part, that I have been guilty of not attending one meeting of the Committee, and I do not desire to throw any blame on members of the Committee, who, I have no doubt, were prevented from attending for good reasons. The Committee has been called six or seven times, and though five out of its nine members constitute a quorum, no quorum has yet been obtained.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. member will see that having called the attention of the House to this matter, he has done sufficient, I have no doubt, to induce members of the Committee to have a meeting soon, in order that they may dispose of the matter which was referred to them by the House. The hon. gentleman says that he himself was absent some few days. The hon. member for Victoria, Ontario, and probably some other members, were in the same position, or else were occupied on some other Committee. If the hon. member takes care to speak to the members of the Committee, I have no doubt a day and an

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

hour for a meeting may be arranged, as there can be no desire on the part of members of the Committee not to meet and obey the order of the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. I think it will answer very well. There is a notice of a meeting of the Committee for to-morrow, and if there is not a sufficient attendance, I may move that the quorum be reduced, or take some other course.

### INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving for leave to introduce a Bill respecting the independence of Parliament Act of 1878, 41 Victoria, Chapter 5, said: The first clause provides that that Act shall be amended by declaring:

Provided further, that nothing in this section shall render ineligible any person holding any office, commission, or employment of the nature or description mentioned in such section (A) of this clause as a member of the House of Commons, or shall disqualify him from sitting or voting therein, if, by his commission or other instrument of appointment, it is declared or provided that he shall hold such office, commission, or employment, without any salary, fees, wages, allowances, emoluments or profits of any kind, that may be attached thereto.

Another clause makes provision for the seat of my hon. friend who sits near me. I shall propose that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections at the proper stage.

Mr. BLAKE. I move an amendment to add the following words:—

“And to impair the efficiency of the said independence of Parliament Act.”

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

#### YEAS :

##### Messieurs

Allen,	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Allison (Lennox),	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Harley,	Platt,
Béchar, d,	Holton,	Ray,
Blake,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Irvine,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Jackson,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	King,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Landerkin,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford)
Casgrain,	Livingstone,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Mackenzie,	Trow,
Cockburn,	McCraney,	Vail,
Cook,	McIntyre,	Watson,
Davies,	McIsaac,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	McMullen,	Wilson,
Fleming,	Mills,	Yeo.—55.
Forbes,		

#### NAYS :

##### Messieurs

Abbott,	Dundas,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Dupont,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Farrow,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Méhot,
Barnard,	Forlin,	Moffat,
Beaty,	Foster,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Paint,
Benson,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Pope,
Billy,	Gordon,	Riipel,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hastings),
Boiduc,	Guilbault,	Royal,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Rykert,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Scott,
Brecken,	Hall,	Shakespeare,
Bryson,	Hay,	Small,
Burns,	Hesson,	Smyth,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Stairs,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Taylor,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Tilley,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Tupper (Picton),
Costigan,	Kranz,	Tyrwhitt,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Valin,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),

Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Daoust,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers,  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,

Macdonald (Sir John), White (Renfrew),  
McDonald (Cape Breton) Wigle,  
Mackintosh, Wood (Brockville),  
Macmaster, Wood (Westmoreland),  
Macmillan (Middlesex), Woodworth,  
McCallum, Wright.—101.  
McDougald,

Main motion agreed to on same division reversed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 111) respecting the Independence of Parliament Act of 1878, 41 Victoria, Chapter 5.

Bill read the first time.

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that for the remainder of the Session Government business shall have precedence on Thursday after Routine business.

Mr. BLAKE. I regret that the hon. gentleman has proposed this motion, because during the greater part of this Session already the hon. gentleman has taken for Government business almost all of the days for private members. Therefore, the practical result of the proposal is to infringe at a very much earlier period than usual upon those days which are devoted to private members. There is the less necessity for it, because Government business can always be proceeded with on any day after the close of private members' business. Considering the time already occupied in the consideration of the Canadian Pacific Railway Resolutions and the course now proposed, practically nearly the whole time of Parliament will have been given up to Government measures.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. We have five days in the week and Mondays and Wednesdays are still reserved for business in the hands of private members. I think that last Session there was a general impression that our Sessions were too long, and we met early in January this year to meet the well understood wishes of the House. The Government have some important measures, but they are not numerous, as will be seen by the paper. I believe it is the feeling of this House that, if possible, prorogation should take place before Easter; and, with the assistance of the House, and with an understanding on both sides, that in considering future measures we shall not have so many or such long speeches, I think we shall be able to get through the business by that time. At the outside, prorogation should take place by the 14th of April, so that hon. members can feel that they have done their duty to their country without seriously impairing their own private affairs. I can assure the hon. gentleman that we shall give every facility for the consideration of measures and motions in the hands of private members. By the exercise of kindness and courtesy across the floor, I do not think that any measure will be shoved out or prevented from receiving due attention by the House. But I think that under the circumstances, if the House is willing, I must proceed with my motion.

Motion agreed to on a division.

#### THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 36) to authorize a further advance to the Province of Manitoba, in aid of the Public Schools therein.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Bill (No. 37) to provide for the salary and travelling allowances of the Judges of the County Court of Cariboo in the Province of British Columbia.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

#### INDIAN BANDS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 22) for conferring certain privileges on the more advanced bands of the Indians of Canada, with the view of training them for the exercise of municipal powers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. First Minister said the other day he thought some alterations might be made. He has decided evidently to let the Bill remain as it is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will be very glad to confer with the hon. gentleman privately on this Bill, but in the meantime I think it had better go through.

Mr. BLAKE. The conference will then be no use so far as this House is concerned.

Bill read the third time and passed.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I would very gladly, had it suited the convenience of this House, have replied to the hon. gentleman on Friday last, because I think that every one who has read the speech which the hon. gentleman delivered will admit it was one to which it would have been better to reply on the spot. If, Sir, the reasoning and the facts advanced by an hon. gentleman who addresses this House are to be judged by the conclusions at which he arrives, I think we may fairly assume that, so far as the public outside are concerned if they take the trouble to follow the hon. gentleman to his conclusions, there is not much likelihood of any serious damage being done by the speech he delivered. I find that after the hon. gentleman had given us numerous details as to the loss this country had sustained, he concluded with this extraordinary statement:

"For myself, I will not hesitate to say that, looking at the thing all round, I believe we would have done better if we had borrowed \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000 and thrown the money into the sea, or had blown it away in fire works, as other nations have done, than allow these hon. gentlemen to control the administration of this country. Five years of their government have done as much mischief to Canada, relatively to our population and resources, as four years of civil war did to the country and the people to the south of us."

When an hon. gentleman, who has occupied the position of Finance Minister in this country, whose position in this country was so high that he has been honoured by his Sovereign by being decorated, will venture to make a statement of this kind in the face of Parliament and the country, I think we may fairly say, either that he has lost all sense of that responsibility which should attach to hon. gentlemen when they address Parliament, or that he has become thoroughly reckless as to the effect anything he may say will have. Not only did he state this as his first conclusion, but his second conclusion was also remarkable:

"More, Sir; I say it with regret, but I say that the people of Canada have deliberately retrograded; I say that the people of Canada have not shown, as a whole, that regard for their liberty, that jealous watchfulness of people in power, that is the price that every free nation must pay for being properly governed. I say that to-day, in Canada, to our shame and loss be it said, public morality is painfully low and public opinion is painfully weak."

That is the statement of the hon. gentleman who appears now to rejoice in having made it. I tell the hon. gentleman that the people of this country will weigh those words and ponder over them; I tell the hon. gentleman that the people of this country will not quietly submit to insult, simply because they have chosen to believe that the hon. gentleman's administration of their affairs was not in the interest of the country, and therefore exercise their undoubted right of relegating him to the position he now occupies. The hon. gentleman commenced his speech by telling us that an Act of

Parliament had prevented his being here during last Session. We have heard that statement before from other quarters, but what is the fact with regard to the hon. gentleman himself? He represents to-day a constituency for which he might have run if the people would only have selected him in 1882—a constituency which he represents to-day as the result of the great pressure brought to bear upon a representative assembly of the Liberal party in that constituency by the hon. leader and the ex-leader of the Opposition, who told them that the discussion of financial questions in this House was likely to occupy a much greater amount of attention in future, and that the presence of the hon. gentleman in Parliament was of great importance to the party, and who thus succeeded by a majority of two in an assembly of some 120 of the Liberals of the Riding in inducing them to nominate him and to send him here to occupy the position he now holds. I dare say the hon. gentleman felt keenly the rebuke, for it was practically a rebuke, which was administered to him by that convention at that time; I dare say he is still smarting under that rebuke today when he tells them, as he tells the country, that they have woefully retrograded, that their moral tone is lowered and their public opinion painfully weak. Does the hon. gentleman say that he was out of Parliament last Session in consequence of an Act of Parliament? Where was the county of Lennox which he had represented for years and which he used to carry by from six to eight hundred majority? It was open to him, if he had so chosen, to go there. The party in power to-day had been in office for four years; their policy was before the country; its effects were known to the people; the hard times which, he said, had deceived the people into supporting his opponents had passed away, and he might have gone back to his old constituency. But no; he did not go then, and what is more, he did not go even at the last vacancy in that constituency where he was best known, but preferred on the contrary, that the extraordinary course should be pursued of opening what was probably the safest constituency for the party in the Province of Ontario, in order that he might take his seat in this House. And, Sir, in the constituency which he did run for, in the constituency of Centre Wellington, what was the fact? Was he left out of that constituency by the effect of an Act of Parliament? Was that the cause of his defeat? Why, Sir, in the townships composing that constituency which were in the constituency in 1878, and where my hon. friend who now represents it obtained at that time a majority of only six, the hon. gentleman was left in a minority of 130, with all the prestige of his position surrounding him. And with these evidences that the people, at any rate, have no confidence in him, he comes to this House, under the peculiar circumstances under which he has come to it, and deliberately, in the first serious speech he has to make, insults the people of Canada in the manner which I have quoted here. The hon. gentleman told us that the tone of the Finance Minister was somewhat different from the tone of the Finance Minister at the last Session of Parliament, and he, apparently in a tone of rejoicing, suggested to us that this policy, it was now admitted, would not avert over-production and consequent injury to manufacturers, or avert loss of wages to their unfortunate employes, that it would not avert poor harvests or give larger markets for lumber, or check over-importation, and he tells us true enough. Yes, true enough, but was that an evidence that his policy was correct? Because, forsooth, there are certain things that no policy which can possibly be adopted can avert, therefore the doctrine of the hon. gentleman, as carried out when he was in office, was that those evils which may be averted, those things which may be done, shall not be done, but we shall fold our arms and look on, and, admitting that Providence over-rules us, admitting that harvests may be bad without our influence, admitting that,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

merchants may over-import, that manufacturers may over-produce, admitting all these things, we will simply fold our arms, and refuse to do the things which we can do and which the policy of this Government has shown we can do wisely and well, for the promotion of the interests of the country. The hon. gentleman then went on to speak of the enormous taxation which exists in Canada to-day, and, with a forgetfulness of the exact facts of the case, he made a statement which, in view of the fact that he has been Finance Minister and is to-day the financial exponent of a great party in this country, I think he ought not to have made. He tells us that the taxes of this country to-day are \$35,000,000, and upon that basis he undertakes to compare the position of Canada with the position of the United States and with that of England, coming to the conclusion, advising all and sundry who may be interested in knowing anything of our position, that the people of Canada are in a worse plight than those of the mother country or of the United States in respect of taxation. Why, the hon. gentleman knows that, of that \$35,000,000, there were at least \$6,524,950 that were not taxes in any form or shape. As well might the hon. gentleman charge that the merchants of Canada are paying taxes for the freight charges they pay to the independent railway companies of the country as to say that they are suffering taxation from the fact that they are paying for the transport of their goods over the Intercolonial Railway. As well might he charge that the people of this country are suffering taxation for any service that is performed for them, as to say they are suffering taxation from the postal service that is provided for them. And so with other branches of the public service. As I say, of that \$35,000,000, no less than over \$6,524,950 cannot, by any fair statement, be called taxation for the people of this country. But the whole system, as it seems to me, of charging the revenues of the country as taxation, and of citing that as the measure of the burdens of the people is an entirely fallacious system. Let me point out one or two facts in connection with it. I take 1874-75, and I find that the revenues which the hon. gentleman had during that year were \$24,648,715. I take 1877-78, and I find that the revenue which the hon. gentleman had was \$22,375,012, or a decrease of revenue during that period of \$2,273,703. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to tell us that the taxation of this country was higher in 1874-75 than in 1877-78? Why, he had introduced amendments to the Tariff adding \$1,600,000 to the taxation of the people of this country during that interval; and, so far from it being a measure of the burdens of the people, it was in fact but a measure of this, that the people in 1877-78 were less able to purchase goods, were less able to enjoy luxuries, were less able in fact to live comfortably, and, therefore, the receipts by the Government were less than they were in 1874-75. Why, the rate of duty paid by the people of Canada in 1874-75 was 12.83. In 1877-78 when we had the smaller revenue and therefore the less taxation, it was 14.03 per cent. That was the condition of things between those two periods. Then, I take other periods. I take 1867-68 and 1873-74, and I find that our revenues in 1867-68 were \$11,700,681, and in 1873-74 they were \$20,123,185, and that, between those periods, the Government of this country had actually reduced taxation by taking duties off a number of articles which were taxable in 1867-68. Will it be pretended that the burden of taxation in this country was greater in 1873-74 than it was in 1867-68? I venture to say that no man outside of this House, or inside of this House, who looks at this question fairly and desires to deal with it fairly, will pretend for a moment to say that the receipts of the Government are the measure of the burden of taxation of the people of this country. Why, during the last half year, we have had a great reduction in the receipts by the Government. Have taxes gone down? The greater part of the

hon. gentleman's speech was devoted to telling us that the people of this country were worse off than they were in the corresponding period of the previous year. Surely they were not worse off by the fact that they were less taxed. That was not the reason for their being worse off. Therefore, this whole system of taking the receipts of the Government as a measure of the burden of taxation in this country is an utterly fallacious system which I think the hon. gentleman ought not to have resorted to in the discussion of a subject like this on the floor of Parliament, in view of the fact that all his utterances—unless indeed people will go to the end of his speech and read the two passages which I quoted in opening my remarks—everything that he says here, may be used outside to the prejudice, not of a party in power, which is a matter after all of secondary importance, but to the prejudice of the country itself, and of its best interests. Now, it is said, and truly said that we have had a period of less prosperity than we had a year ago. It is quite true that there have been some insolvencies, some failures in the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Surely not.

Mr. WHITE. But what are the facts in regard to them? I find that during last year the number of insolvents was 1,384, and the amount of liabilities \$15,949,361. I find that in 1879, which was the year when we felt the greatest effect of the depression which existed previous to that time, we had 1,902 failures, and \$29,347,937 as the liabilities of those failures. But, Sir, in reference to the failures of last year it is only fair to refer to those which occurred in Manitoba and the North-West. The hon. the Finance Minister, in referring to this matter the other day, spoke of the failures in Winnipeg—I presume he meant those in Manitoba and the North-West; and I find, Sir, that the failures in Manitoba and the North-West during the last year were 232, with liabilities of \$2,869,000. So that, taking a fair comparison of the failures in the two periods I have mentioned, we find that the failures during last year were 1,152, and the amount of liabilities \$13,080,000, as against 1,902 failures in 1879, and liabilities of \$29,347,937. But, Sir, if we take the increase in the number of traders in that time we will find the comparison still more significant. In 1879 there were 56,000 traders in Canada, and 1,902 failures, or one failure to every twenty-nine traders; while in 1883 there were 65,000 traders with 1,384 failures, or one failure to every forty-seven traders. That was the difference between the two periods of 1879 and 1883. Now, Sir, there were failures in the United States during that period as well. The failures there increased almost exactly in the same proportion that they increased in Canada during the last three years. In the United States the number of failures rose from 4,735, in 1880, to 9,184, in 1883, and the liabilities from \$65,752,000 to \$172,874,000. Now, Sir, what was the opinion of those who, after all, have, perhaps, the best means of knowing the exact condition of the country? I find that Dun, Wiman & Co., in their report, referring to the condition of things in the United States, in spite of those large failures, said this:

"While, on the one hand, the disasters of the year that is closed have shown weak spots in the commercial fabric, which were least expected in prosperous times, there are undeniable evidences of a stability and profit existing which few occurrences make public. It is safe to say that there is to-day in the United States a greater number of successful business men than ever before; that there are numerous departments of manufacture and trade which are yielding a liberal return, that corporations of immense wealth, influence and usefulness are prosperous beyond what they have ever been before in their history, and that monetary institutions throughout the land are on a generally safe and paying basis. The season just ended has been an extremely favourable one for the "cattle upon a thousand hills," taking into the winter all four-footed animals in the best condition, and leaving them less dependent upon winter supplies, which will thus be saved. The additions to our population by immigration, and the contributions to the wealth of the country from that source have been greater than in any previous year. Sections of

the country, which in former years were either unproductive or depressed, are now thriving beyond all former experience."

Now, Sir, that was the statement of Messrs. Dun, Wiman & Co., in relation to the failures in the United States, which had increased in the same proportion as they have increased in Canada. What was the statement of the same firm in relation to Canada itself, last fall, in the city of Montreal, which, I suppose, I may say is, to a very considerable extent, the barometer by which may be tested the commercial condition of the Dominion of Canada? There were parties in that city attempting to create almost a panic in connection with commercial matters, and Mr. W. W. Johnston, manager of Dun, Wiman & Co., Montreal, published the following circular, dated 28th October, 1883:—

"It is to be deeply regretted that sensational rumours and innuendoes reflecting upon the collective and individual credit of our banks and merchants are daily circulated. For a month past every day has brought with it a crop of these exciting causes of uneasiness. No class of trade interests being exempt from attack.

"In our opinion, after gathering pretty close data at most points, there is no good reason for apprehending any general commercial distress. The conditions which lead to general weakness are largely non-existent. No one short crop will cause any great or lasting trouble. With the effect still felt of previous fair harvests in our favour, the temporary evil of one low average growth can well be endured. Commercial interests will still maintain sufficient vitality to be secure from serious interruption.

"Most of the stoppages we have seen have been created by the most natural causes—would occur in the best of times and carry but little real significance with them—in so far as their reflection upon a community is concerned. If such interests drop quietly out from time to time it is a positive help.

"Many will remember the excitement of last spring and the character of most of the concerns which went to the wall. Wonder was afterward commonly expressed that the sensations of that time should have reached the pitch they did.

"Within the past ten days, we have been asked the most ridiculous questions about some of our oldest and strongest houses. One of the latest—a house handling a capital of several hundred thousand dollars, with a bank balance in its favour of \$50,000 or more, and with a well managed business. Another, with a balance in its favour of near \$30,000, conservative and able to pick its custom.

"No censure can be too severe upon the authors of these rumours, and if created in selfish interests, they take on a colouring disgraceful and unworthy in the extreme."

That was the opinion of the local manager of Dun, Wiman & Co., in the city of Montreal, in relation to the condition of trade in that city at that time. Well, Sir, I go further. At that time a number of the merchants of Montreal were interviewed, and their views were obtained as to the absolute condition of trade. I will not trouble the House with reading all these statements, but I find that almost every one spoken to gave testimony to the effect that, while business was quiet, there was no ground for serious alarm; there was soundness at bottom, and there was no serious fear as to what the effect of the temporary depression would be. I find, for instance, that Mr. A. F. Gault said:

"The merchants generally, he believed, looked forward to a fair trade in the spring. The importations were considerably less this fall, as compared with the last two or three years. The cotton trade had improved somewhat since the last reports."

I find that Mr. J. S. McLachlan, of the firm of McLachlan Bros. & Co., reported:

"A fair fall trade, but payments had been delayed, owing to the late harvest, which had been fully two weeks behind any previous year. Importations were, of course, lighter than during the past two or three years, owing to the increase in home manufacture. The importations for the spring trade, he thought, would be considerably lighter than last year. In all classes of home manufacture, the prices had been lower than they had ever been before."

Then, Sir, I find that the Hon. Mr. Thibaudeau, whose opinions, I presume, will be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite—unless, indeed, the vote he gave in another place last night may have some effect upon them—but I find that he is reported to have stated:—

"That while the sales have not been very good the remittances have, on the whole, been satisfactory. The stocks held generally throughout the country were light, and business in the town and other small centres was not, in his estimation, overcrowded. There had been a large number of failures during the first six months, but during the latter part of the year the number had been very limited indeed. The importations

had been much lighter this fall than during the last two or three years, and their orders for the coming spring were about 25 per cent. less than last year. The state of the cotton trade had, he thought, been grossly misrepresented, and was not nearly so bad as some people tried to make out. He did not believe, either, that the manufacturers were so overcrowded with goods as had been stated."

Then, Sir, I find that Mr. James O'Brien, of the firm of James O'Brien & Co., wholesale clothiers, reported

"A splendid fall trade, with very fair payments. The stocks held throughout the country were not generally speaking large, and the business in the towns was not more overdone than it had been during the last twenty years."

Messrs. Cantlie, Ewan & Co., reported

"The trade this fall rather quiet, but still what business was being done was a good, sound business. Remittances were very good; the importations had been much lighter this fall than during the last few years, and one wholesale dry goods firm had reported to them that their importations for the spring would be £11,000 less than last year. This did not mean that the sales of this firm would be any less than this year, but simply that they would sell just that quantity of Canadian instead of imported goods."

Mr. Thomas Workman, whose opinion as a merchant I fancy, will have some weight in this House, declared that

"The volume of business doing was scarcely equal to last year, but still it had been very satisfactory so far, and payments had been very fair. The stocks held throughout the country were, if anything, a little large, and there were rather too many people in business in the towns, but he did not feel at all discouraged; he thought that the future was very promising. There would not, he thought, be a very extensive business done during the coming season, but he could not see any elements of danger, which some people seemed to anticipate."

I might go on reading a number of these, but I will not detain the House with reading more than this additional one: Mr. Hutchison, vice-President of the Dominion Commercial Travellers' Association, a body of gentlemen, who have probably as good means of knowing what the condition of trade is, as any person can have, at the annual dinner of that Association, given in the Windsor Hotel, at the end of December last, made this statement:

"Let me say, shortly, then, as the result of personal experience, as well as from information gathered by comparing notes with brother travellers, we do not regard the commercial outlook of the country such as by any means to occasion alarm."

That, Sir, was the position of trade in the estimation of a gentleman whose means of knowing what was going on were probably as good as those which almost any other gentleman could possess. Then I find on December 1st, Mr. Smithers, Manager of the Bank of Montreal and President of that institution, made this statement:

"They did not anticipate any serious difficulty on the part of importers and manufacturers in meeting their engagements falling due in February and March, and they had no indications of any strain on the mercantile community. They could not recall the name of any firm that had made any unusual propositions to them, their lines of discount being all down and very reasonable."

And the managers of the Merchants, Commerce, People's, British North American, Molson's and Toronto Banks, all expressed practically the same opinion at that particular time, in relation to the condition of trade in this country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Might I ask the hon. gentleman, without interrupting him, the date of Dun Wiman & Co.'s letter?

Mr. WHITE. October 20th. Then, Sir, I have an authority as recent as December 1st, 1883, which hon. gentlemen opposite usually regard as a tolerably good authority. I mean the authority of the *Toronto Globe*, which, in a lucid interval, said as follows, in regard to the condition of trade:

"Our export trade has grown rapidly. In nine months of this year the value of cattle and sheep sent to Great Britain exceeded the value of the wheat and flour we sent. This year we have had a magnificent hay crop, and the root crop has been good in many sections. We should, therefore, be able to export more cattle and more butter and cheese, and thus make up to a great extent for the shortage of the

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.)

grain crop. Our lumber trade, too, is depressed, but it is not by any means in as bad a condition as it has often been before. On the whole, the prospect, although clouded and somewhat gloomy, is not such as to justify the alarm which seems to be felt in some quarters."

These are the opinions of a number of persons in relation to the condition of trade. But we have another test, and after all, perhaps it is one of the best tests that can be applied as to the condition of trade, and that is the position of the banks in the different intervals. I find, Sir, the condition of the banks at the end of 1882 and 1883 respectively, gives us an exceedingly good estimate of what was the condition of trade. The following are the figures:—

CIRCULATION AND LOANS.		
	Dec., 1882.	Dec., 1883.
Circulation.....	\$36,501,694	\$33,589,454
Loans on stocks .....	\$16,861,583	\$10,415,155
Loans to commercial companies .....	12,153,533	15,254,866
Discounts.....	144,414,188	133,378,550
Over-due debts.....	3,131,551	4,396,298
Total loans .....	\$176,560,774	\$163,444,869

Then I take the cash resources of the banks, which were, in fact, much larger in 1883 than 1882. They increased in the aggregate—I will not trouble the House with going over the details—from \$41,077,273 to \$52,184,833, an aggregate increase during that time of \$11,000,000. Then the condition of the exchanges was exceedingly favourable to the banks, comparing these two periods. The statement is as follows:—

	Dec., 1882.	Dec., 1883.
Due United States .....	\$ 211,375	\$ 135,141
Due Great Britain.....	1,349,442	1,430,171
	\$1,560,817	\$1,565,312
Due from United States.....	\$11,140,072	\$18,060,156
Due from Great Britain.....	1,813,235	4,225,913
	\$12,953,307	\$22,286,069

The deposits were practically maintained during the period. They were as follows:—

	Dec., 1882.	Dec., 1883.
Dominion Government deposits.....	\$ 8,468,228	\$ 7,032,410
Provincial Government deposits.....	2,192,045	3,176,330
Public deposits.....	96,879,514	96,609,746

But I come to another point, and that is the condition of bank stocks. The hon. Finance Minister has made reference to this matter. I am aware that the condition of bank stocks is not always to be taken as an absolutely accurate test of the condition of the commerce of the country; but it has its influence, and it must be regarded as an important factor in determining that condition. Sir, what do we find? That for eleven banks, Montreal, Ontario, People's, Molson's, Toronto, Jacques Cartier, Merchants, Eastern Townships, Commerce, Quebec and Hamilton, the aggregate value of those stocks on January 2nd, 1879, amounted to \$38,357,000, and on the 2nd January, 1884, to \$48,803,000, or an increase in the value of the stocks of those eleven banks during the period from 1879 to 1884 of no less than \$10,446,000; and curiously enough since this Parliament opened we have had an increase in the value of the stocks of those eleven banks, amounting to nearly \$3,000,000, the exact figures being \$2,977,000. But still more strange, I find that since the speech of the hon. gentleman, since the commercial people of Canada have had the opportunity of knowing what terrible losses this country has sustained, since they heard that there were some \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000 which might as well have been thrown into the sea, or sent off in fire-crackers, as other nations have done, the stocks of these banks have

increased nearly \$500,000. They are actually to-day more valuable than they were five days ago, according to the reports of yesterday's transactions on 'Change, by the sum of \$430,000. I think I may accept that fact as an evidence, at any rate, that whatever effect the hon. gentleman's speech may have had in this House, it did not very seriously alarm those who are in the habit of dealing in commercial transactions, and of studying precisely what is the position of commercial affairs. Then with regard to the shipping trade, how was it during the last year? I find that the total tonnage of vessels arriving in the city of Montreal in 1880, was, 628,271; in 1881, 531,929; in 1882, 554,646; in 1883, 664,263; or an increase of very nearly 111,000 tons last year as compared with the year before, in the tonnage of vessels which visited the port of Montreal. Those figures certainly do not look as if we were suffering very seriously in connection with the commerce of the country, in spite of the quietness which prevailed in many respects. Let us take next the Post Office and Government savings banks. The Finance Minister has already given us the figures, the total deposits for the year amounting to \$17,722,094. There has been a steady increase in those deposits as the following figures show. The increase in 1879 was, \$710,669; in 1880, \$1,845,272; in 1881, \$4,783,715; in 1882, \$5,931,989; in 1883, \$4,450,415. Those were the increases during the last six years. Last year with all the depression of which we heard, with all the misery that was said to exist among the people of this country, there was actually an increase of \$4,500,000 in the deposits of the people in the Government and Post Office savings banks of the country. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to say that he did not regard those figures as an absolute evidence of prosperity, or as a thing to be rejoiced at. He told us that they indicated two things: First, that the Government were paying 4 per cent. for money, which, in the ordinary banks of the country, was worth only 3 or 3½ per cent., and that therefore they were out-bidding the chartered banks for deposits of the people's earnings. Then he told us further, that it was an evidence that this money, which was lying in the Post Office and other Government savings banks, ought to be employed in ordinary commercial or industrial pursuits outside. As to the latter argument I confess I was somewhat astonished when I found the hon. gentleman after laying down that doctrine, telling us that already there were ten millions of the people's money in this country invested in non-productive industries. What does the hon. gentleman want? If the people put their money in the savings banks they are told that they are making a great mistake, that they should put it in the productive industries. If, on the other hand, they put their money in productive industries, they are taunted with putting ten million dollars of their money in what the hon. gentleman describes as non-productive industries, to the great loss and danger of the people of this country. But is it a fact that the Government are out-bidding the chartered banks for these deposits? If that argument were true the hon. gentleman should be able to show that the deposits in the regular banks of the country have decreased during the period to which he refers; but so far from that being the case I find that from the 31st of July, 1879, to the 31st July, 1883—and, as I have shown from the other figures I have quoted, they were practically the same at the end of the year—there was an increase in the deposits in the ordinary chartered banks of the country of no less than \$35,393,180. So it cannot be said by any process of reasoning that the country has lost in consequence of these deposits having been made in the savings banks. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman did not always think it was a bad thing to cite the deposits in the savings banks as an evidence that the country was tolerably prosperous. I am not going to quote hon. gentlemen against themselves, because I think that is a practice more honoured

in the breach than in the observance; but, I think, we may fairly in this case, when the hon. gentleman comes back to us as he does, announced in advance as the financial exponent of the party of which he is a member—I say we may fairly refer to what he said, not on the floor of Parliament, but in the most formal way in which a Minister can make such a statement, namely, in a circular addressed to investors in England, as an evidence of the views he entertained at that time. I find in that circular, issued in 1874, Mr. Cartwright stated:

"The deposits in savings banks and societies have increased from £1,240,059 sterling, in 1867, to £3,754,820 sterling, in 1875."

At that time it was a matter to be rejoiced at, a matter to be presented to the investors in England as an evidence of the prosperity of this country, that there were large deposits in the savings banks, and the hon. gentleman very properly used it for that purpose. But to-day, when he finds that those increases stand in the way of the gloomy picture which he desires to paint, he tells us that these figures are an evidence either that the Government have been out-bidding, and improperly out-bidding, the banks for deposits, or that money has been put in the savings banks which should have gone into productive industries outside. As to this question of money going into productive industries, I may point out that of this \$17,750,000 at deposit in the savings banks at the close of last year, no less than \$11,976,237 were in the Post Office savings banks. Now it is well known that a depositor of the Post Office savings banks cannot have at his credit, at any time, more than \$1,000. Well what do we find? I find that there are, at this moment, no less than 61,063 depositors in those Post Office savings banks, persons who have accounts in those institutions, and that the average amount to the credit of each depositor is considerably under \$200. Now, I think, we may fairly assume that the 61,000 persons who average \$200 each in the savings banks of the country, are hardly in a position to invest in those productive industries which the hon. gentleman says ought to have absorbed this money, but that, on the contrary, a fair inference from the figures is, that the people of Canada, the working people of Canada, the ordinary wage-earners of Canada, are the persons who have been depositing, and are keeping accounts in the Post Office savings banks of this country, and that the fact that this large amount lies in these banks to their credit, ought to be the best evidence we can have, that there is no such distress in Canada as the hon. gentleman desired to picture. We are told that there is great destitution among the people; and the hon. gentleman referred us—and indeed we were referred once before in this Parliament—to the fact that here and there soup kitchens have been established, as evidence that the National Policy, forsooth, has not succeeded. Now, Sir, there are, undoubtedly, in all our large cities and centres of population, the poor who have to be attended to. It is one of the glories of this country, I think, that by a system of voluntary contributions from the people, in Montreal—and I believe the same remark applies to Toronto and other cities—commodious establishments have been erected which are devoted expressly to the care and maintenance of the poor, whom we are told by Him who spake as never man spake, we will have always with us. It is quite true that we have this class of people in the country; but let me give you one or two illustrations. In the city of Hamilton, at the opening of the present municipal year, my very dear personal friend, though political opponent, the present Mayor of Hamilton, made his inaugural address, in which he so far forgot the mayor in the politician as to venture a remarkable statement regarding the terrible amount of misery in that city. A member of the Council at once called upon him to give particulars. He declined to give particulars; but at the very next meeting, if I mistake not, of the City Council, the Mayor came down and withdrew everything he

had said, and declared that among a large number of families, some 110, whom he had visited in company with two of the aldermen on a charitable mission, he had not found more than one or two mechanics out of employment. They were the old, the decrepit, widows and orphans—that class of people for whom we always make contributions, and properly so, and whom we ought to make our best endeavour always to assist. Then, in the Local House, a member representing one of the ridings of Wentworth made a statement regarding the condition of his riding, which the town council of Dundas repudiated as injurious to their town, and as not properly representing the condition of the industries and the people of that town. Again, Sir, before one of the Committees of this House—if I may be permitted to refer to it—we learned that among those who are the subjects of charity in the city of Toronto, 226 are old men and women and 400 children. I venture to say, Sir, that if you will go through our cities to-day you will find very few men able and willing to work who are out of employment. Wages may not be so great as they were a year or two ago. The same conditions are obtaining here as obtain in the United States and in England at this moment. Wages are going down in consequence of the general depression and the decrease in the value of goods. These things happen everywhere in spite of every policy. They are found in England under Free Trade, in the United States under absolute protection, and in this country under quasi protection which in the United States would be regarded as almost Free Trade.

An hon. MEMBER. And in France.

Mr. WHITE. In France as well. Everywhere you find these conditions; you find that working people must take less for their labour, just as people take less for their goods. But I venture the statement, that there is not to be found in the cities and towns of the Dominion any such condition of things as that which we were compelled to face in 1877 and 1878, when, Sir, we had bread riots in the city of Montreal; when we had what were almost bread riots in the city of Ottawa, and when there were, in almost all the cities and towns of this country, men able and anxious to work, who could not get employment. There is no such state of things at this moment. Is our present condition exceptional? I said that the same thing exists in England. I have here an extract from a leading editorial in the *London Daily Telegraph*, of February 14th, which is as follows:

"Times are bad all round. There is difficulty and despondency not in one trade but in all. A Liberal authority states that the year has begun badly everywhere for business men; the depression of twelve months ago has been intensified. On all sides we see evidence that business is unprofitable and that production is to be curtailed. Wages throughout the country are falling fast. It is a common saying in the city that there is at the present time no trade so bad as the iron trade except the grain trade, and that the cotton industries are worse than either. All this will lead to thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands being thrown out of work."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What paper is that?

Mr. WHITE. The *London Daily Telegraph*.

Mr. PATERSON. What an unpatriotic paper!

Mr. WHITE. Possibly. We are dealing with questions seriously in this House; although I have no objections to try conclusions with the hon. gentleman in the other tone if that be the tone he desires to adopt. So much, Sir, for the condition of trade in this country at the present moment. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman told us that this policy had failed because it had not brought about that increased trade with Great Britain which it was predicted it would bring about; and he took for his comparison the years 1873 and 1883. Why should he have taken those two years? Does he not know that in 1873 the condition of the United States as to the price of labour, as to the cost of production, and as to the price of commodities of every kind, was such that it operated as a better protection to the people and manu-

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.)

facturers of Canada than any protection we have had since or before? Does he not know that at that particular time you could buy goods in Canada in our retail stores for almost half—certainly three-fourths—of the price paid for them in the United States? Does he not know that the United States in those days was an exceedingly dear country owing to conditions that still remain, arising out of the inflated currency which had been in circulation. Sir, a comparison between the years 1873 and 1883 is not a fair comparison; but what would be a fair comparison would be a comparison of the period from 1873 to 1878, with the period from 1879 to 1883, and I take these periods, because the trade returns are made in the same way from 1873 to 1878, and from 1879 to 1883, and the disturbances referred to by the hon. gentleman do not exist. And, Sir, what do we find? I find, Sir, that from 1873 to 1878, our imports from the United States increased from \$17,735,678 to \$48,631,739, or an increase of \$1,000,000, and I find that from Great Britain, during that period, our imports decreased from \$68,522,776, to \$37,431,180, or over \$31,000,000, so that during the period in which this hon. gentleman controlled the affairs of this country, during the period in which he had, for the sins of this people, charge of its finances, while the imports from the United States increased \$1,100,000 the imports from Great Britain decreased over \$31,000,000. That was the position in which we then stood with regard to our imports. With regard to our exports, I find that during the same time our exports to the United States decreased from \$42,072,526, in 1873, to \$25,244,898, in 1878, or a decrease of \$16,827,728; and while our imports from Great Britain were decreasing in the enormous ratio I have mentioned, our exports to Great Britain had increased but \$7,197,691. What was the condition of things from 1879 to 1883, during which period the hon. gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches have been in office and the National Policy has been in force? The imports from Great Britain increased from \$30,993,130 to \$52,052,465, or an increase of \$21,059,365; while the imports from the United States, though they also show an increase, show but an increase of \$12,293,114. Our exports to Great Britain in this period increased \$10,849,499, and our exports to the United States \$13,503,222. But if we analyse the trade between the two countries, we will find that our importations from Great Britain of the manufacturing products of that country which it is their interest to export, increased in a far greater ratio relatively than the figures I have just given indicate to us. The imports from the United States from 1878 to 1883 increased \$7,400,594, but the increased importation of raw material and machinery alone amounted to \$9,483,652, or \$2,082,058 more than the entire increase; so that over two millions dollars more than the entire amount of the increase of our imports from the United States, were in raw material and machinery which are certainly an evidence of the growth of manufacturing industry in this country, and went into the development of that industry. If we take railway supplies and settlers' effects, we find that the imports from the United States of raw material, machinery railway supplies and settlers' effects, altogether amounted to \$5,483,240 more than the total increase in imports from the United States. What has been the result with regard to Great Britain? From Great Britain, our total increase was \$14,621,285, in which raw material, machinery, railway supplies and settlers' effects amounted to \$4,693,286, or an increase importation of ordinary manufactured goods from Great Britain of \$9,927,999 or \$10,000,000, in round figures; so that the effect of the policy which has been adopted, so far as that effect has developed itself in our trade returns up to this time, has been that while the importation of ordinary manufactured goods from the United States has decreased \$5,500,000, the importation of the ordinary manufactured goods of Great Britain has increased upwards

of \$10,000,000. I take another evidence of the effect of this policy on the trade of the two countries respectively as to its being a policy inimical to Great Britain, because that was, as I understand it, the point the hon. gentleman desired to make. I find that the rate of duties on imported goods from Great Britain increased from 16·1, in 1877, to 19, in 1883; and from the United States it increased from 08·5 to 14·5 in the same period. That is to say the increase in 1883 over 1877 on goods from Great Britain was 02·9, and on goods from the United States 06, or, taking a percentage of increase on the duty itself, the duty on British imports was increased 18 per cent. on the duty itself, while the duty on imports from the United States was increased upwards of 70 per cent. on the duty itself. That is the result of the statement furnished by the trade returns in relation to our trade with Great Britain. Then we come to the question of the balance of trade to which the hon. gentleman was good enough to refer. I find that our entire imports in 1878, were \$93,000,781, and our exports \$68,158,789, of the produce of Canada alone, not including the produce of other countries, making an adverse balance of \$24,922,993. The adverse balance in 1883, was apparently very much greater, the imports amounting to \$132,264,022, and the exports to \$88,334,031, making an adverse balance of \$43,919,804. But when you come again to deal with the question of raw material, railway supplies and machinery, whose importation was in fact the test of the development of manufacturing industry in this country, I find that, leaving those out, the actual adverse balance in 1878 was \$12,114,919; and in 1883, \$12,401,121; and that in spite of the fact that we had so largely increased our imports from abroad. Comparing 1874 and 1875, during each of which years there was a balance of trade against us of upwards of \$50,000,000, I think we can fairly say this Tariff has not been a failure in producing, as near as possible, an equilibrium between our imports and exports. The hon. gentleman dwelt at considerable length on the expenditures in this country; and he sought to leave the impression on the minds of those whom he addressed, in so far as they were disposed to take impressions from him, that the expenditure of this country had been terribly extravagant, and that if he and his friends had remained in office, \$25,000,000 would have been the limit of the expenditure necessary to carry on the affairs of the country. What are the exact facts? In 1873, the expenditure was \$23,503,158; in 1883, it was \$23,730,157, a difference of \$5,226,999. But when you come to analyse this increase, you find that in the items of the interest on the public debt, sinking fund, subsidies to provinces, legislation, immigration, public works, Indian accounts, militia, and the collection of the revenue, no less than a sum of \$4,537,041 included under those heads. It may be that the hon. gentleman, had he been in office, would have been able to lessen the expenditure in regard to these items. It may be that he could have reduced the interest on the public debt, but judging by the way the interest was increased when he was in office, I may be permitted to have my doubts as to the success of the experiment. It may be, Sir, that he would have been able to decrease the amount payable for the sinking fund. It may be that he would have refused to give any additional subsidies to the Provinces, and in that respect he might have decreased the amount. It may be that he could have decreased the amount payable for legislation, although I think that the members of this House and the people at large will say that, if anybody is responsible for the extent of the expenses of legislation, hon. gentlemen at all events must take their full share of the responsibility. It may be that he could have decreased the amount for immigration—that is a matter of public policy. It may be that he would have decreased the amount for public works, \$861,000, but, if he did, the

people who have had that expenditure in public works all through this country, would have been deprived of the advantage of that expenditure, and I venture to think they very much prefer the condition of things as they exist. It may be that he would have decreased the cost of the militia. It may be that the collection of the Revenue would not have cost so much under him as under this Administration, although, if one is to judge of the results by the five years during which he controlled the finances, he would not have been very successful in that particular. There was an increase on these items alone of \$4,500,000, which, added to the \$23,500,000, would make \$28,000,000 as the amount of expenditure, even if hon. gentlemen had been in office and had exercised all the economies they could have exercised, and not the \$25,000,000 he says would have been the limit of the amount he would have expended. I take the item of collection of Revenue. It is a large increase it is true, \$1,321,631, but two items alone of that increase make up \$1,234,590, and, while the increase in the expenditure has amounted to that, the increase in the revenue from those two branches of public works and post office has amounted to over \$400,000 in excess of that, so that we certainly have not lost much under the circumstances in that operation. But a better comparison to take, as an indication of what would have been the expenditure if the hon. gentlemen had been in power during the prosperous time we have had, and which they tell us would have been prosperous if they had been here quite as much as under the present Administration, is to take the years 1875-76, when they were fairly seated in their saddles and in a position, as they thought, of going on in a prosperous career of administration for years. We find that the total expenditure in 1875-76 by hon. gentlemen, who tell us to-day that they never would have increased the expenditure beyond \$25,000,000, was \$24,488,372, and that, as compared with the expenditure of last year, leaves a balance of \$1,241,785 in excess. I take special items in regard to that. Take the ordinary expenditure which may be said to be controllable expenditure. I find that the increase in the ordinary expenditure was \$684,096, and that the increase in the Indian grants included in that ordinary expenditure, was \$830,636, or more than the entire increase of the ordinary expenditure. So, leaving out the Indian grants, which, I think, I may fairly assume to be to a large extent beyond the control of any Administration, if we are to adopt the principle of feeding rather than fighting the Indians in the North-West—a policy which every one will say is a wise policy—then the ordinary expenditure was actually less by \$146,540 in 1883 than in 1875-76. Then, I take the collection of the revenue, and I find the increase in that was \$1,853,516, of which \$1,773,641 was for post office and public works alone, the revenue from public works and post office increasing during that period \$546,126 more than the expenditure. This leaves an increase for the collection of all the other revenues of the country, outside of the two items of post office and public works, of \$79,875 the increased revenue from those other sources having been \$10,887,296, while the debt and subsidies increased no less than \$1,731,172. That is the position of a comparison between 1875-76, when hon. gentlemen were in the full swing of their administration of the affairs of this country and 1883, which was an exceptional year of great prosperity, when, by a policy accepted by Parliament, and accepted by the country, the Government were generous in their contribution to the public service, especially to public works, for the benefit of the people at large. But we are told that the debt has increased. Well, the debt has increased. It increased, in seven years, from 1867 to 1874, by \$32,596,323, or an annual average increase of \$4,370,903. I do not think the hon. gentleman can complain of that. That increase had taken place when he went to England to

make his loan. When he issued his famous circular to the investors, to the money-lenders of England, I find that he makes this reference to that increased debt:

"The whole of this debt has been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility. Though many of the public works have so far yielded but a small revenue in comparison with the interest on their cost, much of the expenditure has been regarded by the Imperial and Dominion Governments as necessary, not in the interests of Canada exclusively, but also on national grounds, so much so that at various times the Imperial Government has sanctioned guarantees in aid of their construction to the extent of £8,400,000."

That was the testimony of the hon. gentleman as to that first increase of debt. Then the hon. gentleman came into office, and during the period from 1874 to 1879 the public debt of this country increased \$34,665,223, or in five years an average of \$6,933,040. I know that the hon. gentleman tells us that he is not responsible for that increase. I know that he tells us that that increase was necessary because of obligations which they inherited from the party who preceded them in office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE. I understand the hon. gentleman to concur in that view of his argument. Now, Sir, what was the obligation which they inherited? Was it the deepening of the canals? Why, that was a matter under Confederation Act made contingent on the condition of the finances of this country, and, when those gentlemen came into office, so far were they from assuming the obligations incurred by their predecessors that they actually cancelled the tenders sent in for the works on the Welland canal and advertised on their own responsibility for new tenders for the construction of this work. It does not therefore lie with them to tell us that they inherited that responsibility from the party who preceded them. They might, under the Act of Confederation, if they thought the finances of the country did not justify it, have postponed indefinitely the enlargement of the canals, so far as any obligations were concerned. Then they say the Pacific Railway was an obligation. If so, it was an obligation that we should within ten years, or as near that as possible, construct a railway to connect British Columbia with the railway system of old Canada. Did they regard that as an obligation? Did they, when the first contract was proposed to be let in 1880, regard it as an obligation? No; they voted in a body against it, declaring that the measure of the obligation was the financial condition of the country. Therefore, they assumed that responsibility of their own motion which they might have left over, if they had chosen so to do, assuming, of course, that the position they took in 1880 was a correct position. Sir, there were no obligations incurred by those hon. gentlemen, the responsibility of which, in view of what has taken place since they left office, they are in a position to throw upon their predecessors in office. They assume those responsibilities themselves, they entered upon the construction of those public works, they incurred that debt, of their own motion, and having incurred it they ought not in all fairness, in all reasonable decency, to come down and say: "We had to do this because the obligation was thrown upon us by our predecessors in office." No, Sir, they increased the debt by an annual addition to it of \$7,000,000 in round figures, during the period they were in office. Well, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House came in, and they have increased the debt from that time to the present by \$15,476,547, or an annual average increase of \$3,869,037. But, when you come to deal with the progress of the interest charges—which after all is the measure of the burden of this debt upon the people of this country—you will find that the condition is much more favourable to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. From 1867 to 1874 the annual increase in the interest charge was \$207,715 per annum; from 1874 to 1879 it was \$222,345 per annum—and I am now taking the net

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

interest charge, not the gross interest charge. From 1879 to 1883 there has been an actual decrease in the net interest charge on the people of this country of \$60,866. So that if, since the Conservative party came into office there has been an increase in the debt, that increase, measured by the annual burden, measured by the interest charge—which is the true measure of its burden on the people of this country—has actually decreased \$60,866. Then, Sir, if you take the gross interest charge, we find this: That from 1867 to 1874 the interest charge increased \$181,595 per annum; from 1874 to 1879 it was \$279,067 per annum; while from 1879 to 1883 it was \$32,035 per annum. Then, Sir, what has been our position with regard to expenditure upon capital account? The debt has been increased, we admit, but what have we been doing with it? Why, Sir, I find that the expenditure on capital account in excess of the additional debt from 1867 to 1874, was \$13,778,037; from 1874 to 1879 the addition to the debt in excess of the expenditure on capital account, was \$6,720,083, that is to say, those hon. gentlemen added that much to the public debt for carrying on the ordinary affairs of the administration of the country, and not in public works in any sense whatever. From 1879 to 1883, we have spent on capital account in excess of the increased debt \$22,463,439. That is the position in which the two parties stand in relation to the debt of this country. I have not said a word here as to the point which the hon. gentleman disputes, namely, that of the increase of that earlier Conservative period, a sum of upwards of \$14,000,000, was a mere matter of account, was an assumption of the debts of the Provinces, which passed from the people in the several Provinces to the people in the Dominion—I have not dealt with that at all; I have assumed the whole. There is an increase in the public debt which has been made by both parties, and the result, I think, is one of which the Conservative party need not be in any way ashamed. But, Sir, it has been said that the policy of the present Government has been to pile up surpluses, and we are told that it has involved a terrific tax on the people. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman did not always hold it to be a bad thing to have a surplus. I can remember what he said in that famous circular—a circular which is invaluable as a model in presenting the position of this country to people outside. We find that the \$13,000,000 of surplus that occurred during the earlier years of Confederation, was not then regarded by him as in the slightest degree a ground of complaint; on the contrary it was presented to the people of England as a thing we ought to be proud of, as an evidence of the increased stability and the greater credit of the people of Canada. Here is what the hon. gentleman said:

"The revenue has shown a continuous surplus during each year since Confederation in 1867, although it has in the interval been charged with much heavy expenditure of an exceptional kind. The eight years since Confederation, therefore, exhibit an aggregate surplus of £3,443,111 (sterling), not including the sinking fund which has been partially applied in redemption of debt, and partly expended on new works."

That was the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the position of a surplus at that time, when he was able to go to England and present to the people there the fact that during the preceding six or seven years there had been this large surplus in the public treasury. But when we come to deal with the question of the cost of administration we find another significant contrast. The hon. gentleman tells us that the country has been extravagantly managed, and that they would have managed it much more cheaply. Well, let me give one illustration, one contrast, of the manner in which the revenue was collected under their Administration and under the present one. Take the cost of Customs collection. I find that in 1878 the Customs receipts were \$12,795,693, while in 1883 they were \$23,172,369. I find that the cost of collection in 1878 was \$714,527; while the cost of collec-

tion in 1883 was \$757,245; that is, our revenue increased during those years no less than 81 per cent., while the cost of collection increased only 6 per cent. Now, Sir, in reference to that cost of collection, it is to be remembered that in the five Provinces east of Manitoba, namely, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, the number of ports increased during that period from 295 to 314; and yet the cost of collecting the revenue in that increased number of ports was decreased by \$9,919. Then, Sir, the increase in the cost of collection in Manitoba was \$29,770, but the revenue increased during that period from \$223,530 to \$1,764,806. In the North-West Territories the increased cost of collection was \$4,121, while the revenue increased from \$19,098 to \$63,165 during the same period. The outside service in the Customs Department, namely, the experts which have been employed, and the detective service, have been rendered necessary the changes that were made in the tariff, cost \$12,526. Now, let me give you another contrast. In 1873-74 the imports were \$128,213,582, the duties were \$14,421,883, and the cost of collecting was \$567,765; while in the years 1878-79 the imports were \$93,031,787, the duty collected was \$12,795,693, and the cost of collecting was \$714,527; or in other words, during the period that hon. gentlemen were in office, when they were economically managing the affairs of the country, when they were establishing for themselves that claim to condemned alleged extravagance on the part of their opponents, I find that the imports decreased 23 per cent., the revenue decreased 11 per cent., while the cost of collection increased 27 per cent. But, Sir, we are told by the hon. gentleman that there has been increased taxation to the people of this country in another form—that we have enormously increased the taxation of Canada by the increased cost of goods as a result of the protective duties which have been imposed. The hon. gentleman estimated this loss to the country at \$50,000,000; I wonder he did not make it a \$100,000,000. Let me give the House one or two points which the hon. gentleman made with respect to it. Take first the article of sugar. The hon. gentleman said:

"To-day, I am informed by men of high standing in the trade, you could put down at Montreal, free of duty, those classes of sugar which are most in demand in Canada, at the rate of \$5 per 100 lbs. I am informed by those gentlemen also, that if they buy those sugars from Canadian refineries they have to pay \$8 per 100 lbs., being an excess of \$3. We consumed, in 1883, 152,000,000 lbs. of sugar. I will allow a large percentage, 12,000,000, to go into the accounts for the waste in converting that into such sugar as the people require; but every man can see for himself that if you could buy that sugar at 5 cents per lb., duty free, and are obliged to pay 3 cents more to the refiner, what the cost to the people of Canada that extra 3 cents per lb. is. It is \$4,500,000. Of that sum \$2,467,000 went into the Treasury, and \$1,500,000 was lost."

That is the statement of the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, I do not know to what kind of sugar the hon. gentleman refers as being that consumed by the great majority of the people of Canada, whether he refers to granulated or yellows. If he refers to yellows, the price in Montreal to-day, and it has been so for some little time, varies from 5½ cents to 7½ cents, the latter being almost as pale and bright as granulated sugar. And granulated sugar in Montreal to-day is worth 8½ cents per lb. But we are not left to surmise in regard to the prices of sugar: it is a fortunate thing for us we are not. When the hon. gentleman roams into the region of surmise he is immense; 300,000,000 or 400,000,000 are matters of little consequence to him. But in this matter we are not, as I have said, left to surmise; we have the actual facts with which we can deal. As to this sugar question generally, I think the hon. gentleman admitted that as regards the \$1,500,000, which he said was lost, some little advantage accrued to the country from the increased shipping brought to the port of Montreal. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is an important factor in the trade of this country. If we can build up a trade

with the sugar-producing countries of the world, giving to them in return for their sugar, fish and other products we may have to send them, we have accomplished a great deal towards promoting the trade of the Dominion. I find that one of the results of this policy has been that, while in 1878 we imported from the West Indies only 7,500,000 lbs., and from Brazil *nil*, (we had been doing a little import trade with South American ports, but it had dwindled away to nothing), we imported in 1883 from the West Indies 72,750,000 lbs., and from Brazil 36,886,052 lbs.,—a branch of trade which every one will admit is of very considerable importance. That is to say, we imported from those two countries 85 per cent. of our entire import. We imported 8½ per cent. from the East Indies, China, etc., and 6½ per cent. from Great Britain and the United States, this being refined. Now, Sir, in 1878 the total import was 108,951,920 lbs., the duty on which was \$2,567,803. Of the total quantity imported 95,154,570 lbs. were above No. 13 Dutch standard, and the duty paid was \$2,289,840. In 1883 the total imports reached 156,697,834 lbs., of which 4,283,488 lbs. were above 14 Dutch standard—the line being increased to 14 instead of 13 as was the case under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The total duty paid was \$2,666,763, of which \$108,407, was for sugar above 14 Dutch standard. As to the question of the enormous protection given to the refiners under the present rate of duty, let me point out this fact: last year, on the average price in New York, less drawback, \$5.70 per 100 lbs., the duty by the Cartwright tariff would be \$1.43. The actual duty on the refined sugar imported was \$2.50. So that the protection we have had in connection with this duty amounts really to only 12½ per cent. I venture to say there is no industry in Canada with so small a protection, when you come to consider the relation of the raw material to the refined article, as has the sugar industry. As to the question of prices and what we have paid for the sugar: The average price in New York, that is to American consumers, was \$3.64. The average price in Montreal for the same period was \$3.40; so that the people of Canada were actually obtaining their sugar on that basis at 24 cts. per 100 lbs., or nearly a quarter of a cent per lb. less than the people of the United States were paying for sugar from American refineries. But taking it under the Cartwright tariff, with duty and charges added and drawbacks deducted, the average would have been \$8.93; while in Montreal, as I have said, the actual average was \$8.40, or a difference in favour of the present Tariff to the consumer, as compared with the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite of 53 cents per 100 lbs., or a little over one half cent per lb. Taking the consumption at 140,000,000 lbs., the hon. gentleman's own figures, as representing the refined sugar provided for consumption, from the 152,000,000 which were imported last year, have, as a result of this policy, that, instead of paying 2 to 3 cents per lb. more for sugar, as has been strangely stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, we have actually had a sum equivalent to \$700,000 put into the pockets of the people as money saved on sugar, compared with what they would have had to pay under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. Or if you take the price in New York to the consumer, and in Montreal to the consumer, about which there can be no question, for it is a matter which can be ascertained from lists of current prices, then the people of Canada have had the advantage of \$350,000 last year over the people of the United States as the result of our present policy.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. WHITE. When the House rose I was dealing with the argument of the hon. gentleman as to the serious taxation imposed on this country by the extra duties under the

National Policy, and I had referred to the article of sugar, to which he made special reference, and I pointed out what I think is the case, that so far from the National Policy having imposed extra taxation on Canada it has really been a great advantage to the country even in the matter of cheapness. I come now, Sir, to the article of cotton, which, perhaps, is the one that the National Policy has more developed than any other industry in the country. I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, that there has been during the latter part of the last year, a depression in the cotton industry in this country. That depression has been in common with the depression in the same industry in England and in the United States. Here it has arisen from causes which were almost certain to produce a depression sooner or later, and the effect of it has been to cause methods to be adopted by the cotton manufacturers which, I believe, will render less likely a depression of that kind in the future. When you remember, Sir, that as late as October, 1882, the cotton mills were unable to supply the demand in this country, that they were unable to fill the orders which were coming into them, I think you will agree with me that the collapse—if one may use that expression—was more sudden than most persons anticipated. But during that time two-thirds of the cotton mills of Canada were running on ordinary grey cottons. It was one of the most natural things in the world that upon an industry of that kind springing into existence, the manufacturers should first produce that particular class of goods which was certain to find readiest market. During last fall the cotton mill owners met together and resolved to lessen by a considerable proportion the production of their mills. Three mills, and only the three, closed down altogether, and they closed only for a month. The Hudon mill, it is true, closed for some three weeks longer, not because of any question of depression, not because of a want of a market for the goods they were producing, but because of the condition of the water in the St. Lawrence River. But, Sir, in spite of that depression in the cotton industry, one cannot but feel that an enormous development in that industry has taken place in Canada. In 1878 there were seven cotton mills in this country. At this moment there are no less than twenty, and if you take the capacity of the mills into account, these twenty are equivalent to thirty of as great capacity as the seven which were in existence in 1878. The mills are now adopting the plan of producing different varieties of cotton. Instead of producing as they did before, almost exclusively, grey cottons, they are going into, in some cases, forty or fifty different classes of cotton goods; and I am glad to know that an industry which has recently been established—or rather is about being established, for it has not yet commenced work—in Magog, that is a print factory, instead of undertaking to produce the cloth, as originally intended, is going to take the cloth from the other mills and become simply a print factory, and that alone. In that way, I think the cotton industry has before it no such gloomy prospect as a great many persons are disposed to think, but that with the conditions which at present exist, with the low prices at which cottons are being sold, with the greater facilities for production which have resulted from the establishment of these mills, in the early future the cotton industry will resume the prosperity which belongs to it, and which attached to it during the earlier period of its recent development. But, Sir, in this question of the price of goods, if the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite be a correct argument, then ordinary grey cheap cottons in Canada ought to be at least somewhere about 30 or 35 per cent. dearer than in the United States or Great Britain. In order to establish his argument that this Tariff has been an extra tax on the people, he must first establish that proposition. Well, Sir, has that been the fact? I have here a statement in which the American prices are taken from the *New York*

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.)

*Economist* of January 12th, 1884, and the Canadian prices are taken at the mills, and I find that the average prices of goods in Canada have actually been just about the same as they were at the American mills. The American price for Whitinsville 33 inch, is  $6\frac{1}{2}$  for 33 inch, Canadian  $6\frac{1}{2}$  cents; for American Pheham, 35 $\frac{1}{2}$  inch the price of which was  $6\frac{1}{2}$ , for 36 inch Canadian  $7\frac{1}{4}$ ; for American Hero 35 $\frac{1}{2}$  inch, the price was 7 cents; for 36 inch Canadian the price was  $8\frac{1}{4}$ ; for 35 $\frac{1}{2}$  inch American Whitinsville the price was  $7\frac{1}{4}$ ; for Canadian 36 inch the price was  $8\frac{3}{4}$ ; for American Dwight Anchor 36 inch the price was 9 cents; the same width Canadian 10 cents. For Langdon G. B. 36 inch the price was 10 cents; for 36 inch Canadian the price was 11 cents. But, Sir, when you come to the weight of the goods—which after all is a very important factor—taking the goods by the pound, I find that the average of the United States cottons was 23 $\frac{3}{10}$  cents per pound, and of the Canadian 22 $\frac{3}{10}$  cents so that giving the weight of the goods, the price of these cottons was actually lower in Canada than in the United States, the prices being at the mills in both places. Now, it must be remembered in the discussion of this question, that we derive our revenue from Customs duty under any tariff we may adopt. I do not understand that hon. gentlemen opposite propose to adopt Free Trade in the sense in which it is adopted in England. I do not understand that they propose to abolish all Custom duties, and adopt the principle of direct taxation in order to raise a revenue for the purposes of Government. Taking a 17 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. tariff, which was the tariff when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, we have a right to add, on their principle, that 17 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. to the cost of cotton goods coming into Canada, and if then we can show that the goods are cheaper than in the United States, their argument as to the taxation involved in this tariff is entirely swept away.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman seems to doubt that. Does he pretend to say that, adding 17 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. to the cost of the goods in Canada, and with a 35 per cent. duty, which does not add more than 17 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. to their cost in this country, the cost to the people of Canada has been increased by the increased duty? Nothing of the sort. On the contrary, the result of the larger market secured to the Canadian mills by this policy, the result of the investment of capital in those mills, the result of the market being to a greater extent, to an enormously greater extent, secured to those mills in Canada, has been to reduce the cost by the larger output of the different mills. Everyone knows as a principle, which is perpetual, which never varies in regard to manufactures, that the larger the output the less the price at which the articles can be produced, and by securing all those different cotton mills, by having some thirty mills—taking capacity into account—instead of seven in Canada, and with a reasonable assurance of a market for those thirty mills, instead of for the seven, the natural result is, that we get the goods a great deal cheaper than we would have had them under the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and as a matter of fact, we have the goods at a lower price than prevailed under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me give you a fact, which can be verified by anyone who chooses to enquire into the matter, as to the cost of cotton goods in September, 1878, as compared with the cost now. The price of raw cotton in September, 1878, was 11 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents per lb., and the cost of cotton goods, 370 yards to the lb., was 7 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents, or 28.67 cents per lb.; while to-day—when I say to-day, I mean the commencement of this year, to which these figures apply—raw cotton is 11 cents a lb., and cotton cloth 3.35 yards to the lb., is 22 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents a lb.; so that there is only three quarters of a cent difference in the price of raw cotton at these two periods, while the cost of ordinary cotton cloth has been reduced from 28.67 cents per lb. to 22 $\frac{3}{4}$

cents per lb. That was the result of the larger output by these mills. Then, Sir, there is another article to which I desire to refer as illustrating my point; and I refer to it because an incident has recently occurred in Canada which gives an undeniable proof that the duty has not as a general thing been paid by the consumer. I refer to the cost of locomotives, as shown in a contract recently made with the Intercolonial Railway with the Kingston Locomotive Works, in connection with which very disgraceful and unwarrantable attacks have been made upon yourself, Mr. Speaker. Now, Sir, what are the facts with regard to that contract? The hon. member for South Huron, the ex-Finance Minister, will know something about this, for, if I mistake not, he is a shareholder in that Company; and the hon. member for Kingston will know something about it, for, if I mistake not, he is a Director in that Company. Tenders were asked, if I remember rightly, for fifteen locomotives of a certain class, from the United States as well as from Canada. The lowest tender was from the Grant Locomotive Works, for \$10,900. Now, if we add 15 per cent. duty to that—and hon. gentlemen opposite would regard that as the very perfection of a low revenue tariff—the cost of those locomotives brought into Canada would be \$12,535 each. The tender of the Kingston Locomotive Works was \$11,300, or \$1,235 less than the article could be brought for from the United States, with 15 per cent. duty paid on it. Then, there were four locomotives required of a different class. The Cook Locomotive and Machine Company, an American Company, made the lowest tender which was \$11,000 at the shop, which, with a duty of 15 per cent. added, would give \$12,650 as the price in Canada. The Phoenix Works, of St. John, N. B., built the locomotives, and delivered them, for \$11,300 or \$1,350 less than the price for which they could have been imported, with the duty paid on them. Not only was that the fact, but there is another rather remarkable circumstance in connection with this matter. There were four American locomotive works competing for this contract; and the average price, according to tender, at their shops was \$11,250, while the Kingston works tendered at \$11,300; so that the difference between the cost of these locomotives at the shop in Kingston, and at the shop in the United States was only \$50 each in favor of the American manufacturer. And yet hon. gentlemen will tell us that the 25 per cent. duty charged on locomotives coming into the country represents a tax on the people of this country. The hon. gentleman knows that under the tariff which existed before, these works which had been in operation had practically ceased to operate altogether; they were dead—practically dead. But a new Company influenced by the conviction that under this Tariff they would at least have a chance of the market in Canada, bought the old establishment out, and put money into it to increase its capacity, with the result which I have just pointed out, that to-day we are getting locomotives in Canada within \$50 of what they could be got for in the shops in the United States, or, in the contract to which I have referred, for \$23,925 altogether less than we would have been compelled to pay had we bought them in the United States and brought them in and paid 15 per cent. duty upon them. Now, Sir, these particulars—I do not intend to give others, although I could do so—I think certainly establish that the effect has not been to increase the price to the consumer, but they show us what has been the value of the National Policy to this country. I ventured to say at the commencement of my remarks this afternoon, that the hon. gentleman had, because there were certain things that we could not control, taken the ground that we should not deal with those that we could control. What was it that deepened most seriously the depression that existed in this country in 1877, 1878, and the early part of 1879? It was the fact that this country

was being made a slaughter market for the surplus productions on the other side of the line. Everyone knows that at times of depression manufacturers are most anxious to find a market anywhere for their surplus products; and in order, if it may be, that they may keep up the price in their own market for the remainder, they will give the foreign market the article at a lower price. We are told that this is better for the man in the foreign country. So it may be for the moment, while the depression lasts; but the moment that depression is past, and things get back to the position, which I think we may call the normal position, when the necessity of sacrificing the surplus product disappears altogether, then we find that the people who were foolish enough to suppose that it was an advantage to get this surplus product thrown into the country as a slaughter market, have to pay a higher price for the goods and the labour of a foreign country, instead of getting the same article in their own country, produced by the labour of their own country, and at a lower price than they could get it for outside. I venture to say that at no time since the National Policy has been established, has it been of more value to the manufacturers of Canada than it is at this moment. Already, as everyone in business knows, owing to the depression on the other side of the line, there is a disposition manifested to repeat the process that went on in 1877 and 1878. Were the low Tariff such as we had then in existence to-day, our manufacturers, everyone of them, would either be closed up, or compelled so to work as to realise no profit, practically, whatever. But the Policy now in operation is, at least to a greater extent than the old policy, preserving this market to the Canadian manufacturer, is preventing that slaughter to the extent to which it went on formerly, though not to an entire extent, and in that way is doing more for manufacturers at this time than it has done at any time since it has been in operation. It is precisely in times of depression that a policy of this kind is of most value to a country, and not of least value, and he misunderstands the object and the advantage of this policy, who ventures to say that because you have depression you should therefore abandon the policy which lessens and mitigates that depression, and prevents it becoming what it would become, under other circumstances. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to indulge in a screech on behalf of socialism. He told us we were building up in this country two great classes. He told us we were building up a class of subsidized millionaires, and in so doing were creating, as all history proved, according to him, a class of paupers on the other side; that wherever, as he put it, there was great wealth in the hands of individuals, there was to be found great poverty on the part of the masses. And we were told that that was one of the results of our policy, and that we were not only doing this, but doing it to an extent which would justify socialism in this country. It occurred to me as somewhat strange that the hon. gentleman should close this part of his speech by a statement of that kind, when, during the whole of the earlier part of that speech, he had been telling us that the money put into manufactures had all been lost, that these industries had been unproductive, and that instead of being millionaires those who had sunk their millions in manufactures had lost their money. Both those statements cannot be true; but what is true is that this policy is enabling men who have business capacity and capital and who understand their work to go on and reasonably prosper; it enables them also to afford employment in this country for the working people of this country, which would not be afforded under the policy of the hon. gentleman. Now I come to a point to which, I am bound to say, I very deeply regret the hon. gentleman found it necessary to refer in the way he did. This country has some difficulties to contend against. We are just on the highway to prosperity—I am not speaking now of the National Policy, but of the natural pros-

perity which a great country like this is almost certain to achieve for itself. We are just on the highway to that prosperity, if we are only true to ourselves. But we have excited the jealousy of rivals outside of this country and of some enemies within it, and it is a matter of the gravest regret that an hon. gentleman occupying the position which the ex-Finance Minister does occupy, should have devoted so much energy, so much study, and so much labour to the production of statistics in order to prove that this country, if the same conditions continue which, he says, have existed for the last five years, would become absolutely depopulated within the next ten or twenty years. I am bound to say that was not a fair, I am bound to say that was not—I shall not use the word patriotic for hon. gentlemen opposite do not like it—but it was not a true position for the hon. gentlemen to take. He has been at the trouble of getting from his friends all over the country municipal and school statistics and everything of that kind for the purpose of showing that this country is practically becoming depopulated, and when he finds the census stands in his way, he says the census is fraudulent, is not to be believed, is utterly worthless as a guide to the conditions in this country. Well, what do we find? The hon. gentleman selected one or two counties in this country. He selected your own county, Mr. Speaker, and one or two others, and he said these counties are becoming depopulated and therefore this whole country is becoming depopulated. No other fair inference can be drawn from what he said but that he wanted to create this impression. But what do I find in the 86 electoral divisions of the Province of Ontario, for he dealt only with that Province? During the last decennial period the population in 86 divisions in that Province increased not less than 320,000 people. That was not a decrease; that did not indicate that we were becoming practically depopulated, and, Sir, out of the whole of those 86 divisions, there were only 9 constituencies in which there had been any decrease; and in these 9 constituencies the aggregate decrease was under 6,000. Yet, with these facts open to the hon. gentleman, he did not hesitate to give the sanction of his important and high position in this country to the statement that we were continually losing population, that our country was becoming in fact depopulated, that it was becoming a country where we could not hold our own people, and to which therefore the people of other countries would be exceedingly foolish to come. I remember hearing a statement of this kind made many years ago, and I know in England it did great injury to Canada. It was made by Sir Charles Dilke in the House of Commons when Mr. McCulloch Torrens brought in his motion for state aid to immigration in 1870. Sir Charles Dilke then made the statement, which he probably took from the speech of some person like the hon. gentleman, who was indifferent to the effect it might produce on the interests of the country, that there were more people going from this country than coming into it, that we were actually becoming depopulated. I had, at that time, the honor of representing the Province of Ontario, in England, for the moment, in connection with emigration matters, and I had a controversy with Sir Charles Dilke in the columns of the *London Standard* on this question, and by the testimony of the *Toronto Globe*, which, after all, I must say, did me every justice in that matter, I was able then, as I trust I will be able now, to show there was no ground for the statement, but that it was made in the interests of immigration to a foreign country rather than in the interests of immigration to this colony. The hon. gentleman referred to the depopulation of some of the towns in Canada. Well, what do we find? We find that, according to the last Census and during the decennial period, in forty-three towns, incorporated towns having under 5,000 inhabitants each, in the Province of Ontario, the increase of population

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

was in the aggregate 32 per cent.; and we find that in the whole of those forty-three towns there were but two in which there was a decrease in population and that decrease was infinitesimal. Every one knows that in a new country like this, towns spring up at every likely place as railways are built, and that when the result of building a railway does not turn out to be for any particular town precisely what those who went in, in the first instance, hoped it would be, that town will suffer while others near it will grow up and increase. When the one ceases to prosper, the other prospers still more abundantly from the accretion obtained from the losing town. That is a kind of thing that occurs everywhere in a new country. It is no indication of a loss of prestige in the country, nor of a loss of prosperity or a decrease in population. It is simply one of the incidents connected with the development of a country and of the building up of towns in a country, as the result of railway development, and is an incident which, as everyone, as I have said, who has been an observer of things knows, must and does occur perpetually. In the nineteen towns and cities in the Province of Ontario, having over 5,000 inhabitants each, there has been an increase of population during the decennial period of no less than 40.2 per cent. That was the condition of things as to the increase of population in Ontario during the period to which the hon. gentleman referred. It is quite true that people have gone from Canada into the United States; it is quite true that we have not been free from that tendency to migration which obtains all over this continent, and which caused the State of Vermont, for instance, in the decennial period from 1860 to 1870, to lose in population some 7 per cent., and during the last decennial period to increase only one-half of one per cent; which caused the State of Maine to be almost stationary, and a number of the other eastern States to increase in nothing like the ratio in which the western States increased, as people move on from the east towards the west. But what do we find on comparing our condition with that of the United States? I propose, in a moment or two, to deal with the argument which the hon. gentleman dealt with, and which is a perfectly fair argument in a way—that we lose population to the nation, while they simply transfer population from one part of the same nation to another. I shall deal with that presently. But, taking the original thirteen States of the Union, I find that they have lost, of their native population, according to the last decennial Census, 19.08 per cent., while Canada has lost of its native born population 16.47 per cent. I find that even the three States of New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania, have each lost a larger number of their native-born population than Canada has lost. New York has lost of its native-born population 1,189,261; Ohio has lost 1,034,373; Pennsylvania has lost 783,515, while Canada has lost 712,368. Now two of these, at any rate, Ohio and Pennsylvania, are considerably smaller in population than Canada, while New York has probably the same or perhaps even a little more population than Canada. They are three States of the Union which are esteemed to be among the wealthiest and the most prosperous States of the Union. And yet, by that process of migration, by that disposition to go westward to seek for new fields, they have each of them lost a larger number of their native-born population than Canada has lost. Even the western States, even those new States, those prairie regions, where people have gone within the last thirty or twenty or ten years, as the case may be, and where they are building up for themselves homes, even those States are losing their native population. Minnesota has lost of its native born population, going into other States of the Union, 39,479. Kansas, the paradise of one hon. gentleman opposite, has lost 46,085 of its native-born population. Texas, the paradise of another of the hon. gentlemen opposite, has lost 44,315. So, even in those

western States that same process has been going on of migration to the west. Taking the percentages of loss of native-born population by States, I find that Rhode Island has lost 17½ per cent, Wisconsin 15½, Massachusetts 15, New York 23½, Pennsylvania 18½, Connecticut 22½, Ohio 32½, Vermont 53½, Maine 28, Illinois 17.85, and Canada 16.47. Of these ten States all but two have lost a larger proportion of native-born population than the Dominion of Canada has lost. Under those circumstances, I think I may fairly say that the tendency of migration is not a matter to be wondered at, that it is not a matter which is to be cited as an evidence that this country is not prospering. In the earlier part of the history of Canada, we had western counties to which the people could go. Taking three counties, with which I am tolerably familiar, Huron, Bruce and Grey, I find that, in 1851, the aggregate population of those three counties was 35,352; in 1871, twenty years afterwards, their aggregate population was 174,075, and I find that, in 1881, the aggregate population was 216,873. In 1870—well, certainly in 1867, of that I can speak of my own personal knowledge—those counties, the northern part of Huron, the whole of Bruce, and the western part of Grey, were without railway facilities at all. You could put one point of a compass on Mount Forest and describe a circle of 45 mile radius without touching a railway, and yet, when farmers had to cart their grain as much as 90 miles to get down to Guelph, which was the leading market town at the time, when they had to cart their grain or, during the winter, to take it down in sleighs, during that time the increase in population was from 25,000 in 1851, to 174,000 in 1871; and, if anyone will go through those counties, as I was in the habit of going through them some few years ago in connection with railway matters, he will find everywhere, as I, an old Peterborough man, found in the county of Bruce, and on almost every concession line, men who had gone from Peterborough to Bruce to settle there, in order to get cheap lands for themselves and their sons, and to bring their family together, selling their farm in the older county to get new lands and build up a new home in the newer county. But, in process of time, those places got filled up, and then people went further west. We had no prairie region to which they could go. They were compelled to go to the western States by an almost unavoidable impulse, to find prairie land on which to settle with their families, to get land comparatively cheaply, and to make new homes for themselves. They went there, and, as one and another went and wrote back to their friends, that process of emigration, begotten of the best kind of emigration agent, the successful settler in the new district, kept going on; and that, so far as the western States were concerned, was one of the causes which brought that emigration to the western States. Take the State of Michigan, where no less than 147,000 of the population are native-born Canadians. And who are they? They are men who have gone there, attracted by the lumbering operations which are carried on in that State, men who found in it the opportunity for labour which they could not get in old Canada at the time. And in the eastern States, where you find large settlements of French Canadians, they went there to get precisely the kind of work, which happily many of them are now getting in Canada, in the mills and factories of that country, and thus they swelled the population. It is, or should be to us as Canadians, a matter of sincere satisfaction to know that, though they are settled in that foreign country, they have not forgotten that they are Canadians, and that, during recent years, the tendency has been not to go from Canada to the States, but it has been the migration of Canadians coming back into Canada. Last year, if I am correctly informed, there were about 20,000 of the immigrants who came into the country, according to the statement issued by the Immigration Department, who gave them-

selves in at the port of entry as being returned Canadians. Then, we are opening up in the Province of Quebec fields which will give an opportunity for these people to come back to their native land. My hon. friend, the King of the Gatineau, the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright), gave us last year a magnificent description of the country in the rear part of his county. We know that the Rev. Curé Labelle, that patriot priest, who is doing perhaps more than any other individual man in the Province of Quebec to develop its interests, is bringing back hosts of Canadians, and settling them in parts of the country which a few years ago were looked upon as practically uninhabitable. Then, in the Lake St. John region, we have another North-West opening up for the Province of Quebec, and before many years are over, I believe we will find a development of population in those districts which were regarded as of no value—when it was thought that Lower Canada, particularly, consisted of a strip of land along the St. Lawrence, and the rear country was looked upon as an inhospitable wild—we will find settled there hundreds of thousands of Canadians carving out for themselves happy homes, and among them we will find returned Canadians who were expatriated and went abroad to get work which they could not get at home, but who seized the first opportunity to settle in their own native country when new fields were opened to them. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was good enough to attempt to justify the extraordinary statements which have been made by the officials of the American Government as to the emigration from this country. Sir, I am astonished the hon. gentleman should have done it. If he had looked at the simple fact of the number of passengers, as given by the railway companies, who can have no motive whatever in deceiving anybody in a matter of this kind, if he had looked at the number given of those who cross and of those who come back, he would have seen that these statements could not, in the very nature of things, be true or accurate in any sense whatever. Sir, in another place evidence has recently been taken on this subject, and what do we find? We find a statement made as to how these figures have been cooked—and I use the word advisedly—cooked, I believe, as part of the policy which is being adopted, and to which the hon. gentleman who spoke on Friday night, I am bound to assume as a matter of courtesy, inadvertently lent himself—cooked for the purpose of injuring this country and of preventing that development which jealous rivals desire should not take place in Canada. I find that a Mr. Irwin, who was deputy-collector at the port through which all this extraordinary emigration takes place, gives this evidence:

"You asked what method I used and what data I had to go upon in making up the report. It was simply arrived at by taking the four quarters of the year and allowing more for the summer, spring and fall quarters than for the winter, as the ocean steamers could not land at Quebec or Montreal during the winter. In reply to your enquiry as to whether any attempt or pretence was made of counting the number of emigrant passengers, I would say that I never, during my term of office, saw or heard of anything of the kind being done."

That, Sir, is the gentleman who is making these returns, and here was his evidence as to how he made them up. Then he goes on to make another statement:

"I was told to estimate what I thought was the numbers of immigrant that arrived from all trains, etc., for the quarters ending March 31st, June 30th, October 30th and December 31st, as each ensuing quarter came round, and was given to understand that an increase in each quarter corresponding with the quarter of the preceding year was required to be shown. On one occasion my report was sent back to me with instructions to put in more females and children. I asked, jokingly, where I was to get them, and was told to manufacture them. In fact the whole matter was treated as a joke. Someone would say to me, "Where do you get your facts in the case?" and I would reply that "figures were facts and could not lie."

Then, Sir, we have a statement from another gentleman who was also engaged in the work of preparing these statistics which hon. gentlemen opposite are not ashamed to cite on the floor of Parliament to the injury of this country:

"With regard to the emigrants from Canada, the statement was got up from a guess at the probable number of passengers on the different trains. We would average, say, six cars to a train and sixty people to a car, and call half of the whole lot immigrants. At certain seasons of the year, when travel was light the average would not, of course, be put so high, but the whole thing all through was nothing but guess work. We never pretended to make a count of the passengers to know whether they were immigrants or not. In fact it was impossible, as we had neither time or men enough to do such a thing. Charles Irwin and myself got up these returns entirely by guess work and copying off the old returns, and before my time he helped Crawford and others of my predecessors to get them up. The idea was to make the immigration look as big as we could. I know myself of large crowds of men going to the lumber woods in the fall who were taken as immigrants, although we knew perfectly well they would all go back to Canada in the spring. In getting up the returns, the way we got at the occupations of the immigrants was this: We took so many thousand persons, and called so many of them carpenters, so many blacksmiths, so many painters, etc., and the balance we called farmers. In fact, the whole thing, from beginning to end, was nothing but the purest guess work."

Sir, that is the evidence of the gentlemen who were employed in preparing these very figures which the hon. gentleman on the floor of Parliament, in spite of his high position, in spite of the responsibility which he ought to feel attaches to every statement he makes, ventured to say were to be believed; and he actually went through the country getting municipal and school returns, and returns from some towns that happened not to have prospered the last few years, in order that he might sustain the statements which, I am bound to say, are utterly unworthy of credence, in view of the manner in which, as it now turns out, they have been prepared. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman went on to deal with the question of foreign population. He said there could not possibly have been so many immigrants coming into Canada during the last ten years because, forsooth, there were not as large a foreign-born population at the end of the ten years as there was at the commencement. He assumes that 20,000 a year was a very large death rate for that foreign population. Now, Sir, it is impossible for any one, I care not who he may be, to make a correct or absolute analysis of figures of that kind and to find out precisely what the death rate of that foreign population was. I think we may fairly assume that from 1861 to 1871 there were comparatively few immigrants settled in Canada. At that time the mode of keeping immigration returns, accepted as immigrants all who came to the ports of Quebec and Montreal, not at all deducting those who simply came *in transitu* and passed through. It is well known to every one at all acquainted with Canada during those ten years, that there was comparatively little foreign immigration during that time—I think I am right in that estimate, and I appeal on the point to every one who knows anything of the matter during that decade. It follows, therefore, that the foreign population of the country in 1871 was composed largely of old people, and the death rate which the hon. gentleman referred to does not, I believe, in any sense whatever represent the death rate which took place during that time of the foreign-born population in Canada. If the hon. gentleman will look at the American Census, if he will take the foreign immigration that came into the United States from 1870 to 1880, and, following the process of reasoning which he has adopted in this case, if he will take the foreign-born population in the United States at the end of that period and at the end of the previous period, he will find that there were in the United States more than a million of foreign population less than there should have been under the process which he applies to Canada. Wherever that million went to in the United States it certainly is not to be found in the United States now; and in view of that fact, and especially in view of the fact that many of this foreign population may have been merely migrants not remaining in the country, I think we may fairly assume that the process upon which the hon. gentleman founded his argument was not a fair or correct one. Now, Sir, I think it is unnecessary to say any more on the subject of immigration,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

or on the migration which the hon. gentlemen have referred to. To-day, fortunately, we are not in the position we were in formerly; to-day, fortunately, we have our own North-West, to which these immigrants can go; they are not bound to go into the United States any longer. And, Sir, more than that, the Americans themselves are going into our North-West, simply because it is a newer country, and the tendency is to remove to newer countries. Why, Sir, a system of migration is going on in the North-West itself. If you go up the South Saskatchewan to Prince Albert, you will find along the banks of the river two or three hundred settlers who were formerly residents of Manitoba. If you will go up to Edmonton you will find there a number of settlers who made their first settlement in the neighbourhood of Prince Albert or in Manitoba, the tendency being perpetually to go west. But with that country now open, with the opportunity to the Canadian emigrant to go in and find a home in his own country instead of in the United States, I venture to believe that the Census returns of the current decennial period will tell a very different tale from that which the Census told at the end of the last decennial period. And this brings me to deal with the question of our North-West. I know I have been accused of being unfriendly to the North-West, because of a remark I made in this House the other day. That remark has been travestied everywhere as if I were an enemy to that country. Thank God, I do not stand here to-day requiring to assert my friendship to the North-West and my earnest hope for its welfare. For twenty years, by tongue and pen, with such ability as God has given me, I have been an earnest and enthusiastic advocate of the North-West of this Dominion, and I believe, as strongly as I believe I am standing on the floor of this House, that the future of this country depends on its development, and without that development, without its success, the future of the old Provinces is hardly worth considering at all, that is, in the sense, I mean, of an independent and prosperous community. Our people will go westward, and the future prosperity of these old Provinces depends, I say entirely, and I use that word advisedly, as we stand on this continent to-day, upon the development of our North-West country. Sir, I used the term the other night, and I repeat it, that those are the greatest enemies to the North-West who are endeavouring to convince the settlers that they should be "spoon-fed" by the older Provinces. That is the fair and reasonable meaning of my statement. But are the settlers parties to that? I shall require better evidence than anything we have seen in the past before I believe it. People have gone into that North-West country. They have found grievances, if grievances they may be called, which are incident to new settlement. They are nothing, as difficulties, to compare with the difficulties which attended settlers in the old Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; but they are incidents which they bear, and which I believe they are prepared to bear, courageously, hopefully and with the result of finding themselves before long prosperous and well-to-do settlers. The hon. gentleman talked of sympathizing intensely with those who wished their grievances in the North-West to be redressed. I ventured to ask him, across the House, what those grievances were, and he was kind enough to refer to two, and to two only: First, the land regulations; and second, the railway monopoly. Now, Sir, what are the grievances connected with the land regulations? Sir, are those grievances greater than those which have obtained in the neighbouring States, which are our rivals in efforts to obtain population for our North-West? Does the settler going into the Canadian North-West stand in a worse position than the settler going into Dakota, Minnesota, Kansas, Texas, or any other States or Territories of the American Union? No; on the contrary, the land regulations are infinitely more liberal in the Canadian North-West

than they are in the United States. The regulations have been changed, we have been told. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when on this side of the House, changed the land regulations frequently. At one time they shut up against settlement large portions of the North-West altogether, and the last regulations they made before going out of office were to open those lands to homesteaders and settlers at \$1 per acre, but with the understanding that they should afterwards pay what the Government might consider the value of the lands when the railway was built and they came to assess that value. That was the condition of the land regulations when hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power. The present Government have changed the regulations on two or three occasions, and on every occasion they have changed them for the better; until to-day they stand as much superior to those previously in force under the previous Government as it was possible for one set of regulations to be superior to another. We were told there were some reservations in the North-West; that there were large reservations in southern Manitoba and that the Mile Belt along the line of railway was reserved. As regard the reservation of the Mile Belt, that certainly could not be a serious injury to settlers going in there to make homes for themselves. There was a reason for that reservation. There was a disposition to speculate to an enormous extent in town and village lots in the North-West. Wherever a station was placed, there people expected a town would spring up. The same thing was going on and the same disappointment will follow, as occurred in 1855-56, when the Grand Trunk was being built and plans of paper towns were to be found in every hotel, and when the people expected to make fortunes by buying a town lot at a railway station. There was a terrible awakening then, and the awakening in our North-West villages and towns has also been of a very serious character; and I believe, as regards some of them, there will be great disappointment in the future. But it was not desirable that people should be induced to take up lots in the Mile Belt and hope to have a station on the lot and convert it into a town plot. The moment stations were fixed along the line the difficulty was removed, and the Mile Belt was thrown open to settlement; and at this moment settlers can go into the North-West and into every part of it, on the railway reservation, I mean the even numbered sections of the railway reservation, on the even numbered sections of the Colonization Company's grants, throughout the whole North-West the land is open for homestead and preemption, not as in the United States, for homesteading alone or for preemption alone. Every man can take a homestead of 160 acres on the payment of a fee of \$10, while in the United States he has to pay fees running from \$15 to \$28, according to the lands he happens to get. In addition, the settler in the North-West can take a pre-emption of 160 acres alongside his homestead, and he can find himself immediately in possession of 320 acres of good land, on which he can settle with his family. Where are the grievances in connection with these land regulations? Is it a grievance that a man can go there and obtain 160 acres for nothing and another 160 acres for a comparatively nominal sum? No; there is no evil connected with the land regulations of to-day. What is wanted in that country, and what I trust will be given at all times, are civil, kind officials, who will recognize, when immigrants go in, that there is nothing they want so much as a kind shake of the hand and a God bless you. Cold officialism sometimes drives back immigrants and settlers, and any officer who undertakes to be guilty of it in the North-West, should be punished by instant dismissal, however valuable his services may be. That, Sir, I believe, will be the policy in relation to the liberal land laws which now prevail in that country, and I am bound to say that I think there is no grievance of that kind. But we are told that there is a grievance in relation

to the monopoly of the railway. Sir, is it a grievance that that a country like that, which has just been settled, which is just being settled, should have already some 1,200 miles of railway built through it, without a dollar of cost to the people who live in it? Is that the grievance which hon. gentlemen opposite complain of? They tell us, if it were not for that monopoly clause independent lines would have gone into that country and they would have had the competition which they say they desire. Sir, a very shrewd man in this country, a practical engineer, whose name is well known to a great many people, and I venture to say, to every gentleman in this House, I mean Mr. Thomas Keefer, once said, that the longest railroad journey a man could take was the journey from the charter to the rolling stock. Sir, the mere giving of opportunities to build a railway, the mere granting of a charter, does not build a railway. These settlers in the North-West, or rather those who are undertaking to speak in their name, pretend to think that the Northern Pacific would have built railways into that country. Sir, already that bubble has burst. That road has enough to do to take care of itself at this moment, without building branches either into our country or into their own. But, Sir, we have had two or three railway companies, ay, several railway companies, chartered, and what has been the result? There is no difficulty about competition within the country itself. Any man can get a charter from Parliament—I sometimes think they can get them too easily—who will come here and propose to build a railway from Winnipeg to any part of that country, except across that Fifteen Mile Belt. Several charters have been obtained, and how many railways have been built? The South-Western Railway has been partly built, and I believe, but for the conduct of the agitators in that country, who, I fear, have been thinking more of their politics than their country—but for the effect of their agitation, but for the news which went abroad that there is discontent in that country, a disposition almost towards secession or rebellion, I believe that arrangements would to-day have been completed for the construction this season of 112 miles of the South-Western Railway. Let us hope that it will be built by some means or other. Then take the North-Western from Portage la Prairie, westwards, over the old trail which went towards Prince Albert. What is the position of that road? A few miles have been built and an advantage has been derived from it, and to-day the promoters are in England endeavouring to raise capital to complete it. And how are they met? The news that comes is that the enemies of the North-West, the agitation of so-called settler's grievances, have had such an effect upon the British mind that they are met with this agitation, wherever they attempt to get a dollar of money to put into that road. There is no difficulty about building railways through the North-West, and as to that so-called monopoly clause, hon. gentlemen know that it was the policy of both political parties in this country that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be built in such a way, and the territory preserved in such a way, that the traffic of the North-West should have at least a reasonable chance of coming down over our own lines and through our own channels of communication. That was the policy of both political parties. The charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway does not affect old Manitoba at all. It has nothing to do with old Manitoba. There is no privity of contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that railway charters shall be disallowed within the old boundaries of Manitoba, and as to the portion of the Province which is included in the new boundaries, if it applies to that, it applies by the deliberate act of the Manitoba Legislature, which passed an Act sanctioning it. We have had an announcement made on the floor of Parliament which, I believe, will be carried out, that with that railway built north of Lake Superior the interests of this country, in connection with the trade of the great North-West, as well

as the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, will render unnecessary any exercise of the power of disallowance; but that on the contrary, with that road built through that section of the country, the object of the Company will be to secure traffic from the western States over their line north of Lake Superior, down to Montreal and Quebec, and from Quebec to the ports of the Maritime Provinces—that that will be their policy rather than to cut off communication with the American States. And what does the monopoly amount to? Unless it can be shown that it has resulted in practical evils to the people of the North-West, it is simply idle to talk about it at all. I find, taking the matter of freight rates—and I make the statement here from information which I believe to be correct—that during last fall there has been a higher price paid to the farmers for grain along the line of the Pacific Railway in the North-West than along the portions of the line of the Northern Pacific, in the corresponding condition, in the United States. Now what are the relative rates of these two railways, which are corresponding railways, both carrying grain from the west to the east. From Winnipeg to Port Arthur, on the Canadian Pacific, the rate is 28 cents per 100 pounds; from Geneva to St. Paul, the same distance, on the Northern Pacific, it is 33 cents; from Manitoba to the Landing, 539 miles, is 30 cents; from Eagle's Nest to St. Paul, on the Northern Pacific, for the same distance, it is 48 cents. From Brandon to the Landing, on the Canadian Pacific, 568 miles, the rate is 33 cents; from Taylor to St. Paul, on the Northern Pacific, the same distance, it is 55 cents. From Verdun to the Landing, a distance of 615 miles, the rate is 56; from Sully Springs to St. Paul, the same distance, on the Northern Pacific, the rate is 64 cents. From Broadview to the Landing, 699 miles, the rate is 37½ cents; from Glendive to St. Paul, on the Northern Pacific, 690 miles, the rate is 80 cents. From Regina to the Landing, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, 792 miles, the rate is 40 cents; from St. Martin to St. Paul, 790 miles, the rate is 90 cents. From Calgary to the Landing, a distance of 1,275 miles, the rate is 63 cents, and the same distance on the Northern Pacific, the rate is \$1.40. So that the rates you get for the longer distances on the Northern Pacific are actually double what they are on the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is the condition of the freight charges on these two roads, one running through American territory, and the other running through Canadian territory. Sir, there is no doubt whatever that the question of transportation is the great question for the North-West—the one important question, which overtops all other questions. The one question which challenges every man who goes into that country is, whether he can secure for his grain such a price as will enable him to cultivate profitably, and that question is answered by the price it is going to cost him to get at the market. Last night I took the liberty of telegraphing to Mr. Van Horne, as to the rates of freight which are to be charged for wheat from Winnipeg to Montreal during the coming season, and what is his answer? I will read it to the House:

“On opening navigation, rate on wheat by railway to Port Arthur, lake from there to Owen Sound or Algoma, and railway thence to Montreal, will be 28 cents per bushel, including elevator charges, but by railway to Port Arthur, thence by water to Montreal, it will be about 25 cents per bushel.

“W. C. VAN HORNE.”

I venture to say that when you have established the fact that by this road you can take Manitoba wheat from Winnipeg and bring it to the port of Montreal at 25 cts. per bushel, and when we remember that that wheat, at the port of Montreal, is worth at least 10 cents a bushel more than wheat from the Province of Ontario, which practically makes the cost of transport 10 cents less on the bushel, you have done away altogether with the question of monopoly. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have as great an interest, Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.)

almost, as the country itself has in the development of that country. The success of their enterprise depends entirely on the manner in which they can put settlers into the country; and the manner in which they can put settlers into the country, depends entirely on the manner they treat them when in the country. What did we find last fall, when the difficulties occurred in connection with the stories of frozen wheat in that country, and the actual fact of frozen wheat in some cases. When the settlers went to the Managers of the Canadian Pacific Railway and laid the matter before them, they found them ready to meet their views at once; and upon that frozen wheat there was an immense reduction made at once in the freight charges, in order to compensate the settlers, as far as they could, for the damage done to them by this unforeseen and almost unprecedented event. Sir, there is no ground whatever upon which any just complaint can be made in relation to the facilities afforded to that country compared with any other part of this North American Continent; and, Sir, I venture to say—and I am sure people outside of this House, uninfluenced by their party sympathies and their party desires, will agree with me—that there is no part of the Continent of America to-day, similarly situated with the North-West Territories which has the same railway facilities afforded to it, and at the same comparatively low rate of charges. Now, Sir, these parties say that they want branch roads, and I sincerely hope they will get them. If they will give capitalists a chance to have confidence in the country, if they will only hold their hand, and if hon. gentlemen in this House, who are making use of the temporary agitation there for their own advantage will only hold their hand—if they will not create an impression in the minds of capitalists everywhere that that country is not a safe country in which to invest capital, because it is liable to political tumult, and possibly to political changes—if they will only avoid that—then, Sir, I venture to say that money will be got to build these branch railways, and before ten years more the people of the North-West, in every part of it, will be able to realize that their lots are indeed cast in pleasant places, and that they have indeed a goodly heritage. Sir, the hon. gentleman did not refer to other grievances which the people urge. He did not refer to the project of the Hudson Bay Railway, which they ask to be built immediately at the public expense—practically at the public expense—because I believe they are asking the Provincial Government to guarantee the bonds of that Railway. Now, Sir, I sincerely hope that the Hudson Bay route will prove to be a success. I believe it will prove to be a success. It is a commercial question—entirely a commercial question. No building of railways to the Hudson Bay, by this House, will ever make the Hudson Bay route a success, unless you can convince merchants, shipowners and underwriters, that it is a safe route for vessels. But I am sure that the people of the North-West will be glad to learn the announcement made the other day in the newspapers as to the policy of this Government with reference to that project. In this, as in everything else, the Conservative party are the pioneers in good works in the interests of the North-West. Sir, I am sure the people of the North-West were glad to learn that it is the intention of the Government this year to cause a thorough exploration to be made of the feasibility of that Hudson Bay route, and that increased inducements are to be given to capitalists who are disposed to enter on the work of the Hudson Bay Railway. I am not afraid, as one belonging to the older Provinces, as a resident of the city of Montreal, of any effect that will be produced on the eastern Provinces by the opening up of that route. No; Mr. Speaker, the more you can develop that North-West by additional routes, the more you develop its value as a factor in the progress of the whole country. If you can secure to the people there a means of getting their grain out of the North-West by way of Hudson

Bay, and from that point to Liverpool, by a shorter line than the route by way of Montreal, and if, as the result, there is a large increase in the trade and population of that country, I say that will inure to the great advantage of every part of this Dominion; and we may fairly look forward to increased competition for the trade of that North-West, by the older channels, as soon as the new one is opened up. All that is wanted is that people will be true to the country. Sir, it seems an extraordinary thing that men can imagine that by a mere stroke of the pen that country can be converted into an iron girdle of railways traversing it. Wonders have been already accomplished in connection with it. No other part of this continent has seen similar wonders; and if hon. gentlemen will only give that country a chance, and make up their minds for once that they will sink their party and think only of their country—if they will only allow capitalists to have full confidence in that great country, I venture to say that before five years are over, we shall hear no more of Manitoba grievances, because the practical experience of those five years, and the practical results accompanying it, will be such that every semblance of what to-day is regarded as a grievance will have passed away, and the country will be in that condition of prosperity which every man in this country earnestly hopes for it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, opened his speech with a rather violent attack upon the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). He was good enough to inform us that he was a little doubtful, on Friday night, whether it would not be better that he should have replied at once to the statements of that hon. gentleman. Judging by the length of time that he has kept us to-night, listening to him—I will not say wearying us—I think the House will admit with me that it was well that he deferred his remarks until an occasion when he would have more time. There was a slight tone of fault-finding in the hon. gentleman's speech, and he said some things that I think he might have left unsaid—something which, if they were necessary to be said, would perhaps, have been better said by somebody else. It is said that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones; and when the hon. gentleman referred to the fact that my hon. friend from South Huron had been defeated in the last general election, and took exception to the truth which that hon. gentleman uttered, which he knew to be a truth, that he had been legislated out of his seat in Parliament, I could not avoid thinking that it would have been well if some other gentleman had alluded to that circumstance. The hon. member for South Huron, as is well known to the hon. member for Cardwell, had received the unanimous nomination of the Reform party in Centre Huron. The unanimous nomination of that party in that Riding meant the election of the member; and when hon. gentlemen opposite introduced their Bill, which is known in the country as the Gerrymandering Bill, it was found that that constituency was blotted out of existence altogether. The elections were sprung upon us, there was no time to make preparations, and the hon. gentleman from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) ventured to contest a riding that had been held by the enemy for years and years, and which had been strengthened by the enemy by virtue of this very Gerrymandering Bill. My hon. friend failed, and for one Session this House lost his valuable services. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) says we had to open a constituency in order to get a seat for the hon. gentleman. True, but it is not the first time an hon. member of this House has been defeated. If I remember aright, the hon. gentleman's (Mr. White) great chieftain, the leader of the Government has, on more than one occasion—at any rate on one occasion—been defeated, and they had to go a long way to find a constituency

for him, but they did find one. Then there is my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, a gentleman who, I believe, has the confidence of his supporters from the Province of Quebec in this House. The fortunes of battle have been against him on one occasion, if not oftener, and he too had to seek another constituency. And how about another hon. gentleman, just about as distinguished, in his own estimation, as the two to whom I have alluded? How about his finding seats whenever he sought them in this House? How about the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) who alluded in such tones to the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) for not being able to find a seat? If I am not mistaken, the hon. member for Cardwell tried his fortunes in the Riding of South Wentworth on one occasion. I think that was his first venture. The people there liked him very well, but they did not like him quite well enough to have him for their representative; therefore, he was bound to look around and try to find another constituency which would be more kind to him. I am not sure, but I think his next venture, Sir, was in the county of Prescott. If I remember aright, however, that county preferred another man at the time. If I am not mistaken, the hon. gentleman ran also in his own city of Montreal. He has found fault with the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) that he did not run in Lennox where he was known, and said that the fact that he ran away from Lennox was an indication there was something wrong. But we find that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. White) ran at home, where he was known, they would not have him. Am I entirely mistaken in saying that he tried his fortune the second time, but was not more successful? True, after years of repeated trials and failures, a seat was secured for him through the kindness of the leader of the Government, in a constituency where the Tories are so nicely and snugly hived, that it was almost impossible for a supporter of the Government to be defeated. There again you will find that the hon. gentleman should not have found fault with the hon. member for South Huron in going where he was not known, because I venture to say the hon. gentleman himself was a stranger to the people of Cardwell. He had to take letters of recommendation and commendation from the leader of the Government to them, and probably it was as much due to the authorization of the Premier, as in virtue of his own ability, which, I admit, is considerable, that the hon. gentleman is sitting here as representative of that county. I do not challenge his right to sit here. I would not have made these remarks had not the hon. gentleman undertaken to make what I thought was rather ungenerous allusions to the hon. member for South Huron. In this matter of representing a free and intelligent people in this House, it does not become any gentleman to be too strong in the denunciation of those who have failed to secure their election. I have caught myself, in a humble way, entertaining, to perhaps a slight degree, that feeling of egotism which seems to pervade, in such a large measure, the bosom of the hon. gentleman; and I have thought that it would be almost impossible to beat me in my own county; but I can assure him, thanks to the last Legislation, my last election was very tight indeed, and I believe I would not, of course, be of sufficient importance to the country to have any one find a seat for me in that case, as was found for the hon. member for Cardwell, after he had been rejected by four constituencies. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to make an admission to which we all agree. It was a new admission for him to make: that is, that no policy in this country can guard against over-production, or, in effect, stave off depression. How the mighty have fallen! How the times have changed! But after having made this admission, the hon. gentleman used his best efforts to prove that, after all, there is no depression in the country. His

tone was different from that of the Finance Minister who, conscientious man that he is, knew there was depression in the country; he felt it, he was depressed himself, in common with the country; he felt that the promises he made the people, that all the statements he had made with reference to what he would do, were not being fulfilled. He felt conscious that he had claimed to exercise powers which are believed to be exercised by a power greater than he or any combination of gentlemen in this House; he remembered that he had told the people that if they would return him and his party to power, certain results would follow; that there would be plenty of employment and high wages to the operatives, that the price of farm products would increase and that every one would be prosperous and happy. He does not feel so well to-day, and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Farrow), who is interrupting me, does not feel perfectly happy himself. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, as the Finance Minister delivered his speech, he delivered it as a man who felt that somehow or other circumstances beyond his control had so arranged it that that the eggs this year were smaller than they had been previous years, and I tell that hon. gentleman that until he will get the Finance Minister to wave his wand again and get the eggs restored to their original size, that unless he secures to us larger and more bountiful crops and higher prices than he has, there will be uneasiness, there will not be that perfect happiness which we were promised. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to tell us that, after all, though the Finance Minister had intimated by his tone that he felt there was some depression in the country, he did not believe there was any great depression in the country at all; and I call the attention of hon. members to the plan adopted, on more than one occasion, by the hon. member for Montreal—I beg his pardon, I did not say Montreal designedly, but having said so, I ask your pardon, Sir, and the hon. gentleman's pardon, for having made that mistake—but I will ask the hon. members of this House if it was not a natural mistake to make. I will ask them if the hon. gentleman, in rising to address this House, ever addressed us in terms other than these: What are the interests of Montreal? What are the interests of the port of Montreal and of the Montreal merchants? Has he ever lifted his voice on behalf of Cardwell? Does he ever mention their interests? No wonder I made the mistake I was trapped into, of considering him as the hon. member for Montreal. He has done this time and again, but on no occasion more deliberately than on this one. He, the reprepresentative of an Ontario constituency, the reprepresentative of the people, he who is here to talk on matters appertaining to the State, to advocate the best interests of the majority of the whole people of this country, has turned himself into an advertising agency, and advertises certain merchants in Montreal who write him letters. I do not wonder the hon. gentleman will get letters from merchants in Montreal, when he says to them: I want these letters, that I may read them on the floor of Parliament, and having read them they will go into *Hansard*, and, peradventure, by some strange method, may find their way into the columns of that widely circulated paper, the *Montreal Gazette*, and your business will be widely advertised and great good will be done. How very likely that these gentlemen will tell him that their trade has gone to the dogs, and they expect to be in financial straits next week? We can understand the value of such testimony. We do not want the testimony of any one merchant in Montreal, or of any dozen merchants in Montreal, in reference to this matter. We would be pleased to hear of their welfare in the ordinary channels and by private means, but to have them blazoned abroad upon the floor of this House as proof positive that a state of prosperity exists in this country, because these gentlemen say that, after all, their trade is moderately good, is, I think, to do something that is very

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant).

little short of insulting the intelligence of the members of this House. The hon. gentleman stated that my friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) had pursued a very wrong course in criticizing the receipts and expenditure of the Government, that he had made some statements that he thought he should not have made; and then he went on detailing matters, giving us figures, selecting years to suit himself, and he asks us to accept that. There was one very noticeable thing; he did not attack the accuracy of a single figure, as far as the expenditure and receipts of the Government where concerned, given by the hon. member for South Huron, that I remember—not one single one. He attempted to pick out a certain year here and a certain year there, he put this construction upon it and that construction upon it, but as to undertaking to challenge, disprove, or dispute the statements, the figures of the hon. member for South Huron, though he has had some days to do it, I fail to see that he upset any one single calculation he made. And what is the value of the figures given to us by the gentleman himself? He says there are certain receipts coming to us from sources other than Customs and Revenue. While you have increased expenditure upon your railways, and upon your post office, and upon your canals, you have increased receipts from those sources, and they swell the total receipts, and therefore, according to the hon. gentleman, to say that all the receipts show the burden of taxation upon the people of the country is ridiculous, it is a wrong method altogether to apply to it. But will he say that the receipts through Customs and through Excise do not show, do not indicate, do not tell the burden of taxation that is upon the people? And, if he looks at that item, he will find that there has been \$10,000,000 more in that direction taken from the people of the country in the year 1883 than in the year 1879; and, if it was taken from them, I hold that the people, having paid it, have borne that burden. As to whether they were able to bear it or not, is another question for us to consider. That they have paid is true, for it has come out of their pockets and gone into the Treasury. I want to lay down one or two points with reference to this expenditure, for I will not follow the gentleman through a maze of figures, but will just give to you, Mr. Speaker, or recall to your mind, certain facts. As was alluded to by the hon. member for South Huron, when we started in Confederation, we started with an expenditure of \$13,000,000. After seven years of Conservative rule, it had expanded to \$23,000,000. I am willing to admit here, and it is right that I should do so, that there was the admission of other Provinces, that there was the assumption of the debts of the Provinces, and that there were many causes that led to bring that up, but the fact remains, nevertheless, that our expenditure went from \$13,000,000 to \$23,000,000. Then the Reform party came into power; for five years they held the reins; there were increased demands for public service during the five years, as there had been during the seven years before; the public business had to be carried on, and it was carried on by our friends, while in the Government, at an additional cost to the country, not of \$10,000,000 during the five years, but of a little over \$1,000,000; and when they went out, they left to the gentlemen who succeeded them a country whose business was being carried on, if you left out provision for the sinking fund, with an expenditure that was about nearly equalized with its revenue. They left it in that state only for us to find, at the end of five years of these gentlemen's rule, that the expenditure had gone up from the \$24,000,000 and a little over where they found it, till the expenditure for the year we are now in, 1884, will probably show an expenditure of \$31,000,000. That is their record. There may be these ideas that the Finance Minister and the hon. gentleman threw out to blind the eyes of the people as to increased revenue, while there is increased expenditure, from our

publics works, but that went on under both Administrations. For purposes of comparison, the figures hold good; and they are as I have given them to you. I desire to call attention to this one point, and it is a serious thing with reference to the expenditures of the country. Our population increased, I think, at about the rate of 2 per cent. per annum. It would only be natural to expect that our expenditure may go on and increase at something like the same rate as our population. If it went no faster, I do not think there would be great cause for alarm. If it had increased in that proportion, the hon. gentleman would not be to be blamed for having the public expenditure, at the present time, at something like \$27,000,000. That would be about the rate at which it might stand. Instead of that, we find it is \$31,000,000—\$4,000,000 more, we hold, than it should be. Now, the House knows, intelligent business men know, that if a man in his own business, living on \$1,000 a year, suddenly increases his expenditure till he is expending \$1,400 a year, unless his means of revenue has become greater, he is getting into a bad condition; and so it is with the nation; \$4,000,000 of expenditure, if it be fixed and cannot be reduced—and the expenditure of a nation, like the expenditure of an individual, once let out, is very difficult to bring in again—\$4,000,000 of an additional fixed expenditure on the country represents a capital of what? It represents a capital expenditure, at 4 per cent., of \$100,000,000, and there is where we are under the management of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Take the details, if you will, of their expenditure. Take the controlling items in that. Take the cost of Civil Government, that they found such fault with the Mackenzie Administration for, because it increased somewhat under them. Where is it? In every Department almost, I believe, you will find an increase. Take the matter of immigration. In that, you will find a tremendous addition to the burden that the people have to carry; and on that one point I might remark that, if there is any expenditure that the people have a right to find fault with on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is in reference to the expenditure which they ask on immigration, because, when the House was asked to vote the immense sum of money and the immense number of acres of land we voted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, one of the strong reasons given to us why we should do it was that they would become such great immigration agents, that they would people up our North-West country, and lift the burden of immigration expense we had to bear off our shoulders. I remember the language used by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who said that millions of money would be saved to us in that way. I remember the language of the Speech from the Throne, which told us that we must be in haste to pass that bargain, as no systematized effort by the Company could be made to bring in that immigration until we did. I remember the language of the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beatty), in moving the Address, when he urged it as one of the great advantages to be obtained. I remember the language of the hon. the Premier, urging that we should give immediate and continuous attention to that Bill, in order that the Syndicate might be in a position to bring this about. And yet, after all that has been done, what are the facts with reference to our immigration expenditure? Why, in 1879-80 we were asked to vote \$183,204. Then our bargain was made, but the next year was the amount reduced? No; we were asked to vote \$250,812, or \$67,608 more; and the next year we were asked to vote \$253,061, an increase of \$69,857; and the next year we were asked to vote \$437,734, an increase of \$254,530. For the current year we were asked, in the Estimates, to give \$520,221, an increase of \$337,017; and in the Estimates before us now, for 1884-85, we are coolly asked to give \$526,375, or an increase of \$343,171 more than we did in 1879-80. Where are the

promises of hon. gentlemen opposite? What are the Syndicate doing in this matter? Where is the return? Where is the value for these millions of dollars that we have expended on bringing immigrants into this country, or trying to get them to come here? And the immigrants that we have already brought to this country, are they here now? We have had laid on the Table, within the last few days, petitions yards in length, with hundreds of signatures, from the working men of the towns and cities of this country, who know whereof they speak, and who tell us that there is no room for any more immigrants. The mechanics of this country say: "If you bring them here you simply bring them here to find either that there is no work for them in those branches of mechanism in which they are instructed, and they must drift over to the other side, or they must displace an equal number of our own men." Thus the process will go on of swelling that exodus which, I am sorry to say, notwithstanding the elaborate attempt of the hon. member from Cardwell, to prove the contrary, is going on from this country to an extent that is deplored by every hon. member on this side of the House, as it is deplored by every member on the other side. It is time this whole question came under review; it is time we addressed ourselves to ascertaining whether our present policy is wise. If we were bringing people from the older countries and peopling our North-West with them, then it would not be so bad; but from the figures submitted by the hon. Minister of Railways, we do not find any such increase as would warrant the expenditures we have made in reference to this one item. Now, Sir, I would just like to ask hon. gentlemen what they think with reference to the question of surpluses at the present time. Is a large surplus a good thing or a bad thing? Last year, when a surplus of some \$8,000,000 was announced, there was great cheering, great clapping of hands, great applause from hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Finance Minister. This year he announced that the surplus will not be anything like \$8,000,000—that it will be something like \$1,000,000—and we have returns for six or seven months of the current year, which would hardly warrant us, I think, in looking even for that amount. What has become of it? What has become of our surplus? "Oh," say the hon. gentlemen opposite, "the Opposition should rejoice, because they thought a surplus was not a good thing to have, anyway." Well, Sir, the Opposition would rejoice if the surplus had been brought about by a reduction of taxation on the people of the country. If articles that are charged 35 per cent. had been reduced even to 30 per cent., we would have given the hon. Minister some credit; if the articles of prime necessity such as breadstuffs and coal, were relieved from taxes and had been given more cheaply to the people, who are suffering from cold during this inclement season of the year, and there had been a decrease from that cause, then the Opposition would have said there was some reason in it. But we say that this surplus has shrunk from \$8,000,000 to \$1,000,000, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, while this excessive rate of taxation remains in full force; and we say the inference is, that the hon. gentleman has overstrained the powers of the people, he has discounted their powers, he has in past years been drawing from them the wealth which now they need, in order to enable them to tide over the difficulties that I fear, from his own statement, are in store for us. Now, we have had, for three or four years past, very good times, the hon. gentleman tells us. Well, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, it is true, we are not in a desperate condition in Canada. I believe there is a great deal of reserve strength, even now, among the people of Canada, that may enable us to tide over the difficulties that are before us; but, Sir, it will require prudent management on the part of our business men, it will require prudent manage-

ment on the part of the Government of this country, to enable us to tide over successfully the hard times which are before us. Sir, if the country is to get safely over this period of depression, how is it to do it? How have we got into this condition? Sir, because we have been living faster than we ought to have lived in this respect. And if the people of this country, having brought large sums into it from sources, one of which has failed them this year, find that now, when they have less to expend, that their powers to economize are lessened, that trade is depressed, how much of that is due to the Finance Minister, one cannot say. He is a happy man, at any rate, amidst this depression [or at least he tries to be. When he has a surplus he rejoices in it; when he has not a surplus he rejoices in it, because, he says, the imports have diminished and therefore he has not got as much revenue. But here let me point out to the House what has been the great cause of the prosperity of the country for the past few years, and in doing that I would ask the attention of the House to the consideration of the fact that we cannot in any measure sympathize with the ideas thrown out by the hon. Minister and those who supported him in days gone by, that this excessive taxation, that this high tariff of his, was after all a source of the wealth that is in this country. Where, Sir, shall we look for the secret of the prosperity this country had during the past three or four years, despite the depleting efforts of the Minister in taking money from the people to the extent of millions and tens of millions, that ought to be theirs now, in order to enable them to tide over the commercial depression? Sir, the year 1879 was one of the worst years we ever had in this country, and the hon. member for Cardwell has quoted the price of bank stocks for that year. But 1879 was not a year of the Mackenzie Government; it was a year during which the National Policy was in existence, and it was a year in which there was more misery, and more failures, as the hon. member for Cardwell told us, than there has been in any year since. And how did we get out of it, Sir? How did we enrich ourselves? Was it by taxing ourselves to double the amount, and taking it out of our already impoverished pockets that we became wealthier? Who will venture to say so? From whence did the money come? The secret lies in the Trade and Navigation Returns, which show this fact, that our exports during the past four years exceeded those of 1879 by no less than \$84,000,000. I call the attention of the House to the circumstance that on three items, lumber, animals and their produce, and agricultural products—three items in behalf of which no sane man would venture to say the National Policy would have the slightest beneficial effect in any shape, manner or form—from those three items, during the last four years, there have been derived of foreign gold \$80,000,000 more than in 1879. That is the secret of our prosperity. Any man can see it; it does not require any peculiar talent to discover it; \$80,000,000 more of gold in circulation could not fail to give a wonderful stimulus to the springs of commerce, and beneficial results could not fail to flow therefrom. But what has become of the money? How is it, that so soon as we have a partial failure of crops we begin to see signs of, and to hear rumours of, and to feel the effects of depression? The Finance Minister is largely responsible for locking up the money. By his trade policy he has caused a vast amount to be locked up as unproductive capital in manufacturing industries, as the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has pointed out. By mad speculation in the North-West, millions more are locked up. Moreover the Government have taken millions more out of the pockets of the people; and we feel that these extra \$80,000,000 have not made us feel so easy as we have a right to expect. I would ask the Finance Minister to consider whether he has not locked up some of the capital in unpro-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

ductive manufacturing industries. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) and the Finance Minister, say that we, the Opposition, occupy a peculiar position in arguing this question, because we said at one time that this so-called National Policy would increase the price of articles to the consumer, that it would enrich manufacturers, and then we said that manufacturers are being ruined. Both propositions are correct. In the first stage of high protection, you have a short supply, a large demand and high prices. When you reach the second stage, over-production, you have unproductive capital and reduced prices to the consumer; but under a high Tariff, it is possible for manufacturers to combine, and combine they do, and restrict production, and thus hold up the prices to the consumer and make their capital available. I will give the hon. Minister some of the effects of the Tariff. But before doing so I will allude to a personal remark in reference to this matter, as the Finance Minister has on this, as on other occasions, sought to bring me in as a sort of godfather to his Tariff, and has sought to cover himself by a statement made by me in 1876.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was the best speech you ever made.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why, I know it by heart. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken out the *Hansard*, because if he will read the connecting sentences to the statement to which he referred, he will be ready, if he is an honourable man, to inform the House that when he quoted that remark he quoted it out of its connection; that he forgot to tell the House that the hon. member for Brant emphatically declared he was not a protectionist; that he was not one of those who believed in building a Chinese wall so high as to shut out trade; that he was in favour of a defensive policy; that he believed, when goods came in large quantities, under a Tariff framed for revenue purpose, it was the duty of the Finance Minister to levy duties on such articles, and thereby give the benefit to the country. That I said then, and I stand by it. But when the hon. gentleman quoted me, he utterly misquoted me in that connection. The hon. gentleman was laying down the proposition that the \$16,000,000 extra taxes taken out of the pockets of the people beyond the wants of the public service, were not paid by them but by producers abroad—foreign manufacturers. The hon. gentleman adduced, as proof the speech of the hon. member for Brant, in 1876, from which he read a quotation—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him? I said from two causes. One was that it was not paid by the people, because manufacturers abroad paid it in part; and the other was—and I quoted the hon. gentleman in support of it—that the middleman lost some of his profits and the consumer did not pay them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am glad the hon. gentleman has made the explanation, because he left the impression that I had said that the producers paid the duty on articles coming in. If he quoted the language, as regard to middlemen, then it was right enough. I pointed out, however, that a change had been made with respect to goods coming into this country, and I instanced the benefit resulting from consumers paying no more, not because the foreign manufacturer paid the duty, but because the prices of articles on which middlemen had large profits, were somewhat reduced.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is the point.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is true. It is a matter of satisfaction to me to know this, that while the hon. gentleman endeavoured to say something in order if possible to make me feel a little bad in regard to the reentrance

into Parliament of the hon. member for South Huron, as to the leader of the Opposition having more faith in the hon. member for South Huron than the humble individual now addressing the House, there is no quarrel on that point. If that view is entertained by the leader of the Opposition, and I have not the slightest doubt it is, my view entirely corresponds with that of the hon. gentleman. If it were a matter of any consequence to me, I have this drop of consolation in my cup, that the hon. Finance Minister, the gentleman ruling, so to speak, the destinies of this country, in an important particular, has declared in this House that the sentiments which were enunciated by the humble individual now addressing it, were the grand principles which had been embodied in the National Policy, and that he had grasped those grand principles of fiscal legislation, and that the hon. gentleman was now carrying them out. But I would point out this, that, like other pupils who conceive too high an opinion of their abilities and undertake to do work better than their masters can do it, the hon. gentleman, if he has misunderstood the principles laid down by me, should resign his position and give way to the man from whom he has learned those great ideas and not attempt to spoil a good design by bad workmanship. That, I think, would be the only right and proper course to adopt. Again, the hon. gentleman has referred to the duty on cigars, a sweet morsel which he has rolled under his tongue. The hon. gentleman went up to Strathroy and met me on a public platform there when I made my statement; but though he had two and a-half hours in which to open the meeting, and I had only one hour, and though he had all night, if he had chosen to, reply to my remarks, he was not equal to the task of answering them at that time. It was only when he came to the Capital and got some officer of the Department to make up a statement which he has laid before this House, that a reply was attempted; but unfortunately for him this is a statement which it would have been better if he had not submitted; because, while the hon. gentleman seems determined, on every possible occasion, to wrestle with this matter of the duty on cigars, every time he attempts it, it trips him, and he appears to worse advantage than he did before. He tells us that 21,000 odd German cigars were imported into this country, but surely he must mean pounds; if he does not mean that, I cannot tell what he does mean. But if he means 21,000 cigars, at his calculation, it would make them \$500 a thousand, or 50 cents for each cigar. He must have got matters mixed in some way, for I find that he works out the calculation, and he says there was 40 per cent. duty at that time. If he will go home and work out the proposition himself, and not trust to the gentleman who appears to have led him astray on this occasion, he will find that the effect of the change of the duty, which was made on that article by my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), would have been this. What were the facts? At this point, I may say that, as the hon. gentleman appears to refer to this matter, because he desires, if possible, to lead the House to believe that I have a personal interest in the matter, cigars did not form at any time a very large portion of my business, but that I have been for some months out of it altogether, so I advise him not to refer to this subject again for that reason, especially as it appears to place him at such a disadvantage. The state of protection on that article was from 2½, 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 per cent., according to the cost of the article. The average protection was 11 per cent. and the change in the Tariff raised it to 15. When the hon. gentleman from South Huron revised his Tariff at that time—the necessities of the revenue demanding it—the duty was increased to 15 per cent. That was the change made in the Tariff at that time, and it was under the operation of that change that the beneficial results, which I pointed out, flowed. If the present Finance Minister can find any way to increase

his revenue, and at the same time produce the beneficial effects which flowed from the change in the Tariff which was made by my hon. friend from South Huron, by imposing not more than 15 per cent. duty, I do not think the people of this country will find fault with him. I may say, with regard to the article of tobacco, that I believe the people of Canada are willing to pay rather a higher duty upon it than upon such goods as cottons and woollens and other such necessities of life, such as the hon. gentleman has taxed. I think if the hon. gentleman refers to this subject, he will find that he has accomplished nothing by it, and that, in the future, knowing now that I am not now interested in the change of Tariff, and was never interested, except to a very small extent, he will see that it is rather strange that I should have given up this portion of my business at a time when the protection upon that article is double what it was under the previous Finance Minister's Tariff. I pass on to say this, that I have in this House, and on the public platform, laid down what I considered was the policy followed by the Reform party when they were in power—the policy of securing revenue by Customs taxation, and levying duties on articles made in this country, which, while securing a revenue, would afford an amount of protection to the people of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite assert that we are free traders, and that we desire to close the manufacturing industries of this country. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has lectured us upon this matter. He has denounced the policy of the hon. member for South Huron, and the policy of the Mackenzie Administration, because, as he said, they would not give increased protection to the manufacture of this country, during the time of depression, and thereby add to the taxation of the people. Does that hon. gentleman remember his views, as expressed by a resolution at the time of the Mackenzie Administration, when my hon. friend for South Huron was Finance Minister? The hon. member for Cardwell has been an active member of the Dominion Board of Trade in years gone by; he has spoken there with ability, he has moved resolutions there, and he has almost taken charge of the proceedings of that body, which has given to the world, in days gone by, in its published reports, all the information he presented in reference to these matters. What were his views at that time? Why, Sir, in an amendment to a motion which was moved by Mr. Wilkes, of Toronto, the hon. member for Cardwell, moved the following resolution:—

“That without expressing any opinion on some of the details of the present Customs Tariff, or the anomalies, which are inevitable on all tariffs, this Board is of opinion that no change should be made in it unless the exigencies of the public service—”

I think I have heard that hon. gentleman use the term, exigencies, on other occasions; it seems to be a favourite word with him—

“demand a larger revenue, and that in such case any increase to be made shall be made in accordance with the principle of the present Customs tariff which, while not interfering with the commerce of the Dominion, affords incidental protection to the manufacturers; that this Board is further of opinion that the permanency of the fiscal policy of the country is most important, alike to the commerce and manufactures, and that no change should be made in the Tariff unless demanded by the absolute exigencies of the revenue.”

That was the resolution of the hon. member for Cardwell and he made a speech on that occasion, in which he made this statement:

“If we could have a 20 per cent. tariff, and the assurance that it must be permanent, I would go in for it. But to my view, if we got that 20 per cent. tariff, strong opposition would arise on the ground of too high taxation. If such a tariff were imposed, and afterwards reduced, it would inflict more, much more, harm on our manufactures than if it had never been imposed. What is wanted is permanence. The 15 per cent. protection gives us fair assurance of that, and under it our manufactures have prospered in the past. It has placed our manufacturing industries in a position of which we may well feel proud. It is a tariff not likely to be lowered in accordance with the views of a fancy financier like Mr. Wilkes, and therefore it may be looked upon as a fair permanent tariff,

and as a permanent tariff which ensures to every man engaged in manufacturing industry adequate protection for all reasonable time to come. A 15 per cent. tariff means more than 15 per cent. protection to manufacturers. There is the cost of transport of goods from the other side of the water, which amounts on an average to at least 5 per cent., so that there is now a protection equal to 20 per cent. That ought to be sufficient for any industry suited to the country; and as to others, it would be unwise to attempt to sustain them by fiscal props."

Then, again, we find that an amendment was moved by Col. Walker, of London, declaring that a 15 per cent. Tariff was enough, and the hon. member for Cardwell withdrew his amendment, because he believed in Col. Walker's amendment, and he voted for a solemn declaration that 15 per cent. was a tariff high enough for all reasonable time to come. Still the hon. gentleman undertakes to lecture us, on this side of the House, because we would not increase the duty—and what for? For the exigencies of the public service? No, Sir; and yet that was the only reason which he thought could be given for being in favour of a 15 per cent. tariff, and yet he is found supporting a 35 per cent. tariff, a tariff which gives a 40 or 50 per cent. protection on refined sugar. Was it the exigencies of public service in this case? No, Sir, but the exigencies of party, and the exigencies and other things which did not operate upon the hon. gentleman in times gone by. Now, I come to speak of another subject, which the hon. gentleman touched upon very gingerly, a subject upon which the Finance Minister, in years gone by, has laid down very strong ground, and that is the question of the balance of trade. That is another of those awkward things which, at this particular time, have got out of joint. The Finance Minister has given the House the benefit of his views on that question on more than one occasion. I would just remind him now of the position he took at one time, and I ask him, judging from that position, to tell us what he supposes this country is coming to. The hon. gentleman is reported, in the *Toronto Mail* of February 24th, 1881, as saying this:

"During the last two years we have nearly equalized our exports with our imports (Cheers). Whatever free traders may say our people cannot understand the theory that the larger the excess of our imports over our exports the more prosperous is the country. We say that, as with the individual, so with the nation, and that if he expends more than he receives poverty stares him in the face. If, on the other hand, his receipts exceed his expenditure, his condition is hopeful. The latter is the condition of the Dominion, if we take into account our receipts for freights (Cheers)."

In his Budget Speech in this House in 1880 he said:

"At the close of the year we will find that by the reduction of the imports and the increase of exports, the balance of trade, which some gentlemen think is of no importance, though I think it is of vital importance to this country, will for the first time in the history of the Dominion, be in our favour."

In his Budget Speech of 1879 he said this:

"There are other difficulties. The volume of imports has not much diminished. Regarding the matter as I do, I think it is to be regretted that the volume of imports has not been materially reduced. I look upon large imports, ever since the Dominion was organized, showing a large balance of trade against us, as one of the causes of the trouble with which we have now to contend—one of the difficulties that it is our duty to remedy. Imports have been decreasing to a certain extent, but are still very large, showing distinctly and clearly, in my judgment, that they ought still further to be diminished."

Again he said:

"It appears to me that we should turn our attention to the best means of reducing the volume of our imports from all parts of the world."

The hon. gentleman was convinced that the country was going to ruin if the balance of trade was against us. He laid that down as a proposition, and he said that it was necessary that our attention should be turned to it; and as soon as his massive intellect is turned to any subject, you may be sure that that subject shall be attended to. Well, turning his attention to the mass of our imports and exports, did he succeed in equalizing them? No, but he succeeded in increasing our imports \$24,000,000 in 1881, \$38,000,000

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant).

in 1882, and \$50,000,000 in 1883. It seemed to be something he could not manage. And he had that terrible thing, as he considers it, a balance of trade against us, to the extent of \$7,000,000 in 1881, \$17,000,000 in 1882, and \$34,000,000 last year. I would suggest that he should turn his attention to this matter a little more seriously. The thing is getting in such a position that he is hardly able to control it. He tells us, however, that after all, there is one redeeming feature about these imports. They prove, he says, that our workmen and mechanics are earning better wages, and are able to spend more money. Another explanation, I suppose, will be given to us in a year or two when, under the depressed circumstances which seem to be coming upon us, these imports will be reduced again. Now, what are the facts with reference to the balance of trade? In the seven years, from Confederation to 1874, the average annual balance of trade against us was \$22,123,745; in the five years of the Mackenzie Government, the average annual balance against us was \$21,023,215; and last year the balance against us was \$34,168,218. I need not review the arguments, with reference to the balance of trade or the statements as to how it is made up; but I will say that it does not require one to be very familiar with political economy, to understand that when any man lays down the proposition, that when you find the Trade and Navigation Returns, on their face, showing a balance of trade against you, you are that much poorer, he has not mastered the elements of political economy in the slightest degree; and the hon. gentleman is beginning to understand that, and is beginning to hedge on that question, while still attempting to save his reputation, by saying that on the average, during the last four years, we have more nearly equalized our exports with our imports. Now, I come to consider the effect of the Tariff on the industries of this country; and I desire first to call your attention to the effect it has had on the manufacturing industries of the country. In connection with that let me call your attention to a statement made by the hon. Finance Minister in 1881. I propose to show, by reference to authorities which I think he will not venture to contradict, that the statement he made in this House, in 1881, with reference to the increase in our manufactures in this country, was not strictly correct. At that time, he came before us with information, gathered from sources which he did not give us access to, showing the increase which had taken place in many lines of manufactured goods. And that information, the authorities which I am now about to quote will show was wholly inaccurate, and such as should not have been given. What was his statement in 1881? Then he was in the hey-day of his glory. He saw prosperity about him; he saw the effects of the stimulus that was given to the country by the large amount of foreign money that was brought into the country from the causes I have stated; and in the height of his pride and glory, he boasted that his Tariff had made this wonderful change. He boasted that on all sides old factories were employing more hands, new factories were opening up, a great stimulus was given to trade; and he had a table prepared, which he said would demonstrate that the increased prosperity was not brought about by the increased exports, but by the development of our manufacturing industries. He told us that he found that the number of persons employed in the manufacturing industries of the country had been augmented by 14,000, representing a total increase with families of 42,000. If, of these 14,000, 7,000 were occupiers and tenants, were they not, he asked, practically building up a new city in that year of 40,000 inhabitants? Then, by some process of calculation which I do not yet understand, he declared that another 20,000 ought to be added, and claimed that the operation of his Tariff in 1881 was adding to this Dominion a city of 60,000 inhabitants; and there, he claimed, was the source

of our prosperity. Well, Sir, he did not give us, in detail, the number of operatives employed in all the manufactures of the country. He gave us that information with reference to two lines. He told us the number employed in the corset factories for one, and I can only judge of his other calculations by those which he gave us. He said that there was an addition of 500 hands to the number of operatives employed in the corset factories, in 1881. In the years 1880 and 1881, the very time this hon. gentleman was giving us those statements, the Census was being taken, and we had not last year, or the previous year the Census returns in our hands, but we have them now. While the Census may be inaccurate with reference to the population, and I believe it is, from the manner in which it was taken, still the manufacturers, in making their returns of the number of hands they employed, the capital they had invested and the amount of their productions, would now be very apt to under-estimate these items. What were the returns made by the manufacturers themselves, of the people employed in factories? At the very time when the Finance Minister said that 500 hands were employed in the corset factories, the Census shows that the total number employed was 320, of whom twenty-three were men over sixteen, fourteen boys under sixteen, eight girls under sixteen, and 275 women over sixteen. The other estimate as to the extra number employed was in the boot and shoe industry, and what did he say with reference to that industry. He said:

"The boot and shoe industry has increased 25 per cent. both as to the amount produced and the number of employees. We find them, moreover, working full time, while before they worked but two-thirds time."

What does the Census show? Does it show any proportion like that. The House will be astonished to learn, after hearing the statement of the Minister, that, according to the Census, while in 1881 we had 18,949 hands employed in that industry, in 1871, ten years previous, we had 18,719, or, after two years Administration of the hon. gentleman's policy, when, according to his statement deliberately made in this House, the number of operatives had increased 25 per cent. and the production in an equal ratio, there were but 230 more men employed in that industry than in 1871. Had there been an increase of 25 per cent., there would have been, 4,600 hands employed in 1881, more than in 1871, whereas the increase was only 230. If only 230 is the actual increase out of his estimate of 4,680, at this rate, his city of 60,000 dwindles rapidly into insignificance. Then we had a reference to the sewing machine industry. When I pointed out the fact that while, under the National Policy, certain manufacturing industries, such as sugars, cottons, and to a certain extent, woollens and one or two others, had benefitted, the old manufacturing industries were not benefitted but many were positively injured by this Tariff, and when I instanced the sewing machine industry as one which gave signs of being hurt instead of benefitted by the National Policy, as shown by the exports of that article to foreign countries, the hon. member for Cardwell replied to me in the following language:—

"Speaking of my (Mr. Paterson's) statement that the exports of sewing machines had declined, he (Mr. White) said it was true, and he thought while I was speaking that he would write down to the manager of the Williams Sewing Machine Company in Montreal and ascertain the cause of that circumstance, and here is the reply—"

Another advertising dodge of the hon. gentleman, another means of puffing the Montreal sewing machine concern:

"In reply to your enquiries, I am happy to be able to state that our business has been very much improved by the operation of the National Policy. We are now employing three times as many hands and making three times as many machines as before the National Policy came into operation, and we find the home markets very much improved. That is to say, we find that more machines can be sold, though we do not get at a higher price; in fact, prices are rather lower than they were, but we do not complain of this, as we much prefer doing a large business

with small profits than a small business on large profits. It is much more profitable and satisfactory."

Here is a gentleman whom the hon. member for Cardwell led us to understand was employing three times as many hands and turning out three times as many machines through the operation of the National Policy as he did before. The hon. member certainly could not have read that letter with any other intent than to give this House to understand that the sewing machine manufactories in this country were all benefitting to the same extent as this Montreal factory; at any rate, he took care to make no exceptions. How do the facts stand with reference to that as shown by the Census, an authority the hon. member for Cardwell will not gainsay? In 1881, 1,188 hands were employed in that line, and 1871, 966 hands; or in all the ten years, an increase of only 222 hands, and the production, instead of increasing, actually decreases to the value of \$75,187. That is to say, we had less value in sewing machines produced in 1881 than in 1871, ten years previous, yet the hon. member for Cardwell read us a letter, which we were not in a position, officially and authoritatively, to contradict, informing the House that there were three times as many hands employed and there was three times the production in that manufacturing industry as before the National Policy. Let us turn back to the boot and shoe industry which the hon. Finance Minister told us was turning out 25 per cent. more work than formerly. If they had turned out 25 per cent. more work than in 1871, ten years previous, there would have been an increased production to the extent of over \$4,000,000, whereas the actual increase was but \$1,762,265. I desire to call your attention to the condition of a few other of the manufacturing industries of this country, as revealed by the Census. The hon. Finance Minister and his supporters cannot go behind their own official figures. I am not reading letters from private individuals, but the official figures given in the Census, the returns made by these manufacturers themselves. I said I would show you from these statements that the old manufacturing lines of this country are not thriving any more under the National Policy than they were in 1871, under the 15 per cent. tariff. I have instanced two lines, but I will give others. In relation to our foundries and machine shops, large industries employing a greater number of hands than any others, with one or two exceptions. What are the facts? In 1871, the number of hands employed in those establishments was 7,653, and in 1881, ten years later, after two years' operation of the National Policy, the number had only increased by 136 men. In agricultural implements, the increase of working men in ten years has been 1,110, a greater increase than in the other lines, but not much more than the natural increase that ought to take place through the increase of our population, and the opening up and development of the North-West, which has afforded a wider market for these articles. Take carpenters and joiners. In 1871, we had 5,408; in 1881, we had 5,702, an increase of 294. Take our rolling mills, another important industry. In 1881, the number of hands employed in those mills was 699, against 762 in 1871, or a decrease of 63, and the production has diminished in the same period to the extent of \$653,100. Take our ship-yards, an industry in which our friends from the Maritime Provinces are interested. What have been the effects of the National Policy upon the ship-yards in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island? Has it stimulated, has it developed that industry? Has it given employment to a greater number of hands there? Let the Census figures, the official figures, the authoritative figures, compiled by the Minister of Agriculture, speak on this point—and they speak with no uncertain sound. In 1871, 6,046 men worked in the ship-yards of this Dominion. In 1881, had that number increased? No; but that number had shrunk to 4,454—1,592 less hands in the ship-yards of this Dominion, in 1881, than ten years before, in 1871. Why

do not the members from the Maritime Provinces support this National Policy that is giving such employment to their ship-yards? Why do they not support this National Policy that has taken out of their ship-yards 1,592 men in the last ten years, instead of placing thousands in them, as the hon. gentlemen opposite said it would? And what is the value of the products of the ship-yards? In 1881, under the National Policy, the value of the products of the ship-yards is nothing like what it was in 1871, under the policy of the hon. member for East York. Why, the products of the ship-yards have shrunk, in the ten years, \$875,004. There is the result upon that industry, a large industry, a great industry, an industry in which the people of this country, many of them, are vitally interested. Take the result in the manufacture of shingle making, an important industry in the wooded portions of our country, and there are actually 711 men less employed there than ten years before, and there is a product of \$124,000 less than in that year. And so you might run through the list, with some exceptions. There has been an increase of cotton operatives, there has been an increase in the woollen manufactories. There has been an increase in our furniture manufactories, but not much more in the article of furniture than would be warranted by the increase of population. In the tanneries, there has been an increase, but not much more than the increase of population would warrant. In the sugar refining industry, what do you think has been the effect produced by the National Policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite? What marvellous effects have been produced in the employment of labour in that industry? We have had it detailed to us in this House, time after time, in days gone by, by the Finance Minister and those who support him. What great development, what great amount of labour, has been given to the country in the sugar refineries? We have it here from the official documents. In 1871, we had 359 men employed in the sugar refineries of the country, and in 1881, we had 723, or we have 364 men more men employed in our sugar refineries two years after the National Policy came into operation, than we had ten years before. There is a very great increase, is it not? 364 men employed. And, in order that the men, the 364 that were employed more, should have been employed, the Tariff was so arranged that the people of this country paid more for the article of sugar, by loss of duty and extra price paid, as has been said in this House time and again, to the extent of more than a million dollars. I grant the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I grant the hon. member for Cardwell, that there were some months when there was keen competition, and the prices of sugar in this country, sold by our refiners, were kept down lower; but I challenge the hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me whether, in the first stage of this high Tariff, which was enacted for the benefit of the sugar refiners, the refinery of Redpath & Son did not clear nearly a million of dollars in that year from the price they got from the people of this country. If it is remedied now, the price was paid at that time. The hon. member for Cardwell did not give us the figures in detail, so that they could be worked out, but I take issue with him on that question and say that, in the article of sugar, by the loss of duty and the increased price, there is to-day a loss of \$1,500,000, if you reduce all that sugar to a granulated basis, compared with what it would have been under the Cartwright Tariff. I am sorry the member for Cardwell is not in his place, as I would like to give him these figures. I see the Finance Minister has also retired. I am sorry that I have wearied the hon. gentlemen, but I see the indefatigable Minister of Customs is there, and I know that he can attend to several Departments at once; and, if not, I will send for the Minister of Railways, who can attend to any number of Departments, because we had the statement from the First

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Minister that, when that gentlemen was broken down by too much work in attending to one office, he prescribed for his restoration to health another office in addition, and sent him across the sea. I am sure that, if we had him here now and put another office on him, he would be restored to the most robust health. I will give to the Minister of Finance, or rather I will give to the Minister of Customs, in the absence of the Minister of Finance, these figures. In the last year of the Trade and Navigation Returns, we imported 148,446,081 pounds of sugar under No. 14. That is the kind of sugar that is imported by the refiners to make into refined sugar. Now, speaking of yellow sugars, as the hon. member for Cardwell knows very well, no calculation or comparison can be made, because yellow sugars are a non-descript, and there is no way of doing it. The only way is to reduce all your sugar to a granulated basis, because then you have a standard article and a standard price in both countries. Therefore, I reduce the sugar refined by our manufacturers to a granulated basis, and, to be on the safe side, I allow 12½ per cent. as a loss in bringing raw sugar into granulated sugar. Well, taking that as a basis, the product would have given 130,000,000 pounds of granulated sugar this year.

An hon. MEMBER. Too much.

Mr. PATERSON. I know it is too much, but I put it on that basis to be safe. Now, granulated sugar in Montreal, taking the statement of the hon. member for Cardwell, is worth \$8.12, less 2½ cash. Granulated in New York, quoted from the New York *Herald* of February 6, was 2\$7.50 the long price, with a drawback off, which is taken off when sold to a foreign country, of \$2.80. The net price a Canadian purchaser would have to pay would be \$4.70 a hundred, or, in other words, the net price of granulated sugar in New York, below the price in Montreal, is \$3.22 per 100 pounds. Now, 130,000,000 pounds, at \$3.22 per pound, amounts to \$4,183,000. If there was no duty at all levied upon sugar coming into this country, you would have a saving of \$4,183,000 by buying sugar in New York. But there is a duty levied upon it, and we know the amount of duty that went into the revenue from sugar this year—and what was it? It was \$2,467,729. That leaves \$1,715,271 that is unaccounted for. Now, I will not say that the Canadian refiner has pocketed that amount of money. I do not mean to say he has, but I say that these figures show that, somewhere or another, there is \$1,700,000 odd that has to be accounted for. It has been paid by the people of Canada, at all events, in the price. We can test it in another way. The Finance Minister ventured the statement that, under the Tariff of the hon. member for South Huron, sugar could not be laid down from the United States as cheap as you can buy it at the refinery in Montreal to-day. Why, Sir, a more rash statement was never ventured by a Minister of Finance on the floors of Parliament than that. If he had taken the least possible care to ascertain whether his figures were right, the hon. gentleman would have found how mistaken he was. What are the facts? I have said sugar could be bought in New York at \$4.70 net, and the duty under the old Tariff on sugar, at \$4.76, would be \$2.18 per 100 pounds. The duty on 130,000,000 pounds, at \$2.18, would be \$2,834,000. That is the duty that would have been paid under the old Tariff on 130,000,000 pounds of granulated sugar brought into this country. But instead of that amount, the sum that has gone into our Treasury this year, as the result of the duty on the sugar that has produced these 130,000,000 lbs. of granulated, was \$2,467,729; or we have a loss to the revenue of \$366,271. What more? The price of granulated in New York is \$4.70; the duty under the Cartwright Tariff would be \$2.18, which would make the sum of \$6.88 which it would cost us duty paid, leaving out the question of freight. We now pay in Montreal \$7.92 for the same sugar; take

this \$6.88 that we would have paid under the old Tariff from New York, from the \$7.92, and we find that the extra price the consumer pays is \$1.04 per 100 pounds. Take 130,000,000 pounds, at \$1.04 per 100, and you have an extra price paid by the people of Canada for their refined sugar, over and above what they would have had to pay, with the duty, under the Cartwright Tariff, of \$1,352,000; to which, if you add the loss to the revenue of \$366,271, you have a total loss to the people of this country of \$1,718,271. So much with reference to the sugar question. Now I come to speak of the cotton industry, an industry that, I admit, has been benefited by the operation of the National Policy, by promoting it in this country; an industry, however, that suffers to-day, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for South Huron and others on the floor of this House, from the unduly high protective Tariff, which has brought about a depressed state of affairs, which can only be remedied by a combination of the manufacturers to restrict production and force up prices. Now, what do we find with reference to the cotton industry? Has it produced the beneficial results, in this country, that we were told to expect? Sir, the benefit we were told would flow to this country from protection to manufacturing industries, was the employment of a greater number of hands, who would receive larger wages. What does the Census return exhibit with reference to this industry? I call the attention of the hon. members of this House, and through this House the attention of the operatives of this country, to what the Census reveals, with reference to the operation of this cotton industry. I ask the attention of the wage-earning class of this community; I ask the attention of the members of this House, who are bound to have regard to the wage-earning class—I ask them to think over these figures furnished to us by the Census, and to say whether we are able to rejoice that high wages are being given to the cotton operatives. The Census shows some eighteen cotton factories in operation in 1881. It reveals the fact that there were employed in these factories, of men over sixteen years of age, 975; of women, over sixteen years of age, 1,445; of boys, under sixteen years, 542; of girls, under sixteen years, 565, or a total number of hands employed in these eighteen cotton factories of 3,527. The total yearly wages paid these cotton operatives, including, no doubt, the salaries of the managers, book-keepers, and all the high officers who are employed in these establishments, and who, in making their returns to the Census, have no object to serve in returning less yearly wages than were actually paid—the total yearly wages are returned as \$714,250. Divide that among the 3,527 operatives and what does it give you? A yearly wage of \$203 to each of these hands, including all the highly paid officers, or \$4 a week on an average to these operatives. If you deduct the high priced salaries, I will venture to say the result will approximate, or come dangerously near, the figures worked out by a prominent newspaper man in this country, from figures furnished by the gentleman who told a *Star* reporter that he gave the Finance Minister the cotton statistics which the latter gave to this House, these figures thus worked out showing that the cotton operatives were working for about \$1.50 per week, I think. And yet the First Minister, on a public platform in Ottawa, asked the working men of this city to endorse this policy and send him back to power; asked them to pronounce on the question of whether they wanted good times, prosperity, steady employment, high wages: or whether, on the other hand, they wanted poverty, want of work, and low wages. He said that was the issue for the working people of this country: "Return us to power and you will have the same prosperity that you had in days gone by." I ask him how he justifies that expression with the words the Finance Minister uttered the other day, finding fault with the Opposition, when he said that though the lumbermen were restricting their

operations, yet the moment a few hundred cotton operatives were thrown out of work for a month a great cry was raised in the country. How long does he expect the operatives to remain out of work? How many months would he desire to have operatives remain out of work who are earning the munificent sum of \$4 per week each, including, in the average, the salaries of all the high-priced officials? "Oh," but these gentlemen say, "it cannot be helped on the part of the cotton manufacturers. They must look out for themselves." Well, what are the results? We have heard a great deal about cotton being cheaper than it was ever before, that there was not much profit to be made by these cotton manufacturers now. What do we find with reference to that in 1881? The Census enables us to understand that point. I have given the total yearly wages. If we add to that the total value of raw products, \$1,927,655, the two amounts make a total of \$3,759,412. We find that these cotton manufacturers made, while paying their operatives at the rate of \$4 per week, \$1,069,507 in a year. Their capital invested was \$3,476,500, on which they made a profit of \$1,065,507, or over 30 per cent. With these figures before us, figures taken from the Census compiled by hon. gentlemen opposite, we can understand that the cotton manufacturers, at all events, if they be deprived at the present time of great profits, are in not quite so bad a position as their operatives, who work at \$4 per week and have not constant employment. I do not like to refer to particular mills, or to attack any man in business, or to allude to any business firm on the floor of Parliament; but speaking in general terms, I would say that one mill, employing 724 hands, has averaged 40 per cent. dividend; three others, employing 736 hands, have averaged about 39 per cent.; but there are certain other factories which have not paid so well, and these have reduced the average to somewhat over 30 per cent. on the capital invested. It will be seen that, while the cotton operatives have increased in the country, they are not that source of wealth we would desire them to be. We would be very glad if it was possible to pay them higher wages, and the country received the benefit. At this point, I desire to bring before the attention of the Finance Minister a question worthy of his consideration, but to which he made no reference in his speech. I refer to the manufacturing of flour. What does the Census tell us in regard to that industry? It points out that in flour and grist mills there was a capital of \$13,856,923 invested; there were 6,472 hands employed, and the yearly product was of the value of \$41,772,372. In no other manufacture in the country, with the exception of saw mills, is there an equal capital invested, and very few other industries have more hands employed. What is the position of that industry to-day? The hon. Finance Minister has told the House that his policy is a policy of protection for the manufactures of the country. The hon. gentleman told us last year, when he added 10 per cent. to agricultural implements, that it was done because our manufacturers were being crowded and jostled in the North-West, and it was the policy of the Government to give additional protection to our manufacturers rather than lose the market, and that when manufacturers were being crowded by outside competitors, he would arrange the Tariff so as to give them additional protection. I ask the hon. gentleman to-night how it is that, having made such a declaration and promise, and after I have pointed out that this large manufacturing industry, with more capital invested than any other interest but one, is not only not protected by the Tariff but is legislated against, he takes no steps to give them relief. A return has been brought down showing the importations of flour, as compared with wheat, during the past six months. The result is that under the operation of the Tariff, 1,068,493 bushels have been imported, in the shape of flour, from American sources, while only 74,389 bushels have

come in as wheat. An appeal might be made to the hon. gentleman, on behalf of the millers, for redress, on patriotic grounds. Why does he fail to increase the duty when it fails to protect these manufacturers, when he raised the duty on agricultural implements, in order, as he said, to save them? The hon. gentleman thought it was incumbent on him to protect the poor classes from wearing shoddy cloth. I would ask him if there was danger of contagion in wearing shoddy cloth, whether there was not additional sin in allowing the food consumed by the people, which goes to form bone, sinew and blood, to be tainted and corrupted by flour drawn from Yankee sources? The hon. Minister stated in his speech this year, that the farmers are now getting the benefit of the duty on wheat to the extent of 8 or 10 cents, because there was a short crop, and no farmer would desire the removal of that duty. That might be true, for this was the first, and might be the only year, when it would be of any advantage. But the policy of the Finance Minister is not to protect manufacturers by reducing the duty on raw materials; but it is to protect manufacturers by increasing the duties on manufactured articles imported from foreign countries, and he has told the House that the foreign manufacturers pay the duty. If that be so, it is easy to provide a remedy. Instead of flour remaining at 50 cents a barrel, the Finance Minister's duty, according to his doctrine, is to increase the tax by another 25 cents, and give Canadian manufacturers fair play in competing with the manufacturers across the line. The hon. Minister may say that the Opposition would object to an increased duty on flour—and so they would, in all probability. But we are not responsible for this Tariff; we are not pledged to it in any way. The hon. gentleman's statement, made on the different platforms of this country, and on the floor of this House, was that, when any manufacturing industry of this country was placed at a disadvantage, from foreign manufactures coming in, he would use the Tariff as a means to prevent this competition, and provide a remedy. I have brought the matter to his attention, and leave him to deal with it. Now, Sir, I come to consider the question of how this Tariff is affecting our farmers. I admit that this year there has been an increased price to the farmer from the duty on wheat. But it is because this has been a year of short crop, a famine year in Canada, a year such as we do not often have, and a year which I trust we may not often have. I say, in the first place, that a Tariff which taxes the bread which fills the mouth of the orphan and the widow, is not a Tariff which should commend itself; and while I say that such has been the operation of the Tariff this year, the Finance Minister knows, and the House knows, that under ordinary circumstances, and in ordinary years, the imposition of this duty on wheat has had no effect on the price whatever, and he knows that while the anomaly prevailed with reference to the duties on wheat and flour in years gone by, it did not hurt the milling industry, because the duty on wheat had no effect in advancing its price. He knows that now this has changed, and as the miller has to import his wheat from the other side of the line, it is only this year that the duty on wheat has given the farmer any benefit whatever, and in ordinary circumstances, he cannot hope to derive any benefit from it whatever. I would ask, in the next place, what has the National Policy done for the lumbermen and the fishermen. The hon. gentleman himself does not pretend that it has done any good to the lumbermen, who are employed in one of the greatest industries of the country. It went on to thrive, as thrive it might, as after his policy came into operation it continued to prosper, as prosper it could, after his policy came in, but whether it prosper or not, his Tariff has no effect upon it whatever, except it be to injure it by the higher prices which are charged for supplies of various kinds. And what is to be said as to the effect upon the

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

wage-earning class of this country? Has the Finance Minister carried out his pledges to them? Has the First Minister and the Minister of Public Works, who asked for their votes expressly on the ground of this policy, and who both appealed to them on the issue that this policy would secure for them steady employment and high wages, kept their promises? I ask these hon. gentlemen if they have implemented their promises, and I reply they have not. I say it is known to the Finance Minister that the promises made by him at that time have not been kept. The answer to that question was to be seen in the hesitating manner, the altered tone of voice, in which he gave us the Budget Speech this year, a speech which was received almost in solemn silence by this House, whereas, in other years, his supporters cheered and rehearsed his words to the echo, as he announced that every workingman in the country was being employed in the country and at a higher wage than before. I say that he should carry out the promises which he gave to these men, that their wages would be increased, and that steady employment would be secured to them. Hon. gentlemen say that there are good times in the country, but the best answer to that statement is made by the leather workers of Montreal, who lately asked their employers for an increase of wages, who are reported to have written to their masters that they did not think of striking, that they would almost sooner starve than strike, but that, as their wages were only \$6 or \$8 a week, as they had families of seven or eight, they could not hope to pay their way; that, owing to the low wages, they could not educate their children, as they had to put them in factories at twelve years of age and under, and they appealed to their masters to increase their wages, if possible. Sir, the policy of the hon. gentleman has driven the workmen of this country into the position of suppliants, who have to beg their masters in order to get their wages increased to a living rate—to a rate which existed before the National Policy was introduced. They tell the Finance Minister that the cost of living has gone up to the extent of 30 per cent., and I think their testimony on that point is more valuable than anything the hon. member for Cardwell, or even the Finance Minister, can give us, with reference to that. We need not argue on the floors of Parliament this question as to the cost of living. It is a question which can be best answered in every home in the country, and by the inmates of every such home; and I leave it to them to determine whether or not the cost of living has increased under the operation of the National Policy. Let the hon. Minister of Finance go to Hamilton, which was paraded as being especially benefited by the National Policy, two years ago. Let him visit the various machine shops, as he did a few years ago, when he was making his triumphal tour through the country, at a period when we were having good times, as a result of the sums of money which were coming into this country from the sales of our goods abroad. Let him go to these places now, and he will find that wages have decreased 10 and even 20 per cent.; he will find men working on short time, and then let him recall the promises he made, that his policy would give the workmen steady work at high wages. But he has not gone to Hamilton, and I do not think he will go. Sir, the position of the Minister of Finance is a proud position, but high as the honour is, I think it is a pity that such a position should be occupied by virtue of promises which were given, but which are now proved to be promises which have not been verified—which cannot be verified—proved by the bitter experience of those to whom they were made and to whose support the hon. gentleman, in a large measure, owes his present position. In conclusion, I would allude to one or two remarks which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) made in reference to the observations of the hon. member for South Huron, as to the exodus from this country. As I understood

the hon. member for Cardwell, he charged my hon. friend with having cooked the American figures in making his calculations. Having read that hon. gentleman's speech, I have only to say that I have been unable to ascertain that he did so. I believe that the hon. member for Cardwell was out of order altogether in referring to proceedings before a Committee of this House, but as I did not call attention to the matter, I certainly think I may be permitted to say that the testimony of an official, who stated that he had deliberately falsified the returns he had sent to the United States Government, is not worth very much, and that it was not very creditable to the hon. member for Cardwell that he should bring such evidence into this House to support his statements. The hon. member for South Huron, as I understand, used no American statistics with reference to this matter at all—they were all Canadian statistics. These figures are a fair matter of argument, and if the hon. member for Cardwell can, by fair arguments, meet them on the ground upon which they were offered, and refute them, I believe the hon. member for South Huron would be glad to find that they could be refuted. I have not gone into the matter, but this much I do know, that as the increased cost of living in this country may be left for decision to the inhabitants of the country, so this matter of emigration from Canada to another country may be left to the people of this country, each man being left to determine for himself, as he looks around his county, whether or not men have gone from that county or not. I should be glad, if in looking into the matter, we find that none of our countrymen have gone into foreign countries—that none of them are now living as citizens of a foreign land. The hon. member for Cardwell pointed out that large changes had taken place in regard to the residents of the adjoining States. He lost sight of the fact that, while in that country the people went from one State to another State, they were still in their own country, they were still paying taxes and their employment was still adding wealth to their own country. He did not venture to tell us that the thousands of people who are migrating from State to State come into our country. If there should be a large population from our own country going to Manitoba, we would rejoice in that, because we would like to see the foundations of that country laid by our own citizens; but what we lament and grieve at is, that after many of them have gone to that country, intending to make it their home, they have been forced—despite what the hon. member for Cardwell can say, the testimony is too plain, and has been too often repeated—forced by vexatious restrictions and laws, which were not made in the interest of that country, to leave their own land and their own flag, and to cast in their lot with a people who, while not unfriendly to us, are still another people. These are the facts we deplore, and the hon. member for Cardwell, or any other hon. gentleman opposite, will talk for a long time before they will convince us that there is not good reason why people should leave that country. That they are leaving it, cannot be denied, and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite on what ground are they leaving it? The climate is as good, we are told, as the climate of Dakota; the soil, we are told, and I rejoice in it, is more fertile than the soil of Dakota. I believe, and I rejoice in it, that our North-West is a better country than are the north-western States, and that being the case, how is it that Canadians, born in Canada, with all the love for our flag that we have, are leaving a country that is as good in climate, more fertile in soil, with our own flag waving over it—how is it that they are leaving a land with all these advantages to settle in a foreign land, where a foreign flag floats over them, and where the soil is inferior to ours, unless it be that bad legislation has driven them away? The hon. member for Cardwell makes light of this. He speaks of the monopoly clause as if it were

nothing. Why, Sir, say to freemen going into that country—what is the fact, that we have a law on the Statute Book of Canada, placed by hon. gentlemen opposite—that that immense country, with all its resources, with all its possibilities, with the prospect of its producing millions upon millions of bushels of wheat, is to be tied up, to have its produce carried over one line of railway for the next fifteen years, and I ask if you do not point to something that is calculated to strike a chill to their very souls. When you tell them that there is a clause on the Statute Book of Canada which the Parliament of Canada itself, when it had an opportunity by the reopening of this contract, deliberately refused to expunge, that for fifteen years from to-day it will amount to an offence for any man or number of men to dare to tap that North-West country with any railways from the United States, in order to afford the people competition, you can readily understand that something exists which which will naturally make people hesitate before they decide to settle in that country. Sir, these hon. gentlemen talk about patriotism—patriotism, exemplified by fastening the fetters of monopoly on the North-West country, and by their refusal to relax those fetters. Patriotism with a vengeance that is. Then, Sir, people go there to find the lands of this great corporation exempted from taxation. They find that when they have grown their wheat, and want to export it, they will have to pay the price which that railway company may ask. These are the things which have prevented that country from being rapidly settled and becoming the great country which it ought to be to-day. Here we are this year, when hundreds of thousands ought to have been settled in that country—here we are, with people scattered over it, far fewer in numbers, I venture to say, than would have been found in that country had my hon. friends remained in power and given effect to their policy in reference to that road. What a folly this House committed when it sanctioned the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I refer not to the fact that \$30,000,000 has been thrown on top of all that we gave them before, but to the fact that they originally received far more money and land than was required for the work to be done—that that great country was practically handed over to them to do with it as they pleased. I ask if, when the Parliament of that day committed that huge blunder—to use no harsher name—they did not inflict a great loss on the people of this country? What are we getting in return? Hon. gentlemen tell us we are opening up the country and they ask us to look at the people who are going in there. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite if there is a man, if there is a woman, if there is a child in that country not born there, who did not go in over the road that was built by the Mackenzie Government before these hon. gentlemen came into power at all. It was after we had opened up that country that people went in, and that a city of thousands of people arose there—that, according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways, there were 61,000 people in that country—that there was a means of ingress into it—that you could go into a Pullman car at Ottawa, and not get out of it till you were in the North-West. The country was in that position when hon. gentlemen opposite handed it over, with \$25,000,000, 25,000,000 acres of land, and \$25,000,000 worth of completed road to a Company, and supplemented it the other day, handsomely and generously, with \$30,000,000 more, which they say, however, is ours and will return to us; consoling this House with the thought of the man who had a note which another man had given him and then run away, and who said: "I do not care if he has run away, for I have his note—I have security." Why did we not keep that road and build it ourselves, as it was being built by the Mackenzie Administration, and as the leader of the Government, himself, said, was the policy

of his Government, the Mackenzie Government having built the difficult part, so that we could push it out into the prairie as settlement required it, open up branches, and, as the commerce and requirements of the country demanded, build the ends. Sir, that would have been a wise policy; but it is too late to propose that now. A Statute was passed by which these fetters were placed on the country, and an opportunity was afforded by the re-opening of the contract to give a remedy to that country, but it has not been used. We have the promise of the hon. Minister of Railways that when this Company slacken their hand the Government will not exercise the power they have exercised in the past, of disallowing charters in the old Province of Manitoba, and then some relief may be given. The hon. member for Cardwell took my hon. friend from South Huron to task, because he said that the moral sentiment of this country had been lowered by hon. gentlemen opposite. I admit that the language of the hon. member for South Huron was pretty strong. He can speak strongly when he likes, and I believe he speaks most strongly when he feels most strongly. I would ask the hon. member for Cardwell, if he were in his seat, whether, when the hon. member for South Huron said that the moral tone of this country had been lowered by the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, he did not himself believe that statement to be true. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the people of this country are not influenced by the example that is set them by men in high places; I would ask him whether the young men of this country ought not to be taught to look to their representative men, to the men who occupy seats in this House, and especially the members of the Ministry, as men from whom they may take that line of conduct in life which will tend to ennoble them, and make them the men they ought to be; I would ask the hon. member whether, judged from that standpoint which himself admits to be the true one, the tendency of his party and the action of the Government and the past Parliament which supported that Government, did not tend to lower the moral tone of the people. The hon. gentleman referred to the Gerrymandering Act, and I refer to it again. I would ask of him who was a party to that Gerrymandering; Act I would ask him and those who acted with him in that matter, and primarily the Ministers, upon whom the responsibility rests, if they did not lower the moral tone of this country. I would ask them if their example is to be an example to the young men, the sons of Canada, that are growing up in our midst, what lesson will the young men learn from that Act of the Parliament of Canada? They will, if they follow the example set by the Minister in that Act, justify the oppression of the weak by the strong, justify the oppression of the poor by the rich, and the business men of this country, if they follow the example set by the hon. Ministers in that question, will learn that the proper course of procedure in trade is when they get a man in a position where he cannot help himself, to better their chances at his expense. Yet the hon. gentleman will try and find fault when I say the moral tone of the country has been lowered. The greatest charge that can be made against the Government lies in that very fact; financial mistakes can be remedied, but to injure the morality of the community, as they have injured it, not only in this but in other cases, is to do an injury to the State beyond computation. In other respects, hon. gentlemen opposite have not done that which it was their duty to do. I do not claim that the members of the Opposition are all that can be desired, in the way of purity, when we come to our election contests; I do not claim that all the virtue and morality is on the one side and that none is on the other side; but this I do say, on behalf of the Liberal party, that they have ever desired and striven to have laws placed on the Statute Books of Canada

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

that would tend to bring about purity in election contests, and hon. gentlemen opposite have always resisted any measure to that end with all their power. This I will say on behalf of the party with which I have the honour to be connected, that their aim has ever been to obtain such a law as would give us purity in elections, while hon. gentlemen opposite have always thrown impediments in our way. These and other acts done by this Parliament are noted in the country, and by reason of their operation a state of things has been brought about that every well-wisher of his country trusts may not be too deeply rooted to be effaced. I desire to say, in conclusion, that I am of opinion with the hon. member for South Huron that, great as are the blunders that have been committed, if the Ministry will but, from this time forward, enter upon a higher course, a better policy, that notwithstanding their financial blunders, they can be recovered from in time by a country with the great resources which ours possesses; but I do ask that, whenever in the future they will be called, as they have been in the past, to set an example to the youth of the country, they should be equal to their position; I ask that their conduct should be such as will elevate the people, and we will get over the financial mistakes they have made. I will say this, that amidst much that is depressing in this country, although the public tone is lower than we would desire to have it in the press of the country, there is one thing I have witnessed that has given me pleasure, and that is that we have in this country yet sufficient high spirit and just feeling on the part of the French Conservative press to enable them, while standing by their party, to refuse to be parties to the foul slander that has been attempted to be cast on the leader of the Opposition, when the members of that Province who, in this House, were manly enough to stand up and while maintaining their party allegiance, to say that they would consider it unworthy of themselves to endeavour to lower the character of a gentleman whose character is untarnished in its honour, the press of that Province echoed their sentiments. It is one of the bright things amidst much that is depressing to find that the whole press has not got so low as to endeavour to steal falsely away the character of an hon. gentleman, whose high place in the estimation of the people it is not possible for the press or any one to lower. Not only hon. gentlemen on this side, but hon. gentlemen opposite—those who are not eye to eye with him—know in their heart of hearts that he is a man worthy of their regards. Driven by the personal taunts of members—who, I hope, forgot themselves, for that is the most lenient way of putting it—he was compelled, in self-defence, to give us a little part of his private affairs, and we learned what was known to some of us before, that there is no gentleman in the country or House who is making the sacrifices of a pecuniary nature, in serving the people of this country, that are being made by him.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. Is that derisive? Does the hon. gentleman who ironically cheers, mean that he is sacrificing as much in coming to this House?

Mr. BOWELL. He may be just as honest if he has not so much to sacrifice.

Mr. PATERSON. He may be, but I am speaking of the sacrifice.

Mr. BOWELL. A widow's mite is as much as his.

Mr. PATERSON. That is quite true; but does the hon. Minister of Customs, who interrupts me, feel he is capable of making such a sacrifice. Would he even sacrifice his wife's relations, or any of his cousins and aunts? Until he is prepared to follow that example, and until he is prepared to give a little better evidence of a self-

denying spirit than I venture to say will be found in some of the appointments he has made, till he can take that position, it does not become him to attempt to weaken the force of what I am saying in reference to this subject. As to that gentleman who, in this House, although he leads the Opposition, moulds largely the legislation, who is always in his place, and who, in private legislation, brings the great weight of his ability to bear upon it, and helps to shape and form many of the Government measures, I ask is he a gentleman who may be taunted, is he a gentleman who may be vilified, is he a gentleman whom hon. gentlemen opposite may rise and in a moment of forgetfulness, taunt as occupying a position unworthy of him? We stand not many on this side, but we wish it to be understood—I, for one, wish it to be understood—that, while prepared to accord all that is right and just to hon. gentleman opposite, while willing at all times and desirous to conduct the debates in parliamentary style and language, while willing to accord to them everything I can in the way of conscientiousness for the votes they give, I tell them that, if they rise to vilify, if they rise to insinuate against the character of the gentleman who leads this party, if they rise to attempt to brow-beat the small band who represent that party in this House, they will find opposed to them a body of men who, though few in number, know enough and are able enough to maintain their rights at all times and on all occasions, and to point out to this Government, when they feel it their duty to do so, wherein they have erred in this matter, as I have endeavoured to do to-night, pointing out to the Finance Minister that promises which have been made have not been kept, and that it is hoped that in future he will amend his action, and that we will have cause to believe that he was promising what he had it in his power to do, and that, having it in his power, he is willing to have it carried into effect.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on the following Resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the following articles be added to the list of goods that may be entered free of duty when imported into Canada, viz:—
  - Bolting cloths, not made up.
  - Boracic acid.
  - Canvas, jute canvas, not less than fifty-eight inches wide, when imported by manufacturers of floor oil cloth, for use in their factories.
  - Cherryheat welding compound.
  - Grease and grease scrap.
  - Indigo, paste and extract of.
  - Iron or steel beams, sheets, plates, angles and knees, for iron or composite ships or vessels.
  - Manganese, oxide of.
  - Potash, German mineral.
  - Sodium, sulphate of.
  - Steel for saws and straw cutters, cut to shape, but not further manufactured.
 And to repeal the following items, now on said free list, viz:—
  - Coleothar, dry, oxide of iron.
  - Fibre, vegetable, for manufacturing purposes.
  - Fish-plates, steel.
 And all items or words contrary to, or inconsistent with the following provisions.
2. *Resolve 1*, That it is expedient to provide that the following articles shall be subject to and charged with the rate of duty set opposite to each, respectively, from and after the date of the passage of this Resolution, viz:—
  1. Acid, acetic, twenty-five cents per Imperial gallon
  2. Caplins, unfinished Leghorn hats, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
  3. Celluloid, moulded into sizes for handles of knives and forks, not bored nor otherwise manufactured, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
  4. Carpeting, matting and mats of hemp, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
  5. Jeans and cantilles, when imported by corset makers, for use in their factories, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
  6. Printed or dyed cottons, not elsewhere specified, twenty-seven and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
  7. Cotton, 42 inches wide and over, when imported by manufacturers of enamelled cloth, for use in their factories, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.
  8. Cotton Warp, No. 60 and finer, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.
  9. Earthenware, decorated, printed or sponged, and all earthenware not elsewhere specified, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.

10. India rubber vulcanized handles, for knives and forks, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
  11. Iron, cast iron forks, not handled, ground or otherwise further manufactured, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
  12. Labels, for fish cans and other uses, printed or painted, a specific duty of six cents per pound, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
  13. Pins, manufactured from wire of any metal, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
  14. Soap powders, a specific duty of three cents per pound.
  15. Steel, ingots, bars, sheets, under three-sixteenths of an inch thick, whole or cut to shape, but not further manufactured, and rolled round wire rods in coils, not elsewhere specified, three dollars per ton of 2,000 pounds, and ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
  16. Steel, rolled round wire rods, under half an inch in diameter, when imported by wire manufacturers for use in their factories, five per cent. *ad valorem*.
  17. Steel, needles, viz.: Cylinder needles, hand frame needles and latch needles, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
- SUGARS, SYRUPS AND MOLASSES:—
18. Sugar, when imported direct, without transhipment, from the country of growth and production, above number fourteen Dutch standard, a specific duty of one per cent. per pound, and thirty-two and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
  - Equal to number nine, and not above fourteen Dutch standard, a specific duty of three-fourths of a cent per pound, and twenty-seven and a-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
  - Below number nine Dutch standard, a specific duty of one-half cent per pound, and twenty-seven and one-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
  19. Melado, and concentrated melado, three-eighths of one cent per pound, and twenty-seven and one-half per cent. *ad valorem*.
  - On all the above sugars, melado, and concentrated melado, when not imported direct, without transhipment, from the country of growth and production:—
  20. Above number fourteen Dutch standard—a specific duty of one cent per pound, and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
  - Equal to number nine, and not above number fourteen Dutch standard, a specific duty of three-fourths of one cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
  - Below number nine Dutch standard, a specific duty of one-half cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
  21. Melado, and concentrated melado, a specific duty of three-eighths of one cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
  22. Concentrated cane juice, concentrated molasses, concentrated beet root juice, and concrete, whether imported direct or not, a specific duty of three-eighths of a cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
  23. Syrups, cane juice, refined syrup, sugar house syrup or sugar house molasses, syrup of sugar, syrup of molasses, or sorghum, whether imported direct or not, a specific duty of five-eighths of a cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
  24. Molasses, other, when imported direct, without transhipment, from the country of growth and production, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*, on the value thereof free on board.
  25. Molasses when not so imported, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
  - The value upon which the *ad valorem* duty shall be levied and collected upon all the above named sugars, melado, syrups, molasses, &c., shall be the value thereof free on board, as provided by section 77 of the Customs Act, 1883.
  26. Zinc, chloride, salts and sulphate of, five per cent. *ad valorem*.
3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal all such parts of the Act 42 Victoria, chapter 15, and of the Acts amending the same, or of the schedules of such Acts, as imposes a duty of twenty per cent. *ad valorem* on "mill irons and mill cranks and wrought forgings for mills and locomotives and parts thereof, weighing 25 pounds or more," and on "stationery of all kinds, not elsewhere specified,"—or which imposes any other duty of Customs on any of the foregoing articles than those imposed thereon by this Resolution, or which admits any such articles free of duty when imported into Canada.
    4. *Resolved*, That section 8 of the Act 42 Victoria, Chapter 15, be repealed and the following enacted:—
    8. An allowance may be made for deterioration by natural decay during the voyage of importation, upon perishable articles, such as green fruits and vegetables imported into Canada, but in assessing the same, and in estimating the damage by breakage upon brittle goods, such as crockery, china, glass and glassware, under the provisions of sections 53 and 54 of the Customs Act of 1893—such allowance or damage shall only be made and allowed for the amount of loss in excess of 25 per cent. of the whole quantity damaged, and only in case claim is made therefor, and the loss or damage certified, upon examination made by the appraiser or proper officer of Customs, within three days of the landing or arrival of such goods at the port of destination thereof; and provided, the duty has been paid on the full value thereof, on application to the Minister of Customs, a refund of such duty may be allowed and paid, in the proportion and in a fulfilment of the conditions above specified, but not otherwise.
- Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.
- (In the Committee.)
- On Resolution 1,
- Mr. BLAKE. I suppose it is not the hon. gentleman's intention to go farther than the free list to-night?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; I would like to get all the Resolutions through to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to continue my observation to the Finance Minister, without his interposition. I do not think it would be reasonable to take the whole of the Resolutions to-night. They have been placed before us at a very recent period. We did not anticipate that the hon. gentleman proposed to take all of them through to-night. Some information is required in reference to some of these points, not on the free list, as far as I am concerned, but as to the effect on the trade of some of the subsequent proposals, and I think the hon. gentleman should allow us to discuss them in Committee, after that information is obtained.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That might be done on Concurrence; but, at the same time, I do not desire to press them. Of course, nothing can be gained, as hon. members opposite, if they desire, can prevent the Resolutions being passed to-night. We might give the information on Concurrence, but, if he prefers, we will take the free list to-night, and the others on Thursday.

Mr. BLAKE. Nothing would be gained by waiting for Concurrence, if we got the desultory debate on Concurrence. We might as well have it in Committee.

Resolution 1 agreed to.

Progress reported, Committee to sit again.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:55 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 5th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FRAUD IN RELATION TO PUBLIC CONTRACTS.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire again to call the attention of the House to the matter which came up yesterday. I thought that the intimation then given by the hon. Minister of Public Works would have received attention; but I am sorry to say that his advice was ineffective. Although a meeting of the Special Committee, to which Bill No. 12 was referred, was called for to-day, nothing was done. I think the proper course, unless the House chooses to do otherwise, would be to reduce the quorum of the Committee. Therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Charlton, that the quorum of the Special Committee, to which was referred Bill No. 12, intituled, An Act for the prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys, be reduced to three members.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When I stated to the hon. gentleman yesterday that I thought that the fact that he had called the attention of the House to this matter, would most likely obtain a quorum for the Committee, I did not think the hon. gentleman would call a meeting immediately, because members have other Committees to attend and other things to do, and if the hon. gentleman had given forty-eight hours notice, I have no doubt the Committee would have met. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is rather quick about it. I am not aware that there is any desire to prevent this Bill being considered. When I was speaking

Mr. BLAKE,

yesterday, I forgot the members who were away. The hon. member for Lincoln is sick and is away from town, the hon. member for Victoria was away at the time, and the hon. gentleman himself had been absent, so that out of nine members, three that we know of were away, and it is not surprising that among the remainder there has not been found a quorum. I certainly think that the hon. gentleman should allow the Committee to meet in the ordinary way. I do not know whether or not this motion requires a notice; but I think the rule that we have been following has been that when a Committee requires to change its quorum, a report is made by the Committee to the House, and upon that report a motion is made by the chairman or some other member of the Committee to change the quorum. The quorum in this case is not large; it is five. I think the hon. gentleman should allow the Committee to meet in the ordinary way, after giving sufficient notice.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend stated yesterday that the Committee had been convened six or seven times fruitlessly. I have no knowledge, in my short Parliamentary experience, of such a state of things as that having existed heretofore. The hon. gentleman states what is true, that the general practice is, when a quorum is to be reduced, that it should be on a report of the Committee; but he will observe that my hon. friend cannot get the Committee together in order to make a report. If the hon. members who are on the Committee and who have undertaken to discharge this duty, did not object to being placed on the Committee when their names were mentioned, they ought to serve; because I need not say that the hon. First Minister or whatever gentleman is leading the House suggests the names of the members of these Committees to which Bills are referred. In this particular instance, the Committee was modified at the request of the hon. First Minister or of some hon. member opposite, who was acting for the Government at the time. I do not suggest this motion should be pressed after what the hon. Minister of Public Works has said, but I say it is an extraordinary and exceptional state of things that a Select Committee composed of nine members struck by the direction of the House should have been convened six or seven times without a quorum being obtained. I trust my hon. friend's next attempt will be more successful. We know it is the rule of the House that members opposed to the principle of a bill should not be on the Committee to which it is referred, that he should not be placed in the anomalous position of endeavouring to carry out the principle of a measure to which he is opposed, or of seeking to defeat it by staying away.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I was put on the Special Committee after the original Committee was framed. I was not aware, at the time, what the subject matter of the Bill was. I attended on two or three occasions when there was no quorum, and at the last meeting, when we had some informal discussion, there not being a quorum present, I said that I ought not to have been put upon the Committee, inasmuch as that I had, during the last Session, voted for the expulsion of the Bill my hon. friend then introduced, which was substantially the same as this one. I promised to attend the next meeting but was prevented by illness, and the next day, left for the west, and have since been absent until this morning. I do not therefore feel that I am open to the charge I understood the hon. member for West Durham to be making against a majority of the members of that Committee, of simply abstaining from attending, in order to prevent the Committee from carrying on its deliberations.

Mr. BLAKE. After the statement of the hon. gentleman for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), I would suggest that his name be struck off the Committee and another substituted.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The matter is entirely in the hands of the House, and I suppose the hon. gentleman will suggest the name of some hon. member to replace that of the hon. member for North Victoria in order that the Committee may be convened.

Motion withdrawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Mr. Cameron (Victoria) be relieved from serving on the Committee, and that Mr. Macmaster be substituted for him.

Motion agreed to.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 112) to prevent Sunday Excursions.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 113) to amend the Act 38 Victoria, Chapter 83, respecting Copyrights.—(Mr. Béchard.)

Bill (No. 114) for the prevention of the Adulteration of Food and Drugs.—(Mr. Costigan.)

#### INCORPORATION OF QUEBEC PILOTS.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether the Government consider that the Act 13 and 14 Victoria, chapter 123, incorporating the pilots for and above the harbour of Quebec, and the Act 16 Victoria, chapter 258, amending the same, are still in force; and if not, what are the reasons for their opinion that the said Statutes are not in force?

Mr. McLELAN. This is a question of law upon which the Department has not obtained an opinion from any legal gentleman, or from the Department of Justice.

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. SMALL enquired, Is it the intention of the Government, during this Session, to introduce any amendments to the Civil Service Act?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The matter is under consideration, and it is likely that during this Session some amendment to the Civil Service Act will be introduced.

#### EXPORT DUTY ON PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS.

Mr. VAIL enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill the present Session to repeal the export duty on pine and spruce logs?

Mr. BOWELL. No, Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the Government to introduce any Bill to that effect.

#### CLAIMS FOR LOSSES ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LANDRY enquired, Whether the Government has in its possession any report from one of the Dominion arbitrators in relation to a claim preferred by a Mr. Fraser, of the county of Pictou, for a sum to compensate him for losses suffered by him in consequence of the burning of his fences and a certain quantity of his wood? Does that report show that the fire in question was occasioned by one of the Government locomotives on the Intercolonial Railway? Did the Government at first refuse to pay that claim, and why? Did the Government subsequently pay that claim, and why? What difference is there, in equity, between that claim and that preferred by Mr. Joseph Charles Lislois? What difference is there, in law, between the two claims?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg leave to say, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that the Government has a report in its possession from one of the Canadian arbitrators in

relation to a claim preferred by Mr. Fraser, of the county of Pictou, for a sum to compensate him for losses suffered by him in consequence of the burning of his fences and a certain quantity of his wood, that that report shows that the fire was occasioned by one of the Government locomotives on the Intercolonial Railway; that the Government did refuse to pay that claim; that the Government subsequently paid the claim, in consequence of an award made by the arbitrator that it should be paid; and that the difference between that claim and the claim of Mr. Joseph Charles Lislois is that, in the one case, the arbitrator made an award in favour of the party, and in the other case, the arbitrator stated that the Government were not legally liable.

#### THE BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. McISAAC enquired, In what counties of Nova Scotia has the bounties to fishermen for last season's fishing been paid, and how soon shall it be paid in such counties (if any) as have not yet received the same?

Mr. McLELAN. I believe the cheques have not yet been issued. A large staff in the Department is engaged in preparing them, and examining the claims, and as soon as possible the cheques will be sent out in all the counties.

#### LIGHTHOUSE ON GOOSE ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. KIRK enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to erect a lighthouse on Goose Island, Guysboro' County, Nova Scotia, this year, for which a sum was voted in 1882.

Mr. McLELAN. There has been a good deal of delay in procuring a site for the erection of the house, a larger sum being demanded for it by the proprietor of the point selected by the officer than we thought we were justified in giving. Steps will be taken to expropriate land and proceed with the erection of the building.

#### PIER IN BELLE RIVER, ESSEX COUNTY.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Did the Government advertise for tenders for the construction of the pier in Belle River, county of Essex? If so, did such advertisement appear in any paper published in the said county? The name and residence of each person tendering, with the amount of each tender? Was the contract let at the tender price? Has any change been made in the work? What security was taken for the performance of the work? If cash, how much? If sureties, name and residence of each?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not a pier. Two piles are being placed on the west side of the entrance to the river, and a few more on the eastern side. We are building no pier.

#### SALE OF POSTAGE STAMPS AT WINDSOR, ONT.

Mr. LISTER enquired, Has R. Venn, of Windsor, been appointed by the Government to sell stamps? If so, when was he appointed and what is his salary? Has he been authorized to sell such stamps in the post office at Windsor? Does he pay rent? If so, how much?

Mr. CARLING. A license was granted on the 28th March, 1883, to Mr. Venn to sell postage stamps; he is paid by commission; he sells stamps in the lobby of the Windsor post office, and pays no rent.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following letter from the Governor General's Secretary:—

"Sir,—His Excellency the Governor General having appointed Chief Justice Sir William Ritchie his Deputy to give the Royal assent to the

Bill respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, I have the honour to inform you that the Deputy Governor will attend at the Senate Chamber on this day at 5:30 o'clock, p. m., for this purpose.

"I have the honour to be Sir,  
"Your most obedient servant,  
"MELGUND."

### PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good, and by an equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

That the traffic in alcoholic liquors as beverages is productive of serious injury to the moral, social and industrial welfare of the people of Canada.

That despite all preceding legislation, the evils of intemperance remain so vast in magnitude, so wide in extent and so destructive in effect, as to constitute a social peril and a national menace.

That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons hereinbefore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for those evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, for beverage purposes.

He said: I do not think it necessary to offer any apology for asking the attention of the House to this Resolution. I think it will be generally agreed by the members of this House that the functions of Parliament are of two kinds. It is, of course, the duty of Parliament carefully to scrutinize and supervise the details of all enactments upon subjects which come under its purview; and it is equally the important duty of Parliament to investigate as carefully, and to discuss as thoroughly, the principles upon which its legislation is founded in order that such legislation may be as effective and as salutary as possible. Subjects for legislation, Sir, do not often take their rise in Parliament itself; but they generally arise from the wishes, the necessities, or the grievances of the people outside of Parliament, and after a course of agitation in the public mind they find their way to Parliament where they demand consideration, discussion and settlement. I am here to-day to state that in my humble opinion there is no stronger feeling in the hearts and minds of the people of this country upon any subject whatever than the feeling with reference to the traffic of intoxicating liquors, and the best means for mitigating the evils arising therefrom, or of doing away with them altogether so far as possible; and I desire to-day to give expression, so far as I possibly can, to what I think are the wishes, the feelings and the desires on this matter of at least a very large portion of the people of Canada. I know that however feeble and hesitating my words may be, there will be in them a striving for expression of the thoughts and convictions of a very large portion of the people of this country in reference to this subject. I am not going to say how large, or how general, or how multitudinous are the demands of the people for legislation against the liquor traffic, but I know this much, that about ten years ago there appeared on the floors of this Parliament a most eloquent though silent plea in reference to this same matter, and in the line of the Resolution which has just been read. At that time there were laid upon the Table of the House petitions signed by tens and scores of thousands of earnest men and women; I think there were petitions signed by municipal councils, by the officers of great religious bodies which were fairly influential and representative in their character; and if I mistake not, resolutions were also laid upon the Table from at least two or three of the Provincial Legislatures of this Dominion, and the prayer of all these petitions and resolutions was in the line of the Resolutions which I have just presented to the House. So much with reference to the constituency which is interested in this matter. I think I may also safely say that during the ten years which have elapsed since then this feeling has not grown less, but on the contrary it has grown broader, and deeper, and more

Mr. SPEAKER.

intensified. Not only is there a large constituency of persons in Canada who, I believe, are demanding that the traffic in intoxicating liquors should be prohibited by legal enactment, so far as this Parliament has power to do so, but I am emboldened to say a few words to-day in behalf of this Resolution because of the importance of the matter itself. We are here, Sir, as legislators sent by the people from the different constituencies of Canada. We spend three or four months in the year in discussing and enacting legislation upon such subjects as demand legislation at our hands. We have spent a great deal of time and a great deal of energy in discussing matters of Tariff and revenue. The object of these discussions and the consequent enactments is two fold: First to raise, as easily and as lightly as possible, a sufficient revenue for the wants of the country; and in the second place, to make the conditions of labour as favourable as they can be made, and to devise means for the greater development of our resources. And yet, during the seventeen years which have elapsed since Confederation, I think I am within the mark in saying that the money which has been spent by our people in the liquor traffic would, by many millions, exceed the average of the revenues which have been gathered by this Government over the whole Dominion. I think I am also within the mark when I say that the conditions of labour and the development of the country have been materially hindered and retarded by the operation of this same traffic. An important subject of legislation is that which concerns immigration, and the policy of bringing in people from abroad to settle our new country, and, by their labour, to develop its resources, and by their industry and virtue, to contribute to the permanency and the beauty of the civilization we are building up; yet I think, Sir, I am within the mark when I say that during the seventeen years which have elapsed since Confederation the result of the liquor traffic in this Dominion, from its eastern to its western limits, in the idleness it has produced, the crime it has excited, and the waste of resources which it has caused, has gone far to nullify the good results of our immigration policy, and has taken out of the productive industries of this country and rendered useless for its development, almost as much brawn and muscle as have been brought into it by the immigration policies of all Governments from Confederation to the present time. Sir, we are concerned with the development and good government of our country as well, and it is the object of our deepest and best consideration that such legislation should be placed upon the Statute-Books of this country, so far as our powers extend, as will contribute to the development and prosperity, to the continued peace and good order of the communities which make up this country. And yet I am within the mark when I say that the evils resulting from the liquor traffic in the Dominion have done more to retard the prosperity of the country and to sow germs of disorder and discontent than any other other evils probably with which this country has been afflicted. So I say, Sir, if we look at the importance of this question, we may be sure that this Parliament is not going beyond its duty, and and that hon. members are not going beyond their privilege when they venture to call the attention of the House to the best means of dealing with and of mitigating the serious evils which result from this traffic. Sir, if the object of good government be to protect what is good, to prevent what is evil, and to develop so far as we can the best in society and in the nation, I do not know of any question which towers higher, which comes nearer, which appeals more strongly for solution than the one we have under consideration to-day. And, Sir, if we regard, on the one hand, the magnitude and dearness of those interests which are affected by it, and if we regard, on the other hand, the magnitude of the mischiefs which are, and which have been wrought by it, the wonder is, not that this request has come to-day into Parliament, but that it has not sooner come,

that it has not been more constantly and more importantly preferred. If we look into the country, and see what has taken place there within the last twenty years, if we look at the hold this question has taken upon the best heart and best brain of the Dominion, if we watch the forces in all their departments which are displayed and the activity at work with respect to this great question,—I say if we look at this we will come to the conclusion that this is no idle demand which has been made and is now being made of this Parliament, but that it is a deep and wide spread current of feeling and thought which is setting in towards the doors of Parliament and is no idle and no vain thing. Therefore, I move these Resolutions this afternoon, feeling that a very large constituency of the people of Canada are in sympathy with them, and feeling as well that the importance of the subject demands the very best and most serious consideration that any body of men in any deliberative assembly can give to it. And, Sir, I hope this will be the initial step in an agitation already begun and carried on in this country, an agitation begun and which I hope will be carried out in Parliament which will not stop until the strongest possible moral sentiment from without shall have been aided and supplemented by the very strongest possible legal enactment from within the halls of Parliament. The Resolution which I move to-day is a simple one. It has to do in the first place with intoxicating liquors as beverage only. It has nothing to do with the manufacture, importation or sale of intoxicating liquors considered as articles of use in chemical, mechanical or scientific ways. It simply brings down the matter to a discussion of the method upon which legislation should proceed with respect to the sale, manufacture and importation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. And if any hon. gentleman asks me, why it is I have proceeded by Resolution rather than by any other method, I state that out of several reasons I think these are good and sufficient. In the first place, a Resolution is within the competence of any member of this House and places this question, so far as the discussion of the principle is concerned, solely upon its own merits, taking it out of the ranks of party and out of the feelings which are excited when party warfare takes place. In the second place, the Resolution will do this, and is destined to do this: it is to raise a discussion in Parliament upon a principle, a discussion which will challenge the attention of the country and produce an interest throughout the country, as having been started and carried on in Parliament, which probably could be reached as well in this as in no other way. Again, Sir, it will test the strength of the principle of prohibition in Parliament; and if it be found that the strength of the prohibitory principle here is not commensurate with the strength of the feeling outside, it will give the people of Canada an opportunity of exercising the constitutional method of bringing up within the halls of this Parliament the measure of strength to the support of this principle which is warranted and called for by the measure of the strength of this principle in the country without. Again, the Resolution is introduced mainly and chiefly for this reason: that in a resolution we are cut off entirely from a mass of details which would otherwise cumber it. The moment that an enactment is proposed before a deliberative assembly, it must run out into details, and these details will strike minds in different ways, and immediately differences and divergencies of opinion take place. This is not hampered by any details. It is simply a question of principle to be discussed and to be decided on its merits; and I think in a matter of such importance as this, it is of the very first significance that in all succeeding legislation with respect to this subject, before it takes place we should have set ourselves deliberately, honestly and candidly to discuss and settle, if possible the proper principle which should guide that legislation. I may be met, at the very threshold of the discus-

sion, with this question: why is it that you prefer to adopt a different course with respect to the trade in intoxicating liquors, from that which you adopt with respect to any other trade. You have, for instance, factories in this Dominion. There are certain dangers which are incidental to the running and working of those factories. Now, it may be said to me: you do not rise in Parliament and ask, that because there are certain evils and dangers incidental to factory life, therefore, a Bill should be introduced to prohibit factories in the Dominion; but you simply set your self to work to guard against evils, which may come from them, and make everything as secure as possible, and when you have done that you feel you have done the best for the industries as well as for the people among whom they are carried on. Why, then, it may be asked, do you propose to adopt a different course towards the traffic in intoxicating liquors? Now, Sir, I am bound to say that I believe that that is an honest question and I think it deserves an honest and a candid answer. I say that we propose to adopt a different plan of treatment with reference to the traffic in intoxicating liquors, because necessity demands a different mode of treatment from any other of the industries of the country, that we can think of. And if you ask me proof of that I cannot give you better or more practical proof in the beginning than this, that the attitude which Government and popular mind has assumed towards the liquor traffic in the last fifty years, is one of the best indications that there is something radically wrong in that traffic otherwise such an attitude would not be assumed. What is that attitude? It is an attitude of opposition, of aggressive opposition, of continued and strengthening repugnance and hostility. I ask you to think of any Anglo-Saxon Government to-day which during the last twenty years has not set its face more and more in a position of determined hostility with reference to the liquor traffic, has not watched it as an enemy, has not looked upon it as ruinous, has not hampered it by checks and restrictions by limitations and prohibitions. Sir, I say that the history of legislation within the last fifty years in all Anglo-Saxon countries, with reference to the treatment of the liquor traffic, has been a history in which these two things have been marked: first, suspicion and the open expression of hostility to the traffic from Governments, and in the second place the aggressive nature of the limitations and restrictions and prohibitions which have been thrown around it. I make the statement here to-day which I think is a moderately fair one, that there is no Anglo-Saxon Government which would dare to sweep away all the restrictions upon the liquor traffic, or if it did sweep them away could live six months after having done so. I also think I am right in making the statement, that there is no Government or party in Anglo-Saxon countries to-day which can take away a single restriction which at present is put about this traffic without the loss of party prestige and public favour by that relaxation. I think this proves at least that there must be something radically wrong in the traffic when these are the attitudes of Governments towards it and in such an aggressive and continued way. But if the attitude of Government has continually shown a repugnant and an increasing hostility to the traffic, much more can this be affirmed of the popular feeling of the Anglo-Saxon race. Sir, I do not know of a single public legalized evil, or a single evil legalized or unlegalized which has drawn forth so strong, so wide and so representative expressions of disapproval as has this same traffic within the half century which has just passed by. Allow me, Sir, to call the attention of the House to some of these expressions which have leaped up from the deep sea of the popular feelings of the Anglo-Saxon world, which have crystallized themselves into expressions, which are living and will continue imperishable as an index of the attitude of the popular

mind with reference to this traffic. Long ago, in the British House of Lords—I think nearly two centuries ago, certainly more than one century ago—Lord Chesterfield, in speaking of the prohibition of the traffic in ardent spirits, amongst other things, said these memorable words :

“Let us crush these artists in human slaughter, who have reconciled their country to sickness and ruin, and spread over the pitfall of debauchery such a bait as cannot be resisted.”

Sir, in 1839, Lord Brougham, that man of great brains, and great purposes as well, uttered these words :

“To what good is it that the Legislature should pass laws to punish crime, or that their Lordships should occupy themselves in trying to improve the morals of the people by giving them education? What could be the use of growing a little seed here and plucking up a weed there, if these beer shops are to be continued to grow seeds of immorality broadcast over the land germinating the most frightful produce that ever has been allowed to grow up in a civilized country, and I am ashamed to add, under the fostering care of governments.”

Rowland Hill, a man of note and nobleness, said :

“Public houses—the bane of the country—excite the strongest indignation in my mind.”

Dr. Chalmers, that noble and representative Scotch minister, said :

“For ourselves we would have rejoiced if, by an entire stoppage of the distilleries, the beastly intoxication of Scotland had been suspended.”

Oliver Goldsmith, witty and versatile, gave expression to this truth :

“Ale houses are ever an occasion of debauchery and excess, and either in a political or religious sense it would be our highest interest to have them suppressed.”

Lord Bacon, an epitome of terse and pregnant wisdom, said :

“All the crimes on earth do not destroy so many of the human race or alienate so much property as drunkenness.”

Richard Cobler, that reformer in the people's best interest, stated :

“Every day's experience tends more and more to the conviction that the temperance cause lies at the foundation of all social and political reform.”

John Bright, the eloquent and noble tribune of the people, said :

“A monster obstacle is in our way—strong drink, by whatever name the demon is styled, in whatever way it presents itself, this prevents our success; remove this one obstacle, and our course will be onwards, and our labours will be blessed.”

The *London Times*, as far back as 1853, stated :

“It is a peculiarity of spirit drinking that the money spent in it is at the best thrown away. It neither supplies the natural wants of man nor offers an adequate substitution for them. \* \* \* \* \* No way so rapid to increase the wealth of nations, and the morality of society could be devised as the utter annihilation of the manufacture of ardent spirits constituting as they do an infinite waste and an unmixed evil.”

At a later date it said :

“The use of strong drink produces more idleness, want, crime and misery than all other causes put together. \* \* \* \* \* Drinking baffles us, confounds us, shames us, and mocks us at every point. It outwits alike the teacher, the man of business, the patriot, the legislator. Every other institution flounders in hopeless difficulties, the public house holds its triumphant course.”

Cardinal Manning, that representative and beloved Catholic English clergyman, states :

“I wish well to all trades, but with a reserve. I hope the baker may bake and sell more bread as long as he lives. I hope that every clothier may sell more yards of broadcloth and make more coats every year that passes over his head. I hope that every farmer may sell more wheat. But I cannot say in my heart and conscience that I hope the brewer will brew more beer, or the distillers distil more spirits, or the publicans sell more of both. (Cheers.) There is a limit to my good wishes. I wish that all trades may prosper except one. The prosperity that I wish to that one trade is that it should cease.”

Again he says :

“The evil ought not to be permitted to grow in order that the police may be called in to repress it. (Cheers.) Prevention is not only better than cure, but prevention is a duty, and cure is a lame halting attempt to undo an evil which we have wilfully permitted.”

Mr. POSTER.

And yet again :

“Of this he was perfectly certain, that if the great drink trade expanded itself every year, and continued its activity in intoxicating and poisoning the men of this country they would be every year losing their power of self-government and the safety which came with it, and those very centres that ought to be their safety would become their chief dangers.”

Sir, in 1877, the British Parliament appointed a Committee of the House of Lords who went into a long two years' investigation with reference to the evils coming from intemperance, and there is this pregnant sentence which occurs in the beginning of their report :

“When great communities, deeply sensible of the miseries caused by intemperance; witnesses of the crime and pauperism which directly spring from it; conscious of the contamination to which their younger citizens are exposed; watching with grave anxiety the growth of female intemperance on a scale so vast, and at a rate of progression so rapid as to constitute a new reproach and new danger; believing that not only the morality of their citizens, but their commercial prosperity, is dependent upon the diminution of these evils; seeing also that all that general legislation has been able to effect has been some improvement in public order, while it has been powerless to produce any perceptible decrease of intemperance, it would seem somewhat hard when such communities are willing, at their own cost and hazard, to grapple with the difficulty, and undertake their own purification, that the Legislature should refuse to create for them the necessary machinery, or to entrust them with the requisite powers.”

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury states :

“There is one dreadful evil overspreading the whole land which makes havoc of our workmen—the evil of intemperance. Unless you make distinct and positive efforts against it you will be neglecting an evil which is eating out the very heart of society, destroying domestic life among our working classes, and perhaps doing greater injury than any other cause that could be named in this age.”

Goldwin Smith, our own, I suppose I may call him, profound and philanthropic thinker, says :

“It is too clear that the rapid extension of this system of saloon drinking is threatening the very life of the community; that it is producing a physical and moral pestilence more deadly in the deepest sense than any other plague, which stalks the infected cities of the East; that it is bringing great masses of our working classes into a self-imposed bondage, more complete and more degrading than slavery itself; that it is not only filling the present with unspeakable misery and vice; but blighting the prospects of labour for the future.”

The *London Telegraph* says :

“Our revenue may derive some unholy benefit from the sale of alcohol, but the entire trade is nevertheless a covenant with gin and death.”

The *New York Tribune*, which, of all papers of this continent, might be expected to say the least stirring and pointed thing with reference to the liquor traffic, in its issue of February, 20th says :

“Many people who pride themselves on their practicality are wont to sneer at the opponents of the liquor traffic as mere ‘sentimentalists.’ No doubt there is much sentiment in that opposition, but it is sentiment based upon the hardest of facts. The truth is that if all the other evils that afflict society are put together they will not nearly equal in weight and sinister effects the one enormous and universal mischief of intemperance. Wherever we turn, in short, we encounter this subtle and sinister agency. It is a blight which lies heavy upon our civilization, and which will have to be cleared away before that civilization can become an object of just pride and satisfaction.”

The Right Hon. William E. Gladstone, that grand old man and most noted statesman, stated in his place in the House of Commons in 1880 :

“It has been said that greater calamities are inflicted on mankind by intemperance than by the three great historical scourges—war, pestilence and famine. That is true for us and it is the measure of our discredit and disgrace.”

And, Sir, as the last indication of that feeling which I will cite, let me ask the attention of this House to a paragraph which appeared, of all places, in the Queen's speech in Great Britain last year, when her Ministers put into her mouth these words :

“After a succession of unfavourable seasons in the greater portion of the United Kingdom, the produce of the land has, during the present year, been for the most part abundant, and trade is moderately active. The growth of the revenue, however, is sensibly retarded by a cause which must in itself be contemplated with satisfaction; I refer to the diminution in the receipts of the Exchequer from the duties on intoxicating liquors.”

Sir, I consider that as one of the most conclusive indications of what the popular feeling with reference to this traffic is that can possibly be adduced. Would such a sentence as that have been put in the Queen's speech if the cotton industry or the iron industry had been depressed—if there had been a falling off in the revenue from any other industry? No, Sir, the only item with reference to which a falling revenue could call out such a paragraph as that is the one whose failure is an indication of the advancing sobriety of the people—an indication that the stream of intoxicating liquors which has been poured out with such deadly effect in Great Britain for centuries past, has at last shown some sign of becoming more shallow and less heavy and destructive. Sir, I hold that these expressions, strong, forcible, and widely representative, occurring as they do through two centuries of Anglo-Saxon history, are fair indications of that feeling of repugnance and hostility which lies deep down in the best heart and the best brain of the Anglo-Saxon world, and which is rapidly leavening that unto its own measure and its own quality. Sir, I think that the two pivotal points on which this whole question turns are these: first, is this traffic in its nature and its results such as to demand legal suppression? And secondly, are the rightness and efficiency of prohibition capable of proof? If we can establish the affirmative of these two propositions, our course is clear. This principle agreed upon and established, legislation must proceed upon that well-established and true principle. Well, Sir, if you will allow me, let us, then, take up this first question: Is this traffic, in its nature and its results, such as to demand total legal suppression? I do not know, Sir, where we can better go for proof of this than to science, physiological science, economic science, social science—and finding out what is the answer of these three, come to a petty fair conclusion as to whether the nature and the results of this traffic are such as to demand its suppression at the hands of the State. And first, Sir, with reference to physiological or medical science, what is its voice with reference to alcoholic liquors? Alcoholic liquors may be said to be made up of two great constituents—alcohol and water, in varying proportions. I hold in my hand an analysis of three or four kinds of alcoholic liquors which will show the fact. For instance, in an Imperial pint of English ale, which weighs 22½ oz., it is found that 18 oz. is water, 2 oz. is alcohol, and 2½ oz. other material. It is found that the same quantity of port, weighing 21½ oz. contains 16 oz. of water, 4 oz. of alcohol, and 1½ oz. of other material. The same quantity of brandy, 20½ oz. in weight, contains 9½ oz. of water, 10½ oz. of alcohol, and ½ oz. of other material. Rum, that expressive, but not very classically named liquor, in the same quantity, weighing 20.148 oz., has 5 oz. of water, 15 oz. of alcohol, and 1.48 oz. of other material. Gin, weighing 20 oz., has 12 oz. of water, 8 oz. of alcohol, and nothing of other material. These figures go to show the make up of these liquors scientifically, and if we apply the analysis to all the different kinds of alcoholic liquors, we shall find that the principle constituents are alcohol and water. Now, Sir, it is not at all necessary for me to speak of the results or good qualities of water; we are all cognizant of them. What we have to do then is to ask what is this substance, alcohol, which makes up the chief basis of all alcoholic liquors? To whom shall we go for an answer, if we do not go to the medical and scientific men, and I wish, if the House will allow me, to read a statement, short as I can possibly make it, of the attitude and the opinion of medical and scientific men as shown by the utterances of great bodies of these men on this matter. In 1847 two thousand and upwards of England's eminent medical men signed and published a declaration to this effect:

"We are of opinion:—That a very large proportion of human misery, including poverty, disease and crime, is induced by the use of alcoholic

or fermented liquors as beverages; that total and universal abstinence from alcoholic liquors, and intoxicating beverages of all sorts, would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality and the happiness of the human race."

Later still, one hundred and upwards, of the representative physicians and scientific medical men of New York signed and published the following declaration of their views:—

"1. In view of the alarming prevalence and ill effects of intemperance with which none are so familiar as members of the medical profession, and which have called forth from eminent English physicians the voice of warning to the people of Great Britain, concerning the use of alcoholic beverages, we the undersigned members of the medical profession of New York and vicinity, unite in the declaration that we believe alcohol should be classed with other powerful drugs; that when prescribed medicinally, it should be with conscientious caution, and a sense of grave responsibility.

"2. We are of opinion that the use of alcoholic liquor as a beverage is productive of a large amount of physical disease; that it entails diseased appetites upon offspring; and that it is the cause of a large percentage of the crime and pauperism of our cities and country.

"3. We would welcome any judicious and effective legislation—State and national—which should seek to confine the traffic in alcohol to the legitimate purposes of medical and other sciences, art and mechanism."

This is signed by the President and the Professors of the College of Physicians and Surgeons; it is signed by Willard Parker, M. D., a man eminent in the medical world, and by upwards of one hundred others of the representative medical men of New York. Not many years ago ninety and upwards of Montreal's foremost medical men gave expression to their sentiments in this form:

"We, the undersigned members of the medical profession in Montreal are of opinion:

"1. That a large portion of human misery, poverty, disease and crime, is produced by the use of alcoholic liquors, as a beverage.

"2. That total abstinence from intoxicating liquors, whether fermented or distilled, is consistent with, and conducive to the highest degree of physical and mental health and vigour.

"3. That abstinence from intoxicating liquors would greatly promote the health, morality and happiness of the people."

This was signed by G. W. Campbell, A.M., M.D., Professor of the principles and practices of Surgery and Dean of Faculty of McGill, Montreal, and ninety others. In 1874 the Medical Association of the United States met in Detroit and gave expression to this opinion:

"That we are of the opinion that the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage is productive of a large amount of physical and mental disease; that it entails diseased appetites and enfeebled constitutions upon offspring; and that it is the cause of a large percentage of the crime and pauperism in our large cities and country."

In 1876 there was held a great International Medical Council in the city of Philadelphia. It was one of the largest and ablest medical bodies ever convened, and their deliverance upon the subject is as follows:—

"1. Alcohol is not shown to have a definite food value by any of the usual methods of chemical or physiological investigation.

"2. Its use as a medicine is chiefly that of a cardiac stimulant, and of an admittant of substitution.

"3. As a medicine, it is not well fitted for self-prescription by the laity, and the medical profession is not accountable for such administration, or for the enormous evils resulting therefrom."

Such was the deliverance of medical men with reference to this substance, alcohol, which forms the basis of the alcoholic liquors which are the wholestock in trade of this traffic in alcoholic beverages. Science strips herself free from every prejudice, she frees herself from every old custom, she has gone into her laboratory and dissecting room, she has conducted her scientific investigations, and in calm, clear, authoritative tones she tells the people that alcohol has no food value, that as a beverage it is productive of infinite misery in the way of disease, ill health and death, that it is a poison to be ranked among poisons and labelled as dangerous; and she asks the people to beware of it as an enemy of the human race. Let me give you some views of representative scientific medical men, individually, on this matter. Dr. Carpenter, than whom there is no more noted physician in Great Britain or probably in the whole

rank of medical physiologists throughout the world, says:

"In the average man, the habitual use of alcoholic liquors, in moderate or even in small quantities, is not merely unnecessary for the maintenance of bodily and mental vigour, but is unfavourable to the permanent enjoyment of health, even though it may, for a time, appear to contribute to it."

Sir William Gull, a Fellow of the Royal Society and Physician to Her Majesty, stated in his evidence, in 1877-78, before the Lords' Committee:

"I should say, from my experience, that alcohol is the most destructive agent that we are aware of in this country. \* \* \* I would like to say that a very large number of people in society are dying day by day, poisoned by alcohol, but not supposed to be poisoned by it. I know it is a most deleterious poison."

Dr. Benjamin Richardson, a very celebrated medical analyst says:

"Finally, to sum it all up, I find that alcoholic drinks give no strength, reduce the tone of the blood-vessels, build up no muscle, destroy its powers, and make it less active for work; that these drinks in the most moderate quantity can be of no use to me or anyone else as a substance for food. We are sometimes told that it is fanatical, it is impractical, it is contrary to the interests of individual men, or classes of men, to speak those things and oppose alcohol. Be it so. In another age it will be a wonder that such arguments as those we are obliged to use, were ever necessary to convert an unwilling world. In the meantime unhampered by any of those plausible excuses, it is our duty, whether it be called fanatical or philosophical, practical or impractical, advantageous to class interests or opposed to them, to unite, body and mind, heart and soul, in suppressing this evil at its root, and in endeavouring to make this earth something nearer heaven, by pulling down from its high place the demon Drink, who still reigns so triumphantly in the land in which we live."

Dr. Thomson, a Fellow of the Royal Society and Surgeon Extraordinary to His Majesty the King of the Belgians and Surgeon to University College Hospital says:

"I have long had the conviction that there is no greater cause of evil, moral and physical, in this country than the use of alcoholic beverages. I do not mean by this that extreme indulgence which produces drunkenness. The habitual use of fermented liquors to an extent far short of what is necessary to produce that condition, and such as is quite common in all ranks of society, injures the body and diminishes the mental power to an extent which I think few people are aware of. Such, at all events, is the result of observation during more than twenty years of professional life devoted to hospital practice, and to private practice in every rank above it. Thus, I have no hesitation in attributing a very large proportion of some of the most painful and dangerous maladies which come under my notice, as well as those which every medical man has to treat, to the ordinary and daily use of fermented drink taken in the quantity which is conventionally deemed moderate \* \* \*. But if I ventured one step further it would be to express a belief that there is no single habit in this country which so much tends to deteriorate the qualities of the race, and so much disqualifies it for endurance in that competition which in the nature of things must exist, and in which struggle the prize of superiority must fall to the best and to the strongest."

And as a final evidence I shall quote the words of Dr. Andrew Clark who is known to some gentlemen in this House and is favourably known as a medical authority the world over:

"As I looked at the hospital wards to-day and saw that seven out of ten owed their diseases to alcohol, I could but lament that the teaching about this question was not more direct, more decisive, more home thrusting than even it had been."

"Can I say to you any words stronger than these of the terrible effects of the abuse of alcohol? It is when I myself think of all this that I am disposed, as I have said elsewhere, to rush to the opposite extreme, to give up my profession, to give up everything and to go forth upon a holy crusade, preaching to all men, beware of this enemy of the race."

Sir, I rest my case, on its scientific aspect, with these testimonies that I have read before this House, and I hold that we have a perfect right to conclude from them that, so far as the voice of science in a medical and physiological way is concerned, science puts in no plea for the maintenance of this traffic; that, on the contrary, its whole plea is that the traffic is an enemy to the human race, in the words of the celebrated Dr. Clarke, and as such it ought to be suppressed, ought not to be allowed to exist. Well, Sir, let us next ask, what is the voice of Economic science with reference to this liquor traffic? I am not one of

Mr. FOSTER.

those who believe that the doctrines of the political economist are hard cast-iron doctrines which must be applied in every country and at every age, without reference to the differing circumstances and capabilities of the country where they are sought to be applied. I have not read very many of these books through, but I believe I have arrived at three or four common sense economic rules, which will commend themselves to this House and to the country; and I am within the bounds of all reason when I state that, other things being equal, the maximum of prosperity in a country is to be reached (1) by the frugal and proper use of all its material resources, (2) by the wise conservation and employment of its labour power, (3) by the prudent and useful expenditure of the earnings of its labour, (4) by having the minimum of non-producing and dangerous criminal elements. Now, if these four propositions be true—and I do not think it is necessary to say a single word in attempting to prove their truth—let us ask the question, what is the attitude of the liquor traffic with reference to these four propositions? I state unhesitatingly, and I challenge contradiction anywhere, that the liquor traffic antagonizes every one of these simple canons of economic truth. The first one is, that countries will be most prosperous, other things being equal, when the frugal and proper use of all their material resources is ensured. What then with reference to the liquor traffic and the material resources of the country? Sir, it commences in a waste of the best and most precious material resources of a country. In Great Britain to-day it is estimated by their most eminent statisticians that the quantity of grain destroyed each year in order to make the alcoholic liquors that are consumed in Great Britain amounts to the total sum of between 70,000,000 and 80,000,000 bushels of grain, or of produce equivalent to it; some 50,000,000 or 60,000,000 of it is pure, unadulterated grain. In the United States of America, from 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 bushels of grain is used up in the manufacture of the alcoholic liquors that are taken in that country; and, in our Dominion of Canada, where a partial failure in one of our grain crops has this year produced wide and deeply felt disturbance, we every year give up from 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 bushels of grain, to be made into intoxicating liquors to be distributed and used through this country. That makes a total, in these three Anglo-Saxon countries, of 70,000,000 and 50,000,000 and 3,000,000—in round numbers 125,000,000 of bushels of grain, which are the material resources upon which the liquor traffic first operates in order to make the wares it has for distribution. Now, let us for a moment look at that immense pyramid of grain—125,000,000 of bushels, if you please. That can be used in three different ways. We may take it, as God has given it to us, we shall the constituents neatly and deftly put together for the best preservation and reproduction of strength in the human frame; we may turn it into the channels of food supply, to feed our men and our cattle, and it will bring forth its results in fruits; for anyone will tell us that, if we put it to that use, it will be put to the use that God intended it for, and to the use which will be of the greatest service to the community and to the people. There is another use to which this grain can be put. The torch may be applied to that pyramid of grain, 125,000,000 of bushels, and it may be destroyed by fire. In that case, Sir, it is simply wanton and reckless waste. There is another use to which this grain may be put, and that is this, it may be put through certain processes by which its food value is entirely or almost entirely destroyed, it may be turned into what is physiologically and chemically known as a poison, and which is sent broadcast through the community and through the country to do its work and bring forth its result of evil, of disease, and of death. Mr. Speaker, when I was interrupted in my remarks by your announcing to the House the

receipt of a letter from His Excellency's secretary, I was calling the attention of this House to the waste of material resources consequent upon this traffic in our country, and I had just stated that, in these three Anglo-Saxon countries, at least 125,000,000 of bushels of grain, or of produce of equal value, were destroyed in the manufacture of these liquors. I was proceeding to state that there were three uses to which this grain could be put—the one legitimate use of food supply; it could be burnt and so recklessly and wantonly destroyed; or it could be distilled and brewed into a liquid which lost the food properties of the original grain and which contained deleterious and poisonous qualities such as have been pointed out in the medical and scientific testimony I have read before this House. Now, I state this, that, if it be a proper canon of economic truth that the frugal and proper use of all material resources is necessary to the maximum prosperity of a country, that traffic which deliberately destroys so much as 3,000,000 of bushels of grain in our own country, so much as 50,000,000 of bushels of grain in the United States, or so much as 70,000,000 of bushels of grain in Great Britain, and destroys its food value, and turns it into something which is not valuable as a food but is destructive and deleterious as a beverage, I say that that traffic stamps itself as antagonistic to a country in that economic sense; it offends against the simple rule, the proper and legitimate use of the material resources of the country. Well, Sir, let us go one step further and ask, What is the attitude of this liquor traffic to the labour power of a country?—for we laid it down as a second rule that the maximum prosperity of a country, other things being equal, was to be reached by a wise conservation and employment of its labour power. Well, Sir, I find in the first place that in the manufacture of these liquors in the Dominion, 1,411 persons are engaged in breweries, 285 are engaged in distilleries, and I have made an estimate which I am sure will not be considered excessive, that 10,000 persons are engaged in the distribution of alcoholic liquors. Thus we reach a total of about 12,000 persons who are engaged in the manufacture and distribution of alcoholic liquors in the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, I state this, and I do it calmly and deliberately, believing that it cannot be successfully contradicted, that all the labour of these 1,411 men employed in breweries, of these 285 men employed in distilleries, and of these 10,000 persons engaged in the distribution of alcoholic liquors, is labour which, to say the least of it, is lost as far as the proper end of labour—which we must always keep in view—is concerned. Suppose, for the sake of illustration, that these 12,000 persons were engaged in a legitimate and productive business—a number of them in the fields at farm work, a number of them in the mines at mining, and a number of them in various departments of building. Suppose, then, I come up and say to these 12,000 men: "Come with me and I will give you work. Leave all the business you are now engaged in, and I will employ you for a year and pay you equal or greater wages." Immediately the 12,000 labourers leave off their work in the field, the mine and the workshops, and I set them to work in this way: I say to them, "Go yonder to the forest, 12,000 of you, and hew down the tall trees that are growing there, carry these down to the mills which have been built for the purpose; have those trees all sawn into thin strips, and have these strips cut up into still thinner pieces, and when you have done all this, at the end of the year, gather up what you have prepared and apply the torch to it and burn it up." Is it not patent to every person who follows the illustration, that all the labour of those 12,000 men employed in this way during the year, has resulted in nothing, has been lost to the country, and in the meantime, the field, the mine and the workshop have been lying idle? So, Sir, I think, and I do not believe it can be

controverted, that the labour of 12,000 persons, employed in the manufacture and distribution of intoxicating liquors, is labour which, for all productive purposes, is lost to the country. And I say the traffic in alcoholic liquors offends that second rule, which we have laid down, that other things being equal, the maximum prosperity of a country is to be found in the wise conservation and employment of its labour power. Not only is that true with reference to the labour employed in the liquor traffic, but I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact, which cannot be left out of view, that the traffic in intoxicating liquors destroys and nullifies a large proportion of our labor power. In 1834 a commission was appointed by the British House of Commons, of which Mr. Buckingham, was chairman, and one of the first sentences of the report of that commission was the following:

"The loss of productive labour in every department of occupation, to the extent of one day in six throughout the kingdom (as testified by witnesses engaged in various manufacturing operations) by which the wealth of the country, created as it chiefly is by labour, is retarded or suppressed to the extent of one million out of every six that is produced, to say nothing of the constant derangement, imperfection, and destruction in every agricultural and manufacturing process, occasioned by the intemperance and consequent unskillfulness, inattention, and neglect of those affected by intoxication, producing great injury in our domestic and foreign trade."

Now, Sir, that is not the statement of a temperance fanatic; that is not the statement of a partizan; it is the statement of a cool Conservative committee, who for years investigated this question, and took evidence, and ended by declaring that one labourer out of every six had his labour nullified and destroyed in Great Britain, so far as production was concerned, as a result of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and that therefore one sixth of the possible production of Great Britain was prevented by the fact of the existence of this traffic. Sir, I do not pretend for a moment to say that the loss of labour in a new country like ours is at all comparable to the loss of labour in a thickly settled country like Great Britain, but it is patent to every hon. gentleman in this House that a great deal of labour is wasted in Canada as a direct result of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. Suppose, as a moderate computation, that every liquor shop, every distributing centre in Canada, destroys and nullifies the labour of at least two individuals; according to this estimate, in the 10,000 liquor shops of the Dominion, the labour of a force of 20,000 men is nullified, destroyed, and lost to the country completely, so far as their productive power is concerned, by reason of the liquor traffic which exists in our midst. I state, therefore, that the traffic in alcoholic beverages offends against this second rule which we have laid down, that, other things being equal, a country will be prosperous in proportion to the wise conservation and employment of its labour power. Sir, let me go a step further and call the attention of the House to the waste of wealth consequent on the liquor traffic. Eminent statisticians in Great Britain and the United States have made most elaborate calculations on that point, but I propose to take the official calculations. It is calculated that in Great Britain the people spent, last year, \$650,000,000 for alcoholic beverages; it was calculated that in the United States the liquor bill amounted to \$700,000,000. Well, Sir, after looking somewhat closely into this subject and making, as I think, a fair and moderate estimate, I come to the conclusion, and believe, that the people of Canada spend for alcoholic beverages each year a sum pretty nearly equal to \$40,000,000. So, Sir, in this new country of ours, which so greatly needs to husband its resources and turn its surplus wealth into capital for the development of the country, the people spend at least \$40,000,000 per year. Now, Sir, let me call the attention of the House to another illustration which bears upon this subject. Here is a labourer, and we will suppose that he earns \$450 per year. We will suppose it takes \$100 of this amount for the fair

and reasonable expenses of living for himself and his family. That man, then, has \$50 of surplus left. Now, it is apparent to every one that the future of that man, so far as this world's goods are concerned, depends upon the disposition he makes of that \$50 surplus. If he places it in the savings bank year after year, he is laying up something for a rainy day and laying the foundation of his own independence. If he invests the amount in real estate and gradually makes for himself a home, he is doing the same thing. But if he goes to a gentleman and gets from him fifty pieces of brown paper and hands over \$50, and then takes those fifty pieces of brown paper and slips them away in a drawer at home, in the opinion of every common sense man he will have uselessly spent his surplus, and he will be as poor at the end of the year as at the beginning. But let me go a step further with that illustration. Suppose that man goes into one of the low or high dram shops and spends the surplus of \$50 for intoxicating liquors, which does him harm and injures his family as well, every sensible man will agree with me when I say that he has more than wasted his surplus, for he has used it to his own injury and to the injury of his family. It is exactly the same with a country as with individuals, but in a greater degree, and that country which wastes its surplus wealth on alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes, which are so little use and so great an injury, wastes its resources and spends where it should not, and prevents itself from becoming as rich as the productive resources would entitle it to be. So I say the traffic in alcoholic liquors offends against the third rule we have laid down, the prudent and useful expenditure of the earnings of labour. Let me for a moment call the attention of the House to a third result. We laid it down as a rule, too, that the maximum of prosperity, other things being equal, will be reached in a country which has the minimum of non-productive and of dangerous or criminal elements. What is it, Sir, that is one of the first results of the traffic in intoxicating liquors either in a community or in a country? It is to create non-producers, more or less of them; and every non-producer created is a burden to the country and must be maintained by the honest earnings of the people who do work and who do produce. Suppose, for instance, you have five labouring men and their families, and those five men enter into partnership, pool their earnings and the surplus of their earnings as well. We will suppose each to be earning \$400 a year. The five will, therefore, earn \$2,000. It takes \$350, we will say, for each man's reasonable expenses of living, which gives a total of \$1,750; so that at the end of the year the five persons will have a surplus of \$250. Suppose one of those five men becomes incapacitated in any way from earning; he and his family are still to be kept. There are, however, but four now earning, and these at \$400 each will give a total of \$1,600 a year. But it takes \$1,750 to keep the five families, so that there is a deficit of \$150 because of the throwing out from productive labour of one of those five men. This deficit has to be made up out of previous earnings or it has to go as a mortgage on future earnings; in either way the fifth man who falls out from productive labour is a drag and a burthen on the four who remain in it. So, I say, it is plain and clear that every non-producer in the country is a burden to the country, and has to be kept by the honest labour, and out of the honest earnings of the people. Whatever is true in individual cases is true of the nation as a whole, and every one who has looked into the subject knows and is certain that the traffic in alcoholic liquors results in producing a large number of persons who are non-producers, who do not earn their own living, who are thrown on charity, public or private, and consequently retard the progress and accumulation of wealth of the country. It is the same with regard to the dangerous and criminal elements which come out of this traffic as an inevitable result, which has been known and appreciated and deplored for

Mr. FOSTER.

centuries, and at no time to a greater extent than in the present day. So that the liquor traffic antagonizes that rule which makes the prosperity of a country amongst other things depend on having a minimum of non-productive and dangerous or criminal elements within its borders, for all those criminal elements have to be cared for, restrained and watched, and this the country, either from its general or special funds, has to pay, and for the cost of this the people are responsible. So, Sir, when a demand is made for a prohibition of the liquor traffic, I say there is no argument that economic science will put forth to withstand this plea: That this traffic commences in a waste of raw material, that it continues in a waste of the labour resources of the country, that it ends in a waste and deterioration of labour power and of human life. So, Sir, when we desire that the liquor traffic should be suppressed by legal enactment, we are within the bounds and rules which economic science on every page lays down, and which will join us in declaring that the liquor traffic should be legally suppressed in the best economic interests of the country. Now I wish to go from this a step higher. We have been talking about physiological science and economic science, but there is something which is higher and more important than that, viz: the social necessities and considerations which are forced upon us. Physiological science and economic conditions are worthy of our best attention, but these are only the conditions on which society is built up and the social fabric is constructed, and this is something of far higher import and far more weighty than the others of which I have just made mention. Into human society certain factors enter; some of them for good and some of them for evil. Our educational institutions strive to impart to society that intelligence, that knowledge, that information which will at one and the same time give a guarantee of its permanency and also adorn and beautify it. Art and literature and industry come to help as factors for the building up and enrichment and beautifying of society. Invention gives all its contrivances for its comfort; commerce gives all its explorations and carrying for its enrichment and its wealth; and all these good forces join and unite themselves to make of society a great edifice in which the power of man, supplemented by the principles and practices of morality, will make a superstructure strong and powerful, and beautiful as well. I say what society demands is of far greater consideration to us than what either physiological science or economic science demands. When the liquor traffic enters into this society as a factor, what happens? I will make my remarks as short as possible, for I do not want to detain the House at too great length, yet I feel it is not demanded of me in the interests of this subject, and those to whom this subject is dear, that I should unnecessarily shorten my remarks even though some impatience is manifested in the House; but I submit that the importance of the question which I am attempting to treat warrants me in making my remarks sufficiently lengthy to enable me to place the question properly before the House and the country. Now, Sir, what happens when this traffic enters as a factor into this beautiful structure that we call society. I shall not make my remarks very long, but I say the first result that comes to our cities and towns, to the distributing centres of strong drink, is the creation of idleness, the taking away of industry from its work, the taking away of labour from its employment, the filling up of the benches of the idle, and this idleness at every distributing centre, multiplied by the number of these distributing centres, gives us a vast area of idleness produced in the country, of labour taken from its proper employment, of productive power stolen from its proper functions—a vast amount of idleness which gathers about this liquor traffic in all its

distributing centres. None of us can begin to compute, not having the personal knowledge, the loss which every year, and every hour, comes to this country throughout its length and breadth by the idleness which is produced by the liquor traffic. But not only is idleness produced, but disorder is produced. If there is one thing which civilization specially prides itself upon, it is upon having brought the genius of order out of the wild wastes of savagery and barbarism, and having taken her by the hand and led her along in the van of civilization, says to us that so long as good order reigns in civilization there will be permanence, there will be progress, there will be stability, there will be beauty, and there will be strength of civilization as well. I state to-day, from my place in this House, and I defy contradiction, that there is no more potent seed germ of disorder in this or any other Anglo-Saxon country than that which springs out of and is involved in this liquor traffic as it flows through this country. None of us can find out, for we have not the scope of mind, the comprehensiveness of mind, to grasp it, the multiplied disorders which arise through the country out of the germ seeds which are sown by the liquor traffic as it flourishes among us from year to year. What comes next? Pauperism is injected into society; labor is pulled down into idleness; and the inevitable result is that that which should be wealthy and independent, able to take care of itself, is reduced to a pauper's condition; plenty is dragged out of its seat, and poverty takes its place. Go to the old country, read the records of the Poor Law Unions, read the records of Parliamentary investigations, and if we use our eyes even in our own communities, we will find that there is no more potent cause of pauperism in the country, no more potent cause of criminality than the liquor traffic by the dissipation which it produces, by its taking away the independent aspirations, taking away the desire, on the part of mankind, to improve their position, by its tendency to sink a man lower and lower in the strata of society. Pauperism raises its gaunt form in every one of our villages and cities all over the country. There has been a talk about soup kitchens in Parliament this Session, Sir. I make this statement believing it to be true, that though some people are brought into the condition of recipients of charity because death has suddenly struck down their friends, or because of the visitation of circumstances which cannot be controlled; I say that the great mass of the pauperism and poverty which goes round begging for charity, is that which is the direct result of the dram-shop, where the earnings, which should have gone for food, have been wasted in dissipation and debauch. That is the pauperism which forms the mass and weight of the burden in the old country, and that is the pauperism which is growing to be the mass and weight of the burden in this country. And as it is one of the strongest hindrances to the prosperity and progress in this or any country, let us who are beginning to build up a new nationality, let us who are growing up from rural constituencies, from small towns and village constituencies—let us look to it that the cause which produced this burthen of pauperism is weeded out of our country while it is still young, so that while we go on to a denser population, we may grow up with less of that pauperism which has afflicted older countries. What else is injected into society by the liquor traffic, and by the distributing centres of that traffic? Crime, Sir. There is no more hydra-headed monster that dogs the steps of civilization, none of a more terrible or revolting character than that which shows itself, not only in our great cities and in our centres of civilization, but in our rural communities as well—one which waits on the footsteps of civilization and christianity all over the world. Christianity with its light and beauty takes hold of men's hearts and transforms our whole civilization, but it has behind it the

terrible dogging footsteps of that multiplied crime, which is a dark shadow that may set off in greater brightness the civilization which has just advanced, but which is none the less a source of disgrace and shame to our country. It is something to which the best legislative minds of this or any other country should devote themselves, and they would raise themselves in the estimation of all the best people if they would put their gigantic powers towards solving it. I say, Sir, that this patching up on one side, while this ulcer sore and source of crime is allowed to remain, is not a statesmanlike thing, is not a common sense thing: is something which experience proves to be wrong: is something which the common sense of mankind will not much longer tolerate. Sir, if there be one thing which marks the legislation of to-day as against the legislation of fifty years ago, it is the paternal character of the present legislation. Men have got beyond the idea that they are here simply to recruit soldiers, to gather taxes, and carry on war, and let the best interests of the country take care of themselves, and they have come to the conclusion that in the future it is the practical duty of legislators to dig down into the causes which lie at the root of social deterioration, to stamp out these causes of crime and pauperism by proper measures of restriction, and in this way infuse a light and brightness into society which could not be infused in any other way. Sir, is it necessary for me to go into statistics to prove that crime comes from that traffic? No, it is not. But still, I feel it is my duty to ask the attention of the House for a few moments while I give them the results of experience of men abler perhaps than any of us to give an opinion upon this question, with reference to the criminality induced and produced by this traffic. Sir, I take first our own country and I begin with the Province of Ontario. In 1881 the total commitments were 9,229, and of these the number committed for drunkenness and disorderly conduct was 3,328. In 1882, the total commitments were 9,620; drunk and disorderly, 3,447. In 1883 the total commitments were 9,880; drunk and disorderly, 3,895. The inspector, in his report of 1883, states:

"The most deplorable feature is the very large increase in the commitments for drunkenness, the figures being, in 1882, 3,497; in 1883, 3,925, an increase of 393, or 11.38 per cent. The percentage which the commitments for drunkenness bear to the total commitments is 29.42, against 36.35 per cent. in 1882, showing that, not only are the commitments for this offence numerically greater, but that the proportion they bear to the total commitments is also increased. It is to be hoped that the efforts now being made by the various associations for the promotion of temperance will have the effect of reducing the large number who find their way, through this vice, to the goals of the province."

A Committee of this Parliament of 1875, reported that the commitments to the common goals of Ontario and Quebec in the years 1870, 1871 and 1872 were 28,289, of which 21,236 were for drunkenness and kindred crimes—80 per cent. of the total. In nine years, from 1875 to 1883, inclusive, the total number of commitments to the goals of Ontario were 98,063, of which 33,444 were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, or 34 per cent. of the whole. In 1881, the nine cities of Ontario had a total number of arrests for all crimes of 13,196, of which 6,926 were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, being 45 per cent. of the total arrests in those nine cities. Sir, this proves that in Ontario, which is in some respects the pivotal Province of this Dominion—one which has as great advantages as any in moral training and educational training—more than that, Sir, one which has, I believe, one of the best Liquor License Laws to be found on any Provincial Statute Book—is shown an increasing number of arrests, and an increasing number of convictions for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. In the city of Toronto last year, the total number of arrests for all crimes was 6,636, of which 3,407, or 50 per cent. of the whole, were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. I wish now to give what I consider one of the

most conclusive tests which has been given in any country or in any age with reference to the crime caused by intemperance. I hold in my hand part of the eleventh and twelfth annual reports on the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of labour, a very excellent institution—I wish we had a counterpart of it in this Dominion—a body of very able and intelligent and industrious men, whose sole duty it is, at the command of the Commonwealth Legislature, to give their whole time to making such investigations as they are ordered to undertake. They were ordered by the Massachusetts Legislature to undertake an investigation with reference to the percentage of crime resulting from the use of intoxicating liquors in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and what were the results, as shown in their eleventh report?

#### ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message was delivered by René Elouard Kimber, Esq., Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

“MR. SPEAKER,—

“Sir William Ritchie, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of Your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.”

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

And having returned,

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

An Act to amend the Act intitled: An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for other purposes.

#### PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FOSTER. I find, Sir, that the investigations of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics show that during the 20 years, from 1860 to 1879, the total number of sentences pronounced in the Commonwealth was 578,458, of which 340,814, or 60 per cent., were for what the Bureau denominates distinctly rum crimes, that is, crimes which came directly from violations of the license laws, and cases of drunkenness and disorderly conduct and from excessive indulgence in spirits. Well, Sir, that left 40 per cent. of the crime of the State of Massachusetts, and the question came as to what category that 40 per cent. should be distributed into; and so the Bureau of Statistics were instructed by the Legislature to continue their investigations, and to report, during the next year, as to what proportion of these crimes would be attributable to the traffic in intoxicating liquors. That Committee went to work. It took Suffolk County, which includes the city of Boston, as its base of operations and it investigated the criminality in that county from September, 1879, to September, 1880. It went about this work in the most methodical manner. It not only had agents who attended every trial during the year, but those agents were instructed to most thoroughly investigate the causes of each crime, and the antecedents of the persons who committed the crime. They went back into their history, they traced up that history to its beginning, and after a most elaborate investigation they penned their report, of which this is the result: From September 1st, 1879, to September 1st, 1880, there were 16,897 sentences, of which 12,289 were for distinctively rum crimes. That left 4,608 cases, which the Bureau undertook to investigate, and as the result of their investigation they found that of these 4,608 crimes, 2,097 were committed by persons who were in liquor at the time of the commission of the crime, making 12 per cent. of the total attributable directly or indirectly to intoxicating liquors. Adding 72 per cent. for distinctively rum crimes

Mr. FOSTER.

to this 12 per cent., we get a total of 84 per cent. of all crime due, directly or indirectly, to the use of liquor, as the result of the investigation of the Bureau. I will give the concluding part of their report in their own words:

“These figures paint a picture, at once the most faithful and hideous, of the guilt and power of rum. Men and women, the young, the middle-aged, and the old, father and son, husband and wife, native and foreign born, the night-walker and man-slayer, the thief and adulterer—all testify to its ramified and revolting tyranny. Therefore, the result of this investigation, in view of the disproportionate magnitude of the exclusively rum offences, and considered in connection with the notorious tendency of liquor to inflame and enlarge the passions and appetites, to import chaos into the moral and physical life, to level the barriers of decency and self-respect, and to transport its victims into an abnormal and irresponsible state, destructive and degrading, calls for earnest and immediate attention at the bar of the public opinion and the public conscience of Massachusetts.”

I think that that report, giving the results of an investigation most impartially and most thoroughly carried out, cannot but be very conclusive. It sets forth the alarming and preponderating influence which the use of intoxicating liquors has in the production of crime in these countries of ours. I wish, besides, to read to you the opinions of several of the most eminent judges of Great Britain with reference to their experience in this matter. As early as 1670, Sir Matthew Hale, Chief Justice of England, said:

“By due observation extending over twenty years, I have found that if the murders and manslaughters, the burglaries, and robberies, the riots and tumults, and other enormities that have happened in that time, were divided into five parts, four of these have been the issues and products of excessive drinking—of tavern and ale-house drinking.”

Lord Chief Justice Coleridge said:

“I can keep no terms with a vice that fills our jails, that destroys the comfort of homes and the peace of families, and debases and brutalizes the people of these islands.

“There is scarcely a crime that comes before me that is not directly or indirectly caused by strong drink.”

Judge Patterson says:

“If it were not for this drinking you (the jury) and I would have nothing to do.”

Judge Anderson says:

“Drunkenness is the most fertile source of crime, and if it could be removed, the assizes of this country would be rendered mere nullities.”

Judge Wightman says:

“I find in my calendar that comes before me, one unfailing source, directly or indirectly, of the most of the crimes that are committed—intemperance.”

Mr. Justice Hawkins declared this:

“His lordship appealed to the members of the Grand Jury not only to repress, as far as possible, the crime of drunkenness, but also to bring their influence to bear upon those who encouraged drunkenness. It was a very serious matter, and he could not express too strongly his opinion that both those who indulged in the baneful and pernicious vice, and those who encouraged it, should be put down with a strong hand.”

Lord Chief Baron Kelly said:

“Two thirds of the crimes which come before the courts of law of this country are occasioned chiefly by intemperance.”

Mr. Frederick Hill, late Inspector of Prisons in England, and a high authority on penal science, writes:

“I am within the truth when I state, as the result of extensive and minute enquiry, that of four cases out of five, when an offence has been committed, intoxicating drink has been one of the causes.”

Dr. Elisha Harris, of New York, after a thorough inspection of prisons, says:

“After two years of careful inquiry into the history and condition of the criminal population of the State, I find that the conclusion is inevitable that, taken in all its relation, alcoholic drinks may be justly charged with far more than half the crimes that are brought to conviction in the State of New York, and that full 85 per cent. of all convicts give evidence of having, in some larger degree, been prepared or enticed to the criminal acts, because of the physical and distracting effects produced upon the human organism by alcohol and as they indulged in the use of alcoholic drinks.”

The Board of Police Justices of the city of New York, in their report of 1874, says:

"We are fully satisfied that intoxication is the one great leading cause which renders the existence of our police courts necessary."

Governor Dix, of New York, said :

"Intemperance is the undoubted cause of four fifths of all the crime, pauperism, and domestic misery of the State of New York."

Sir Thomas Chambers, Q.C., M.P., as Chairman at a meeting addressed by Sir W. Lawson, in Westbourne Park Chapel, London, March 22, 1882, said :

"I am in a position of course to see and to feel the mischief of intemperance, as administering the criminal law at the central criminal court for a long series of years; and my experience only confirms and strengthens the view I have held for very many years, that if we could absolutely put an end to the vice of intemperance in this metropolis and in other great towns in the country, we should put an end to nearly all the crimes of violence which are brought before the public tribunals."

Mr. Justice Denman, at the Surrey Assizes, in August, 1882, said :

"I don't know in enforcing the considerations which are placed before the judges as a part of their duty in the proclamation against vice and immorality which has just been read, that any judge can better discharge his duty than by again and again calling the attention of the gentry of the country as well as inhabitants generally to this fact, that the great bulk, I might almost say the whole of the offences of violence which take place in the counties of this land, are directly ascribable to the habit of drinking to excess."

The Recorder of Dublin, the Hon. Frederick R. Falkiner, Q.C., at the annual Licencing Sessions, held in October, 1881, in Dublin, said :

"I have been for a whole week trying cases such as no Christian Judge ought to have to try—cases of outrage and violence in this city, every one of which originated in public houses. The drinking system of Dublin is responsible for three sentences of penal servitude and seven heavy sentences of imprisonment which I had to impose, varying from twelve to twenty-four calendar months. I marked the evidence in every case, and every one of them began in a public house. It is the drink system and the drink alone that leads to all this misery and crime and sorrow."

Mr. Baron Dowse, in charging the jury in a case heard in a Commission Court, Dublin, in November, 1881, said :—

"He found that drink was at the bottom of almost every crime committed in Dublin. Even in cases that had no apparent connection with drink at all, if closely investigated, as he himself had done in many cases, they would be found to have their origin in drink."

Such is the testimony, and it is only a small part of the testimony that may be culled from the utterances of criminal judges, from the utterances of judges of Police Courts for the last hundred years, which I offer to this House in support of this proposition, a self-evident one, I know, but one which none the less requires to be supported by this evidence, thus kept alongside of the assertion in order to make the conviction, if possible, deeper and still deeper, but evidence that intoxicating liquor, as it is distributed and used throughout the country, is at the bottom of nearly nine-tenths of all the crime which has to be tried in the various courts of the country, and, if it is at the bottom of all the crime which has to be tried, it is also at the bottom, as the cause of that criminality, of what are the worst influences and the worst retarding causes to our prosperity that possibly a civilized country to-day has to labour against. Now, will you allow me to sum up the points I have made with reference to the traffic, in its nature and in its results. It is true that physiological science labels alcoholic liquor a poison and pronounces it dangerous, and, in the words of the eminent Dr. Andrew Clark, goes forth on its mission of proclaiming to the world that it is an enemy to the human race; it is true that the plainest rules of economic science, as applied to the keeping and proper use of our material resources, as applied to the wise conservation and proper employment of labour, and as applied to the prudent management of our surplus wealth and to the gaining of that invaluable consideration in any country, a minimum of the non-producing and criminal element, it is true that every one of these rules is antagonized by the liquor traffic, which destroys the material

resources of the country, which works against its labour power, renders much of it useless, and turns much of it into ways which result in no benefit to the community or advantage to the country, which goes against the proper husbanding of the earnings of the country, which ought to be put by in surplus or put into capital, for the better and further development of the resources of the country; it is true, beyond cavil or doubt, that it is the very bottom cause of that great non-producing element, of that great criminal and dangerous element in our society which has to be watched and guarded and maintained, which, by the opinions of the judges and by the consensus of all men of intelligence, takes a place in our country and in all Anglo-Saxon countries which is to be deplored, which is to be investigated, and which, if possible, is to be alleviated. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have made good my proposition that the traffic in intoxicating liquors antagonizes all these in its nature and effects, and that as such it demands total legal suppression at the hands of the State.

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

### After Recess.

### THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported and read the third time and passed :—

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the River St. Clair Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Macmaster.)

Bill (No. 11) respecting the Union of certain Methodist Churches therein named.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 61) to amend the Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Atlantic Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Nova Scotia Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Live Stock Insurance Company.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Traders' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Beatty.)

Bill (No. 94) to empower the Sovereign Fire Insurance Company to relinquish their charter, and to provide for the winding up of their affairs.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 30) to extend to the Dominion of Canada the powers of the corporation called "De Nederlandsch-Amerikansche Land Maatschappij" (The Netherlands-American Land Company).—(Mr. Abbott.)

### RELIEF OF JOHN GRAHAM.

Mr. JAMIESON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 107) for the relief of John Graham (from the Senate).

Motion agreed to on the following division :—

YEAS :  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Guillet,	Moffat,
Allen,	Hall,	O'Brien,
Allison (Hants),	Hesson,	Orton,
Armstrong,	Hickey,	Paint,
Baker (Victoria),	Homer,	Robertson (Parings),
Beatty,	Innes,	Ross,
Benson,	Irvine,	Scott,
Blake,	Jackson,	Scriven,
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Shakespeare,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Small,
Burpee (Sunbury),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Victoria),	Kinney,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kraus,	Stairs,
Cartwright,	Lister,	Taylor,
Charlton,	Livingstone,	Temple,
Cochrane,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper (Picton),

Cockburn, Cook, Davies, Dickinson, Dodd, Dundas, Fairbank, Farrow, Fisher, Fleming, Forbes, Foster.	Mackenzie, Macintosh, Macmaster, Macmillan (Middlesex), McCallum, McDougald, McLellan, McMullen, McNeill, Mills, Mitchell.	Vail, Wallace (Albert), Wallace (York), Watson, Weldon, White (Hastings), White (Renfrew), Williams, Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland), Woodworth.—85.
--	--	---

## NAYS:

## Messieurs

Allison (Lennox), Amyot, Auger, Bain (Soulanges), Bain (Wentworth), Bécharde, Belleau, Benoit, Bergin, Billy, Blondeau, Bolduc, Bossé, Bourassa, Burns, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Middlesex), Caron, Casgrain, Chapleau, Costigan,	Coursol, Curran, De St. Georges, Desjardins, Dugas, Dupont, Fortin, Gagné, Geoffrion, Gigault, Girouard, Grandbois, Guilbault, Gunn, Harley, Holton, Hurteau, Landerkin, Laudry (Kent), Landry (Montmagny), Langevin, Laurier,	Lesage, McDonald (Cape Breton), McMillan (Vaudreuil), McCraney, McIntyre, McIsaac, Massue, Méthot, Montplaisir, Pinsonneault, Platt, Ray, Rinfret, Robertson (Shelburne), Royal, Somerville (Brant), Thompson, Trow, Valin, Wilson, Yeo.—65.
--	---	--

## PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION BILL.

On the Order for the consideration of Bill (No. 6) to provide for the punishment of Seduction and like offences being read,

Mr. CHARLTON. The vote in the Committee by which the first clause of this Bill, as introduced, was struck out, was a very close one, the majority being only three; and I have made some changes in the clause as it originally stood, which, I think, will obviate the objections to it which some members entertained. I think also that the country will desire to know what members of this House favour that clause, and what members are opposed to it. For that reason I shall move: that the order be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with power to insert the following as the first section of the same:

Any man who shall, under promise of marriage, seduce and have illicit connection with any unmarried female of previously chaste character, and not over twenty-one years of age, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punishable as hereinafter provided.

The changes made in this clause, as compared with that in the Bill as originally introduced, are, that the subsequent marriage of the parties is not a bar to conviction, and there is a limit introduced as to age, the limit of age being twenty-one years. Many members of the Senate last year expressed themselves as willing to support the Bill if a limitation of this kind were inserted. Although I do not myself approve of the limitation as to age, yet to strengthen the Bill in the House and to render its chances for becoming law better than they otherwise would be, I waive my own views, and adopt that view of the case.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

## YEAS:

## Messieurs

Allen, Allison (Hants), Allison (Lennox), Armstrong, Auger, Bain (Wentworth), Baker (Victoria), MR. FOSTER.	Fairbank, Farrow, Fisher, Fleming, Forbes, Foster, Guillet,	McIsaac, McMullen, McNeill, Mills, O'Brien, Paint, Paterson (Brant),
--	---	--

Beaty, Bécharde, Blake, Bourassa, Burpee (Sunbury), Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Middlesex), Campbell (Renfrew), Cartwright, Casey, Charlton, Cochrane, Cockburn, Cook, Coursol, Davies, De St. Georges, Dickinson, Dodd, Dundas,	Gunn, Harley, Hickey, Holton, Homer, Innes, Irvine, Jamieson, Kaulbach, King, Kinney, Kirk, Landerkin, Laurier, Lister, Livingstone, Mackenzie, McCraney, McIntyre,	Platt, Ray, Reid, Robertson (Hastings), Robertson (Shelburne), Scriver, Shakespeare, Somerville (Brant), Somerville (Bruce), Springer, Taylor, Thompson, Trow, Vail, Wallace (Albert), Watson, Weldon, Wilson, Yeo.—79.
---	---	---

## NAYS:

## Messieurs

Abbott, Amyot, Bain (Soulanges), Belleau, Benoit, Benson, Bergeron, Bergin, Billy, Blondeau, Bolduc, Bossé, Brecken, Burns, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Victoria), Cambell (Victoria), Carling, Caron, Casgrain, Chapleau, Costigan, Coughlin, Curran,	Daly, Desaulniers, Desjardins, Dugas, Dupont, Fortin, Gagné, Geoffrion, Gigault, Girouard, Grandbois, Guilbault, Hackett, Hall, Hurteau, Kilvert, Landry (Kent), Landry (Montmagny), Langevin, Lesage, Macdonald (Sir John), McDonald (C. Breton), Macmaster,	Macmillan (Middlesex), McMillan (Vaudreuil), McDougald, Massue, Méthot, Mitchell, Moffat, Montplaisir, Orton, Pinsonneault, Rinfret, Royal, Scott, Small, Sproule, Tupper (Pictou), Valin, Wallace (York), White (Cardwell), White (Renfrew), Williams, Wood (Westmoreland), Woodworth.—70.
---	---	---

House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Section 1 agreed to.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved that the Committee rise.

Motion negatived on a division.

Committee rose and reported.

On motion that the amendment be read a second time and concurred in, being put,

Mr. FOSTER moved, That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with power to insert the following, as the second Section of the said Bill:—

Any man who by means of a feigned or pretended marriage has sexual intercourse with any woman of previously chaste character, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punishable as hereinafter provided.

Also to insert the following as Section four of the Bill in the place of Section three of the Bill as first introduced:—

Provided that the evidence of the female in respect of whom the offence is alleged to have been committed, shall be corroborated as to the offence mentioned in the first section hereof as to both promise of marriage and seduction, and as to the offence mentioned in the second Section hereof as to both the feigned or pretended marriage and the sexual intercourse, and as the offence mentioned in the third Section hereof, as to the inveiglement or enticement, by some other material evidence; and to provide that Sections four, five, six, seven and eight in the Bill (No. 6) as first introduced, be numbered five, six, seven, eight and nine respectively.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I rise to a point of order. If I understood rightly amidst the noise, the hon. member for Norfolk moved the second reading of the Bill as amended, and my hon. friend from King's has moved an amendment

to that motion, seconded by my hon. friend from Norfolk. I do not understand how the same hon. gentleman can move the motion and second an amendment to it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I moved the second reading of the amendment, and not of the Bill. That amendment was declared carried. With reference to the motion now before the House, it was rendered necessary by the division of what, in the original Bill, was the first section of the Bill, into two sections. The first section, as introduced, provided a punishment for seduction, under promise of marriage, and also for a feigned or pretended marriage. This was divided into two. The amendment I put into your hands was that seduction, under promise of marriage, should be a misdemeanor, and that was carried in Committee. Then my hon. friend moved that a pretended or mock marriage should be a misdemeanor. That makes two clauses of what was formerly the first clause of the Bill. The balance of this proposed amendment consists merely of the verbal alterations rendered necessary by introducing a new clause into the Bill. The third clause in the original Bill provides that offences which are specified in the first and second clauses shall be corroborated by other material evidence. There are now three classes of offences, and it became necessary to change the phraseology of what was then the third section of the Bill, and to provide that the offences named in the first, second, and third clauses, instead of the first and second clauses, should be corroborated by other material evidence. The only question which the House has to pass upon now is whether a feigned or pretended marriage shall be a misdemeanor. All the other portions of the motion are merely the necessary changes in case this section, with reference to feigned marriages, becomes the second section of the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman has not answered my point of order. It was that my hon. friend moved the motion which you put from the Chair, to which my hon. friend from King's moved an amendment, seconded by my hon. friend from Norfolk. That is certainly the case.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will make it clear. I should have declared the motion for the second reading of the amendment carried, and then the motion should have been that the Bill be now read the third time, and in amendment to that the hon. member for King's made his motion.

Mr. CAMERON. That motion then, for the third reading of the Bill, would be moved by my hon. friend from Norfolk, and then my hon. friend from King's moves an amendment to that, which my hon. friend from Norfolk seconds, thereby seconding an amendment to his own motion, which clearly cannot be done.

Mr. SPEAKER. In order to make the minutes correct, I declare now the question to be that the amendment be now read the second time and concurred in. Shall that be adopted?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then comes the motion of the hon. member for King's. Who seconds that?

Mr. DAVIES. I second the motion.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The amendment is so lengthy, involving so many verbal alterations, and, I think, some alterations of substance, that I do think that the consideration of it should be deferred to another day, in order that we may see it in print and have an opportunity of understanding it. I have been quite unable to follow either the motion of my hon. friend from King's or the explanation of it which my hon. friend from Norfolk has given, and do not desire to vote on it without having it plainly in print before me.

Mr. BLAKE. I really do not see that there is as much complication in this as the hon. gentleman for Victoria thinks there is. We had in the Bill, as it was before us awhile ago, three different classes of proposed offences, of which two, however, were combined in one clause. That one clause, in which these two were combined, was stricken out of the Bill, and the provision in the remaining portions of the amendment referred to were necessarily confined to the only offence which remained in the Bill as it stood. These are provisions as to evidence, as to the woman being permitted to give evidence and certain corroboration being necessary. Of course to make the Bill consistent with itself, when the Committee decided to strike out the first clause, the provision as to evidence was confined to the only remaining offence in the Bill. The House has inserted one additional offence—seduction under promise of marriage. Now, it is proposed that the House shall insert the other offence which was stricken out—seduction obtained by means of a feigned or pretended marriage. Perhaps it would have been better if my hon. friend had divided the matter still further, and had not proposed the alteration in procedure until the House had decided upon the insertion of the second offence; but it is clear that, if the House decides upon that, the remainder is simply consequent upon it and upon the change we have just now decided to make. It is no alteration in any way. The Committee and the House both decided upon the principles of evidence which should be applicable to this class of offence, namely, that the woman should be allowed to give evidence, but that there should be corroborative evidence. And all that it is proposed to do in the same form of words is to apply to the three offences that rule of evidence and procedure which we have already agreed should be applied to the one offence that the House agreed formerly should be in the Bill.

Mr. BERGIN. The fact that the leader of the Opposition has found it necessary to make such a lengthened explanation ought to be sufficient to show the House that the explanation of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was not such as was satisfactory to the House. I strongly approve of that clause of the Bill which was stricken out at the first reading, and I should like to see it become law; but, Sir, I am not prepared to vote for that which I do not and cannot understand, as it has been put before the House. I think my hon. friend, who has many supporters on this side of the House as well as upon that, would do well to have it printed and put properly before the House, so that we can all intelligently vote upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really think, under the circumstances, that it ought to be postponed, so that we can consider this long amendment. It may be, and I have no doubt it is, that some portion of the amendment is merely in consequence of the division into two branches, introducing one which was lost before. There is so much new matter introduced in this amendment which was rejected before, that I really think we had better not proceed with it to-night. I think the hon. gentleman had better move that the debate be adjourned, and as the motion will appear in the Votes and Proceedings, we will have a better opportunity of considering it. It is out of the question that we can be forced to vote upon a long resolution, which we have no opportunity of reading; and, perhaps, we may differ in opinion as to these amendments being merely technical.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is to my recollection, and I think it is to the recollection of the House, that the First Minister suggested to my hon. friend for North Norfolk that he should prepare and introduce this identical amendment which has now been introduced by the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster). The First Minister declared, in the course of the discussion some days ago, that he advised my hon. friend to take that particular offence—

the offence of obtaining connection by means of a mock marriage—and cover it by a clause such as has been now prepared and introduced; and if I understood him, he then expressed approval of such a clause. Now it seems to me as simple a proposition as could well be made before the assembled wisdom, that such an offence as is mentioned by my hon. friend should be made a crime; but as grave doubts have been expressed whether it is a crime by law, I do not think my hon. friend could do better than to insist on that being put in. No doubt the third reading may, in that case, be left over, but as the hon. gentleman the other evening expressed an extreme desire to have the Session close in a short time, and as he has taken Thursdays from this time out, I think there is every reason why my hon. friend should proceed. The fact of the matter is, in all probability, unless my hon. friend proceeds to-night, he may have his Bill entirely lost, and I strongly advise him, therefore, to accept no delay.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in stating that I advised this clause should be adopted. This clause, as introduced by my hon. friend from King's, provides that any man who, by means of a mock marriage, has intercourse with any woman of previously chaste character, shall be guilty of misdemeanor. I did not agree to that; I did not advise that. I advised there should be a distinct clause, making the fact of a feigned marriage an indictable offence, and that any man who induced a woman to marry him by mock or pretended marriage should be guilty of a misdemeanor. That was my suggestion, and I think it is a confusion of terms as it stands now.

Mr. CHARLTON. I separated these two offences, thinking that the amendment now in your hands would be imperilled by coupling it with the motion making seduction a crime, and for that reason I separated the offences. I informed my right hon. friend I intended to do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think he approved that course. Now, Sir, what follows that section with regard to making mock marriage a crime, is mere verbal changes in the Bill. As it exists, that adds one new clause to the Bill—it makes three clauses in place of two, and it renders it necessary to specify that corroborative evidence shall be had in three cases instead of two. I would suggest that all in that motion be struck out that relates to procedure, and that we merely deal with the amendment with regard to mock marriages. The House can understand that, and we will leave the changes that are rendered necessary in the adoption of these two sections, to be made afterwards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This does not make the feigned marriage a misdemeanor.

Mr. CHARLTON. It makes it a misdemeanor, coupled with the consequences that follow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite a different thing.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course, the House will pass upon that. I suggest, in order to simplify the matter, that all in that resolution relating to the procedure, relating to the changes in the numbers of the sections, be struck out, and that the House accept the amendment with reference to making feigned marriage a crime.

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. gentleman is making it still more difficult to understand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What the First Minister appears to have been reported to have said was this:

"This clause had better be struck out, as it is ineffective for any purpose, and a clause prepared by the hon. gentleman, making a feigned marriage a misdemeanor, and providing that if the feigned marriage be followed by co-habitation, it would be an aggravation of the offence."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite a distinct thing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a fine distinction the First Minister is drawing. He is willing to make a feigned marriage an offence, and if followed by co-habitation an aggravation of that offence, and is that not just the principle that is taken here?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What I said before, and what I have said now, is that a feigned marriage should be an indictable offence, and if that feigned marriage is followed by another outrage, that would be an aggravation of the first offence. That is what I said.

Mr. BERGIN. I rise to a point of order. It appears to me the hon. gentleman cannot, in accordance with the Rules of this House, spring an amendment of this kind on the House without notice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes he can.

Mr. SPEAKER. On motion for the third reading, an amendment of this kind can be introduced without notice. The amendment is in order.

Mr. CHARLTON. Although it may be urged that the motion is a long one and not easily understood, yet I repeat that it is simply a motion to make a feigned or mock marriage a crime, and all that follows that motion is merely verbal changes that are rendered necessary in the Bill by making two clauses out of one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall move that the debate be adjourned. I think, in common fairness to those who desire to vote understandingly, the House will allow this debate to be adjourned.

Mr. BEATY. I join in supporting the amendment to adjourn the debate, because the question is now so badly mixed up that I am quite sure the House does not understand it. I do not understand it myself, although I voted for the amendment proposed originally. I now find the Bill has been somewhat reconstructed, so much so that it is not in its original shape, at all events, and I think it is better to have it printed and then we will be able to understand it. I trust the House will agree to adjourn the debate, so that we can have an opportunity of seeing what is in the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill is not reconstructed; it contains no new offence. It merely divides the clause that provided for two offences, and it places these offences in two separate sections or clauses. There is no new matter brought in, and there is nothing in the amendment but what was in the original Bill, together with the necessary verbal changes. I would not object to the postponement of action on this Bill, if the result of that postponement would not prove the death of the Bill; but at this stage of the Session, postponement simply means that the Bill will not be acted upon this Session, and no friend of the measure will vote for the motion of the right hon. gentleman. The matter is plain and simple. The three offences contained in the Bill are mentioned in three clauses, whereas, when the Bill was first introduced, they were mentioned in two clauses, and corroborative evidence will have to be given in regard to offences mentioned in three clauses instead of two. The matter, as I have said, is very plain, and the most ordinary intelligence can understand it, and I am unable to understand how any hon. member could make it honestly a reason for wishing postponement.

Mr. BERGIN. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to impute motives.

Mr. CHARLTON. There can be no doubt whatever that favourable action on the proposition of the right hon. gentleman means the death of the Bill, and for that reason

I urge the friends of the Bill to oppose what would otherwise meet with my approbation. I wish to see the Bill acted upon by the House, and would prefer that it should not be killed in a bye-way instead of in open contest.

Mr. IVE'S. There is a great deal of hair-splitting about this matter. It strikes me that it is not very complicated, and that we might pass upon it to-night.

Mr. HESSON. I really do not understand the Bill, in consequence of the changes made in it. I am desirous of seeing the principle carried out, and I wish to vote for it; but as there seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding in regard to it, I think the Bill should be reprinted. I favour the adjournment of the debate.

Motion to adjourn the debate (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to, on the following division:—

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Desaulniers,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Allison (Hants),	Desjardins,	McCallum,
Amyot,	Dickinson,	McDougald,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dodd,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Dugas,	Massue,
Beaty,	Dupont,	Méhot,
Belleau,	Fortin,	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Benson,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Paint,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Gilbault,	Pope,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Reid,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Brecken,	Hay,	Royal,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Small,
Burnham,	Hickey,	Smyth,
Burns,	Homer,	Sproule,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Cameron (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Tupper (Pictou),
Carling,	Kraze,	Tyrwhitt,
Caron,	Landry (Kent),	Valin,
Chapleau,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Costigan,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),
Coughlin,	Lesage,	White (Hastings),
Coursol,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Renfrew),
Curran,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Wigle,
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	Williams,
Daly,	Macmaster,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Woodworth.—95.

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McMuller,
Allison (Lennox),	Fleming,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Auger,	Foster,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Platt,
Blake,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Ives,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Caugrain,	Landerkin,	Temple,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Cochrane,	Lister,	Trow,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Vail,
Davies,	Macenzie,	Wallace (Albert),
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Watson,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
Farrow,	McIsaac,	Wilson.—63.

### THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 38) to prevent fraud in the manufacture and sale of Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. Massue.)

### LAW OF EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 3) further to amend the law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron).

(In the Committee.)

On section 1.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I had intended, before Mr. Speaker left the Chair, making a short reply to some observations which were made at a previous stage of this Bill, by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I would not perhaps have presumed to reply to that hon. gentleman if he had confined himself to a discussion of the Bill on its merits and demerits. I would have left my arguments to stand against his, and left the House and the country to judge which had the most merit; and, Sir, I would not have had the presumption of thinking that my view would have prevailed against his. But the hon. gentleman went further, and tried to draw the attention of the House to what I said, not so much by attacking my motives, as by dealing with what he chose to call the attack I made on the public morality of the country, and that being the case, I think it is but right that I should say a few words on that point. In the first place, I wish to say that I had no intention of making an attack, such as has been designated by the leader of the Opposition. Whether the words I used were sufficiently strong to warrant him in styling them as he did, an attack upon the public morality, I leave to the House to say. I had no intention of using such strong language, and I hope I shall not be unfortunate enough to-night, in my choice of language, as to convey the idea that I am making an attack upon the public morality of the country. What I intended to say was, that I believed that the laws of our country had a tendency to encourage perjury. I believe they have. I believe that, owing to that tendency, the country has drifted in that direction, and that to-day more perjury is committed in courts of justice than formerly. I said further, that there were many cases in which the amounts involved were too important, and the interests of the parties were such that evidence was given which made it a wonder, indeed, that jurymen were able to arrive at a correct conclusion, and which left the impression that perjury had in many cases been committed. Sir, I stick to that statement. But, Sir, I wonder why the hon. gentleman was so ticklish about this question of public morality. It being my first speech, I thought to myself how careful hon. gentlemen must be in the expressions they use so as not to be tripped up by a gentleman of such standing, of such commanding ability, as the leader of the Opposition—ability which, I must say, I always admired before I came to this House, and which I have learned still more to admire since I became a member of Parliament, and from which I certainly do not wish to detract. I also thought, on referring to some language made use of by the hon. gentleman on previous occasions in this House, that it was similar to what I had used the other night, and that I might ask him to substitute his language on these occasions for the expressions which I used the other night, though I do not think I would care to express myself so strongly as he did. I ask the House to go back to the Session of 1880, when the hon. gentleman was discussing a Bill entitled, I think, a Bill for the suppression of crime, and let us see what the hon. gentleman said:

"Some years ago, when it was the duty of the late Government to call attention to this subject, statements were made which indicated that the rate of increase of crime in Canada was of a very extraordinary and alarming character—"

The hon. gentleman then gave some figures, and proceeded to say:

"knowing there has been an increase, in two years, at the rate of 25 per cent. But that even does not represent the true state of the case, because the ratio of increase is, unfortunately, progressive."

I scarcely think that my language, the other night, was so strong as that. When I said that, I thought our legislation

had a tendency in a particular direction. The hon. gentleman said further:

"There is something radically wrong in such a state of affairs. Our population has certainly been increasing during these two or three years at a very slow rate, but there has been this increase, in the graver classes of crime of, at least, 25 per cent., which is certainly extremely disheartening."

A little further on he said:

"My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has been good enough to send me an advanced copy of the General Criminal Statistics to which I then referred, and I find that the increase of crime throughout the community is even more startling than I supposed."

So we find that in one sentence the hon. gentleman finds the condition of things alarming, in another, crime is steadily progressive, and in another, that the condition of things is startling. He said further:

"We have no ground for congratulating ourselves in reference to the morale of the country, and some repressive step is required to prevent the further increase of the evil growing so rapidly as it is in the large cities more particularly."

The other night the hon. gentleman was the champion of the morality of the country, thinking that I had made an attack upon it by the words I used, when I had no intention of casting any slur upon the people of this country. The litigants of the country have among them many men who desire to tell the truth, but even these litigants embrace but a small proportion of the people of this country. Even if I had referred to all who involved themselves in litigation in this country, they would form a very small minority, as compared with the whole population of this country, and therefore what I said was not to be interpreted as an attack on the morals of the people of this country. The hon. gentleman said:

"We have no grounds for congratulating ourselves in reference to the morale of the country, and some repressive step is required to prevent the further increase of the evil growing so rapidly as it is, in the large cities more particularly."

In 1877, the hon. gentleman said:

"Upon the whole, he believed that the main difficulty in the question was to be found in the question of perjury—"

The very same argument that I use at present—

"In the very great temptation which already existed in civil cases, and still more in criminal cases, not to tell the truth. There were cases, however, occurring every day in civil matters—"

I spoke of civil matters—

"in which the interests in regard to property, and still stronger, the excitement occasioned by hostile feelings, particularly in suits between relatives, were so great that the temptations to commit perjury were very great; but notwithstanding that fact, the operation of the law had been as he had stated."

Now, which of us two had used the stronger language in reference to the morals of this country? It seems to me that his language was very much stronger, indeed, than any I used; and as reported, Sir, I have nothing to take back, and I have not endeavoured to correct the report of my remarks in any way, or spoken to the reporters about it; I have nothing to take back, although I might make this qualification, that what I said applies to a very small number of people in this country, and that I did not mean to imply that everyone engaged in litigation committed perjury, but I simply intended to say that our laws had that tendency, and they having that tendency our people had drifted in that direction. I had my attention called to this subject on account of the rebuke I received from the hon. gentleman, and on account of a reference which I have seen, in one of the public journals of this Dominion, to this subject. What my hon. friend said was made all the more striking against me by his remark that if what I stated was true as to New Brunswick, I spoke for my own Province, it was not true so far as the Province of Ontario was concerned; and yet, only a few days afterwards, I picked up a journal printed in Ontario, in which I found these words:

"Judge McDougall deserves the thanks of the community for the stand which he has taken in respect to the matter of perjury in minor cases. Mr. LANDRY (Kent).

cases. It is an evil which deserves to be, as far as possible, rudely and effectually stamped out. It is very true, that in dealing with this matter, a great deal of allowance must be made for the defects of human nature."

The article then goes on to explain these defects of human nature, and to point out that witnesses may swear falsely without committing perjury; and then it says:

"But after all due allowances for mental peculiarities, dullness of perception, and defectiveness of understanding, the fact remains that there is a vast amount of downright perjury, properly so-called, practised almost continually."

Now, Sir, this was not intended for New Brunswick. It was printed in a paper published in Ontario, which has, perhaps, as large a circulation as any other paper in this country; and it was not printed because of anything said in reference to this, but it was written by a gentleman who believed what he wrote, and he used language stronger than was used by me. I thought it was due to myself that I should say this much, because I have received letters from gentlemen in my own Province asking me what I had said; because some of my friends had seen the remarks of the hon. gentleman in the public press, which are much more widely circulated than mine, owing to his standing and position in this country; and being asked what I had said to call forth such a rebuke from the hon. gentleman, I felt that I had not deserved it, and that he must have thought that it would have the effect of lowering me in the Province of New Brunswick, in connection with the very first remarks I made in this House. My hon. friend from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), got up afterwards, and said I was not speaking for the morals of the people of New Brunswick, and that the people there were more moral than I represented. I do not wish to retaliate on my hon. friend, but I think it was rather unfair for him to twist me in the way he did, after the manner in which he spoke of his constituents in 1880, which I suppose he remembers himself. Having said so much with reference to myself, I simply now repeat that I have not found any necessity to change my mind with regard to this Bill. I think it is one that should not be adopted by this House; and I am encouraged in that view by the fact that although the second reading was carried by forty-nine majority, after it was discussed more fully, and hon. gentlemen looked more closely into it, the next majority in favour of the Bill was only five. I hope that now, instead of having any majority in its favour, it will be rejected, and that this Committee will not discredit itself by aiding it to become law.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very sorry the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), should suppose that I made any attack on him, or had any desire to lower him in the opinion of this House or of this country, or of his Province. If he reflects for a moment on what I said, he will see that any suspicion of that kind is unfounded, and that from my point of view I was not merely justified but bound to say what I did. I will repeat what the hon. gentleman said and what I said—I read from *Hansard*:

"There is temptation, and so much of it that it is a deplorable fact to-day that there are very few important cases tried in this Dominion, involving a large amount of money, where there is not such swearing on both sides as to make people believe that perjury has been committed."

That was the observation I took exception to. I said that had the hon. gentleman confined his observation to his own Province, much as I regretted the state of things which it developed, I should not have felt called upon to say anything; but speaking of my own knowledge, not a recent one, of litigation in Ontario, I did not think that that observation represented the true state of affairs. It was an observation which I think I did not too severely characterize when I said:

"I have not heard, in a long time, a greater slur on the state of society in Canada than that which the hon. gentleman's words, if they were applicable to the whole of this Dominion, would not merely imply but

describe—that the condition of the morals of our population was steadily deteriorating; that the crime of perjury was now so rife that it is suspected, with too often good cause, to exist in the great majority of cases that take place.”

That was my paraphrase of what the hon. gentleman said, and I think it is a tolerably accurate paraphrase, erring, if at all, on the side of mitigating rather than exaggerating the strength of the hon. gentleman's observation. Now, the hon. gentleman has said that he is vindicated by something that has appeared in some newspaper as to the great amount of perjury that is committed in petty causes. He will observe that in the course of some observations which I made and which he has been criticising, I used these words :

“I have heard of late there is more laxity of swearing in some of the tribunals before which petty cases are tried; in the division courts. Whether the greater solemnity which prevails, the presence of a larger audience, the presence of counsel in the causes, instead of their being conducted as they usually are conducted in the division courts, may tend to a greater looseness in the other courts or not, I know not; but I do speak of what I think I do know, when I say that that description, that lamentable description of things which the hon. member for Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry), gave as the prevalent state of things in his own Province, would be wholly inapplicable to the Province in which we are now situated.”

You will observe that my observation had reference to important cases. The hon. gentleman spoke expressly of important cases, and in speaking of those cases he spoke of that class of cases with which I was more familiar when in practice; and when he declared that a sad state of things existed as regards the sanctity of the oath, I felt bound to repudiate his assertion, as far as it affected the Province from which I come. With reference to what he said about the increase of crime generally, I founded my observations on certain statistics which, I think, I read in the course of my speech, and which are not inconsistent with anything I said on that occasion or to-night. The hon. gentleman finds he has nothing to recall; I have to say that I find nothing to recall in what I said, either.

Mr. WELDON. I was not in the House the other evening when the hon. gentleman made his remarks with reference to the increase in perjury, but I read his speech, and must say that my experience does not bear out what he said. In our Province, during the last twenty-seven years, I cannot call to recollection any case in which the parties were committed by the judges for perjury and found guilty. The whole principle of this Bill has been tested in England and elsewhere in regard to civil cases; and I have seen criminal cases in which great injury and injustice was done, by the parties employed not being allowed to give evidence. As far as New Brunswick is concerned, I must say that perjury does not exist to the extent the hon. gentleman has indicated.

Mr. BOSSÉ. I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. IVES. This Bill is not an attack upon the principles of criminal law as understood, practiced and established and approved by this Parliament. It is simply the extension of the principle already recognized and acted upon. The same arguments precisely which were used when we adopted the amendment that permitted the defendant, in the case of assault and battery, to give evidence, is now proposed to be extended to other cases of misdemeanor. Until hon. gentlemen can tell us how the crime of perjury has become more frequent by the adoption of the amendment which we adopted a few Sessions ago, with respect to common cases of assault and battery, I do not think we should be frightened out of extending the provisions of the law in this matter. It does not seem to me so serious a question, that it should be treated in the summary way proposed by the hon. member for Quebec. We adopted the principle years ago, and we adopted it again the other day when we sent this Bill to a Committee, and I do not see now any reason why we should kill the Bill by adopting this motion.

Mr. BOSSÉ raised a point of order. The Bill could not be discussed on this amendment.

Mr. BLAKE. We have a right to discuss whether it is expedient this Committee should rise or not. My hon. friend is saying why it should not rise. You cannot take that rise out of us.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The effect of the motion of the hon. member for Quebec, if carried, would practically be to kill the Bill. I think this would be an unfair course to take. The House has already assented to the principle of the Bill, and the First Minister, than whom there is no better judge, assented to it on two or three different occasions. The Bill, in 1833, was referred to a Committee composed of perhaps the best criminal lawyers of the House from Ontario and the other Provinces. The Bill, as now submitted, is just the Bill which was reported by that Committee, and, therefore, I do not think it would be fair to ask the House to rise now.

Mr. DESJARDINS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I fail to see what can justify the great haste shown by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). During each Session—for what purpose of notoriety I am at a loss to understand—he seems to endeavour to make a specialty of criminal matters. This may be very amusing for him, but I believe that Parliament has something more practical to deal with, and that before going any further in a procedure, as the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) has very properly said, would result in increasing the number of false oaths before our courts of justice, it is prudent, at least, to pause awhile. As it has been said by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), we have had some experience in the procedure which permits the defendant to give evidence in his own behalf, or the husband and wife to testify in favour of one another, in cases of simple assault. Well, we should first wait for more experience as to the working of that law, so as to be able to see how far the fears which were expressed when this first Bill was passed, were well founded. I believe that the time elapsed since this Bill was passed is not sufficient to justify our taking another step in that direction. My impression is, Mr. Speaker, that the tendency of this legislation is to diminish the respect due to an oath which is not a simple matter of form, but also comprises an act of faith very important in religious creeds. Considering that the present Bill has a most dangerous tendency, I think that the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé) is justified in asking that the Committee do now rise without reporting.

Motion agreed to on a division.

Committee rose.

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

Motion agreed to, and (at 11:05 o'clock, p. m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 6th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### AN IMPERFECT RETURN.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the imperfect character of a Return made the other day to an Address of the 16th April, 1833, for copies of all correspondence, reports, and Orders in Council, with reference to

the claim of Mr. Dustan, of Halifax, for a remission of duty on machinery for a sugar refinery. Nine months elapsed in the preparation of this Return, and all we get is, on the 31st January, 1884 :

"In return to the enclosed Address of the House of Commons for copies of all correspondence, reports and Orders in Council, with reference to the claim of Mr. Dustan, of Halifax, for a remission of duty on machinery for a sugar refinery, I beg leave to state that there is no correspondence on that subject on record in this Department."

The Address called for Orders in Council and reports, as well as correspondence. Mr. Johnson, who writes this, of course would have no Orders in Council, and he does not answer as to reports. I understand the practice to be that these Returns are sent into one of the Departments—I believe to that of the Secretary of State—whose business it is to examine them and see whether they are proper answers to the Orders and Addresses of the House; and it seems to me to be an extraordinary thing that, after so long an interval, so very imperfect an answer should be given. It was stated publicly last Session in the newspapers that a very large remission of duty had been made to Mr. Dustan, with reference to this sugar refinery. When I moved the Address, the Government did not intimate that there was no correspondence. They granted the Address and now, as I say, after an interval of nine months, we get an imperfect answer without any information at all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will enquire about that portion of the Address that has not been answered and have the information brought down.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CASEY. Before you leave the Chair I wish to make a few remarks on the speech with which the hon. Finance Minister introduced his Budget to us. In that speech he treated us to a very different style of oratory from that to which we have been accustomed of late years. Of late years the hon. gentleman has been triumphant in his tone. His speeches have been a perfect psalm of triumph, from beginning to end; we have discerned in them the joyful trump of victory, sustained by the deep bass of the boom of the National Policy, but this present speech is different in tone. Instead of the customary psalm of triumph we have a speech full of apology—a speech, which from beginning to end, is nothing but an apology for the partial failure of the Government policy in certain respects, and an explanation of the reasons of that failure. Instead of the triumphant sound of the boom, we hear but the still small voice of an accusing conscience which the hon. gentleman has not been quite able to stifle. When he prophesied to us last year continued prosperity, when he saw before his mind's eye the seven fat years of inspiration, the seven fat kine stretched in long perspective before him, he spoke with an air of certainty, with the conviction of one to whom the stars had told something of what was about to happen. Then, as on previous occasions we were inclined to suspect that his prophecy had been inspired by the astrologer royal, the seer Wiggins, who sees the winds afar off, and whom the hon. gentleman keeps in his own Department, possibly for the purpose of furnishing him with private information of this kind. If we were inclined to suspect that the hon. gentleman's prophecies originated from that source, when we heard them, we are still more inclined to suspect it after hearing the explanations this year. We are familiar with the course adopted by Wiggins in explaining why his predicted storms did not appear. He has always been able to show that although it was not very stormy here, it had been very stormy in the Indian Ocean, or on the coast of Japan, or somewhere else, and it was not his fault if the storm did not take place in our neighbourhood; it was not

Mr. BLAKE.

his fault if something had gone wrong with the elements. In short, the cause of the failure was everywhere else but in the seer himself. The hon. gentleman's explanations in regard to the partial failure of his policy are something of the same nature. He has tried hard to make us understand that the depression he admits does exist is not so bad, after all, and if it does exist, it is not the fault of the Government, or of that miraculous, wonder-working, revivifying and encouraging policy with which they have favoured the country, and he winds up with the hope that "we may soon be in the position we occupied a year ago, of prospering in every particular." That is a very lame conclusion to come to after all the glowing prophecies with which he favoured us only one year ago. He went on to tell us there was no depression worth speaking of in the agricultural interests. There had been, he admitted, a bad harvest of wheat but the deficiency was made up by the extra good hay crop, because the farmers would be able to feed more cattle, and consequently export more cattle next spring. But if the deficiency in wheat be so great as he has said, 20,000,000 bushels, it will take a large increase in hay to make up for it. Even if the necessary extra millions of tons of hay were furnished by the hay crop, that would not quite compensate for the deficiency in wheat. We must remember that hay is not so saleable as wheat, and if it is to be turned into beef you must first have the cattle. In a season when the wheat crop fails farmers are not flush of cash, and are, therefore, not in a position to purchase the extra number of cattle to be fed and exported as the hon. gentleman expects. We must remember also that stall-fed cattle require grain as well as hay, for you cannot fatten cattle exclusively on hay, and the hon. Minister has placed an obstacle in the way of farmers obtaining that particular kind of grain most profitable in feeding cattle by putting a duty on Indian corn; and although he has agreed to give a rebate on the duty on Indian corn when imported for the purpose of distilling or starch-making, yet, no rebate is granted the farmer when he imports the corn for the purpose of adding wealth to the country by using it to feed cattle. On the whole the farmers are not likely to be very flush of money during the coming year. I do not want to draw an alarming picture of their condition, because it is not alarming, but they are likely to continue to be shorter of money than they have been and less in a position to bear with equanimity the burdens they have been bearing for some years past. The hon. gentleman went on to speak on the question of the depression that exists among the workmen and the poor. He told us there was "no general suffering, that there was no unusual number of people out of employment." Well, the evidence of our senses in every city and manufacturing town in Canada contradicts that statement. We are all aware, from our own experience and the reports in the press, that there has been an unusual number of people in want and suffering in Montreal, Toronto, London and Ottawa, and all the important cities in the Dominion. Some of these people are no doubt starving immigrants, but who is responsible for that, if not the Government, considering the inducements they have held out to immigrants of a class who are not needed here, to come out to this country? Having allowed paupers to come here from Irish workhouses, can the Government claim to be free from responsibility? I think not. But even if the question only concerned our own people, we are able to assert, though we do so with sorrow, that the number of our own people out of work and suffering want this year is greater than it has been for years past. We have the hon. gentleman's own admission on the subject, for he tells us it was to be regretted that the cotton manufacturers had "discontinued" a number of employes this year. That is a nice euphemism for saying they were dismissed; and it is preferable to the phrase used

by the organ of the Government, the *Toronto Mail*. The hon. Minister says they were "discontinued in order to allow the cotton owners to place their business on a healthier footing by reducing production." The *Mail* gave a different explanation. It said those poor fellows wanted rest, that they had been working so hard on account of the increase in cotton manufacturing the past few years, that they wanted rest, and their considerate employers had discontinued them for a few weeks, or months, in order to enable them to recuperate in the enjoyment of their savings of the preceding four years, so that they might be in good condition for work again the coming spring. Sir, I think that the hon. Minister has been more polite to the workingmen, has, at all events, studied their feelings more than his organ in Toronto has done. I leave it to themselves to settle their difference in this respect. When an hon. gentleman on this side alluded to the existence of a soup kitchen in London—something which I believe my hon. friend, the Postmaster General has never seen in that city before—

Mr. CARLING. I beg your pardon. There is one there every winter. I do not think a winter has passed by for the last ten or twenty years that there has not been something of the kind in the city of London.

Mr. CASEY. Well that is a much worse showing for the National Policy than I had supposed.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman must be aware that the city of London is the centre of a large rural district and the poor people come in from the agricultural districts, and as they remain in the city during the winter, they have to be provided for by the city.

Mr. CASEY. Just so. Then the Postmaster-General says that it was not the poor workingmen who have to be provided for the past few years, but the impoverished farmers, the poor people from the agricultural districts. If he prefers to put it that way, well and good.

Mr. CARLING. I did not say it was the impoverished farmers; I said it was the poor and destitute people from the villages and surrounding districts who came to the city.

Mr. CASEY. The poor and destitute people from the rural districts, the hon. gentleman said. Well, Sir, if destitution has existed in the rich farming community around London to such an extent as to compel the benevolent people of London to establish soup kitchens the past few years, it reveals a state of things even worse than I had supposed. I confess that, although I live within 20 miles of London, I never heard of this destitution before. I never heard before that there was so much poverty and destitution in and about London, and I believe that the hon. Postmaster General has somewhat exaggerated the condition of affairs there during the last few years. However, I believe that an unusual number of people are now receiving relief in London. An alderman of that city, a strong Conservative, stated over his own name in the newspapers, during the last municipal campaign, that there were between 1,200 and 1,400 unemployed workmen in the city of London, a larger number than he had ever before known to be unemployed there. Although this statement is so unfavourable to the Conservative party, that Conservative alderman of the city of London has never withdrawn it or denied it. So, then, in London, at all events, things are in a worse condition than they have ordinarily been. The Finance Minister objected to a reference to this matter by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; he said it was wrong to make a charge against the benevolent people of the city of London for relieving the poor by giving them bread. Now, Sir, we do not make a charge because benevolent people relieve the poor, but we make a charge against the Government, that it is largely in consequence of their policy that these poor exist in such numbers. We

know, of course, that we have the poor always with us, but we are able to understand the reasons why the poor are with us in greater numbers in some years than in others. I think we are able to state distinctly, in this case, that the unusual number of poor people at present in the city of London, as well as in other towns, is due to manufacturing having been unduly stimulated the last few years by a protective tariff—stimulated to such an extent that a good deal more has been produced than the country can consume, with the inevitable result that production had to be stopped for a time, and the workingmen who might have been profitably employed under other circumstances, are thrown out of work and have to remain unemployed until the country has consumed the surplus produce already manufactured. My hon. friend, the Minister, objected again, because we called attention to this state of things. He said we were crying down the credit of the country, that we were acting unpatriotically in referring to this depression. Well, Sir, I could quote you from speeches—not of the hon. gentleman, because he was not here—but of his colleagues in 1875-76-77-78, containing expressions with regard to the state of gloom and depression in which the country was then plunged, which I would not like to repeat myself in regard to the present condition of the country, and which I would not like to repeat even if the condition was as bad now as the hon. gentleman asserted it was then. They went into superlatives, into exaggeration, into extravagance in describing the depression that then existed. It was their whole stock in trade; and it was simply by producing the impression that the country was then in a state of such gloom and difficulty that it could not be made worse, and might be made better, that they were enabled to carry a majority on behalf of their great panacea for all such evils, the National Policy. Now, Sir, it is doubtless a bitter pill for the hon. gentleman to be reminded that notwithstanding the existence of that cure all that same gloomy state of things, in a modified form, has already begun to recur. In dealing with the state of the country, the hon. Minister stated that the depression is not as great amongst the cotton manufacturers as we assert, because they still earn fair profits and declare good dividends. Well, it is admitted that those dividends are vastly less than the dividends they have been declaring the past few years. But if they are now earning fair profits, what is to be said of the exorbitant profits they have been making the last four or five years? If now when their industry is admittedly depressed, they are earning fair profits, what exorbitant profits have they been wresting from the people of Canada, when protection was in full swing, and they received the full benefit of the taxes imposed? Why, Sir, if the profits are still fair, are they reducing production? Why are they dismissing their operatives? Is it fair to the workingman, if everybody is to be protected, to allow the employers, the moment they make less profits than usual, to "discontinue" their operatives for as long a time as they please? I do not think it is, if we are to have protection all round.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Discontinue the Government.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend near me suggests that the remedy would be to discontinue the Government. That is, no doubt, a solution that will come sooner or later. Sir, why is over-production an evil and a loss? Over-production means an unusually large production of articles of value, articles which go to form the wealth of a country. Why is an unusually large production of these articles a source of loss to the manufacturer, and a source of depression to the country? Why can we not sell those articles abroad and make a profit upon them? Why can we not show to the world at large that protection to Canadian manufacturers enables them to sell their goods abroad, and to compete with the foreign manufacturer in the foreign market?

Why can they not do that? Simply because the manufacturers cannot afford to do it; simply because the home production of our manufactures has been artificially stimulated, at an artificially high cost, and therefore they cannot sell their goods abroad at a remunerative price. They cannot even sell them abroad for what they cost to manufacture. The hon. gentleman tells us that so far from protection having enabled them to compete in a foreign market, and enabled us to establish an export trade, we are not yet enabled to compete with the foreign manufacturer in the home market. He says the protected industry of the production of pig iron could not exist, and could not compete with foreign competition, even in our home market, unless we gave it a bounty of so many dollars per ton in addition to the protection. Is he not crying down the credit of our iron and cotton manufacturers, and the credit of our country, when he tells the world that these industries are so feeble, so shaky, that they can only be kept up by bounties, and that they cannot compete with the foreign manufacturer even in the home market? I think he is. The cause of this depression has been already alluded to—it is due to the stimulation which preceded it. We all know as a matter of theory and as a matter of history in regard to other countries, that protection inevitably brings about over-stimulation and consequent over-production and consequent depression. We are now able to realize this fact in our own experience. We have been through two stages, over-stimulation and over-production; we have had the "boom" and the spree, and now we are suffering from the headache. The stimulation had exactly the same effects as a glass of brandy has on the nerves—stimulation for the time followed by depression next morning. The hon. gentleman proceeded to discuss the effects of the Tariff on different classes of the community. He said the Tariff had been on trial some years and had proved itself to be fair and equitable. Let me consider his arguments and proofs in this connection. He said, in the first place, that the taxation had been less on the average during those years than under the tariff of the late Government, because he said the foreign producer pays a large part of the duties. That is quite true under certain circumstances. When the foreign producer is afflicted with such a glut of merchandise as the Canadian manufacturers appear to be afflicted with at the present time, he may be willing to make such terms, to reduce his price sufficiently to enable the importers to pay the duty without loss—that is quite possible, and I believe many of the Canadian manufacturers would be glad just now to sell their goods to the United States on such terms. But the Finance Minister asked the House to believe that such has been the ordinary course of trade, that during good times, such as we have just experienced, the foreign producer of manufactured goods, especially the American producer, has been reducing his prices to Canadian importers to the extent of the duty; and in asking the House to accept that statement, he asks hon. members to believe more than even his own supporters can believe. The contention is so absurd that I cannot imagine the Finance Minister expects it to be taken seriously or as anything more than a jocular excuse for the taxation which he is imposing. The hon. gentleman made an average of the taxation imposed on the principle of deducting the surplus each year from the revenue of that year. He said that deducting the surplus, the rate of taxation was \$4.82½ per head. But why deduct the surplus from the taxation? Has it not been paid by the people as much as the rest of the revenue? Were not the \$8,000,000 which the hon. gentleman claims as last year's surplus, taken out of the pockets of the people as really as the money expended? The surplus must be considered in computing the taxation as much as any part of the revenue. If so, we must add to the taxation \$8,000,000, which would show the amount of taxation per

Mr. CASEY.

head last year to be \$6.42, instead of \$4.82½ as the hon. gentleman claims. The Finance Minister has taken great credit to himself because the Tariff has been a great source of revenue. I do not know that the hon. gentleman is entitled to such great credit, because he was able to raise a great revenue by high taxation; it does not require any great amount of financial genius to impose sufficient taxation to obtain a large revenue; but to such credit as attaches to that performance, he is entitled. He has obtained a tremendous amount, an exorbitant amount of revenue. He says he framed the Tariff so as to produce that. Let us look at his explanation in detail. He said:

"The Tariff had to be so framed that it would produce too much at first, in order that it might afterwards, when the importations are reduced in consequence of the increase of home manufactures, produce as much as the expenditure of the country required."

The hon. gentleman further said:

"Finding the Tariff continued for some years to produce a surplus they were able to remit \$2,250,000 of taxation."

That is evidently an explanation after the fact. He did not make it when the Tariff was first proposed; it was intended to fit the fact, but it does so very clumsily. What are the circumstances of the case? In the first year of the National Policy, the Tariff produced a deficit. Every year afterwards it produced an increasing surplus, and the very largest surplus was produced in the year in which the hon. gentleman remitted \$2,250,000 of taxation, as he himself claims. If he had foreseen the movements of the trade. If he had fitted the Tariff to meet them. If home manufacturers had reduced the importations, the results would be these. In the first year there would have been a large surplus, and it would have decreased year by year with the increase in home manufactures and increased imports until an equilibrium was reached. But the very opposite state of affairs has been produced. Consequently the hon. gentleman either did not frame his Tariff with that intention, or the results were exactly opposite from those which he expected. I do not think I need argue any longer to prove that he did not frame the Tariff with this intention, because the hon. gentleman himself admits that he did not know what the Tariff was going to do. He said:

"Even if we had known to what extent revenue would exceed expenditure, it would not have been good policy to keep it lower. By keeping it high we have been able to remit \$2,250,000 of taxation on the necessities of life."

This is admirable. By his own figures we have had in those years a surplus of \$20,000,000, which he reduces by \$4,000,000 from the proceeds of western lands. We have his own admission that \$16,000,000 have been taken unnecessarily from the people by the Tariff; but he says that by taking that amount he has been enabled to remit taxes. To remit taxes to what extent? To the extent of \$2,250,000; that is to say, that he has been able to remit to the people about one-seventh of the amount of money which was unnecessarily taken from their pockets, and the Government have expended the other \$13,750,000 which was unnecessarily taken out of the people's pockets, and out of the circulation and business of the country. But notwithstanding the fact that the surplus was so large last year, we find by the hon. gentleman's own statement that the revenue is now decreasing; and why? For the same reason that it was small in 1879, because the people are not well off and cannot import as much as usual and accordingly do not pay so much revenue. That is the reason why we had a deficit the first year of this Tariff, and the hon. gentleman's predictions were so far mistaken, because while that deficit was never expected, it was also never expected that we should have the surplus which has amazed the hon. gentleman so much. But we all know that the Tariff was not framed on this or any principle. We know that it was framed after private con-

sultation and caucussing with the representatives of the different interests that were to be benefitted by the Tariff. We know that as far as possible the respective claims were balanced against each other, and the result was the Tariff. What I complain of is, that the present proposed changes have been made on the same principle, that they are the result of communications with parties to be benefitted. The detailed explanation given by the hon. Minister, will show this. He tells us that he has put on a certain tax because a certain interest has represented that it will be benefitted thereby; that he has put on a certain other one, because some manufactory of that description of goods is expected to start, and he has put on this tax in order to help them to go on. I say that the original tariff and the amendments which have been made to it from time to time, are just as much of the nature of private legislation as any Bills which are sent to the Private Bills Committee, or to the Railway Committee. The whole Tariff and all its amendments are a mass of private legislation, put together by the Government on the *ex parte* statements of the persons who are interested, without hearing any evidence as to the effect on other interests, without the check which is imposed by consideration in the Committee; and they bring them down to the House and ask their followers to put them through as Government measures when they are legislation of a wholly private and personal character, intended solely for the benefit of individuals and classes in this country. But, Sir, not content with this glorification of the Tariff as a revenue producing Tariff, the hon. gentleman says it is a grand protective Tariff which has really encouraged to a wonderful extent the home manufactures of the country. In proof of that statement the hon. gentleman tells us that two years ago a commission visited certain establishments—I think, so far as my knowledge of the establishments goes, in most cases, picked establishments, chosen for their prosperity and for their friendliness to the Government—he says that this commission visited such establishments and that they reported favourably as to the production of those manufactories, and the wages that were paid to the operatives. But this was two years ago; this was in the height of the boom, in the height of the good times; in a period when the fumes of the stimulant supplied by the National Policy were yet in the brains of the commercial world; before the period of depression and headache came on. No wonder this commission gave a good report two years ago, especially when we consider that the commission was appointed for the purpose of making a good report, and that it was likely to be faithful to its duty. But would the hon. gentleman like to send out such a commission now, to visit, for instance, the cotton operatives who are working on half time, to visit the soup kitchens, to compare notes with the men who are out of work in the different cities and question the starving immigrants? Would he be willing to publish as an official document a verbatim report of what was heard and seen on such a visit? Would he like, Sir, to issue a commission to find out how this Tariff protects the operatives, for he says it does protect them? He asked where they would have been now in the present depressed state of things if it were not for the National Policy? Still, he admits that the cotton mill-owners are allowed to discontinue their operatives whenever it suits them, in order to add to their profits, and I do not see where the National Policy protects them in that case. It does not prevent the operative being dismissed just as he used to be in the old days when the fly sat on the wheel. But does the workingman get any advantage in wages, seeing that he enjoys no fixity of tenure? No; the hon. gentleman says he does not, because he tells us that the wages of the cotton operatives and other operatives have had to be reduced on account of the reduction of wages in similar trades in the United

States. He says the circulation of men between the two countries is so free that when the wages of men are reduced on the other side, they have to be reduced here also. I do not exactly see the force of his reasoning. I do not think the Canadian operative would be likely to migrate to the United States simply because the wages of workmen on the other side have been reduced. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance can explain the matter, but at all events he says the wages here have fallen to the rate paid in the United States. What good effect is the National Policy having on the wages of the operatives, if they are ruled now as they were before by the rate of wages in the United States? What has the National Policy done for the salary or recompense of the workman? I do not think the Minister could explain that point very satisfactorily. But there is a point which the hon. gentleman did not notice with regard to the protection which the National Policy affords to the workingmen; and that is that the inevitable effect of its operation is to produce at regular periods these crises, that state of things which leads the employer of workmen to discontinue his operatives, to give them a rest when they are over-worked; and so long as this protective policy continues, these crises will recur more frequently and more severely than under a freer system of trade. The operative will find that the only protection which the National Policy gives him is the protection from over-work, which it affords him by giving him regularly recurring periods of rest. But the hon. gentleman argues that it is not only the operatives who are reaping a benefit from the National Policy, but the consumers; because, he says, the consumer shares its benefits. And in what way does the consumer share? Because, he says, our manufacturers, having the market to themselves, can, and do, reduce the prices. The hon. gentleman shows a deep knowledge of human nature, and I am sure we can all agree with him in this, that the object of the manufacturers in seeking to obtain control of the market was simply to reduce the prices. It was for that reason that the manufacturers of the United States maintained that grip of the market which they have so long had—simply in order that they might be enabled to give the people goods at a cheaper rate than they could get them if they were allowed to buy freely from the foreign producers. These manufacturers cannot have had any desire to obtain increased profits for themselves by getting control of the market. The Finance Minister tells us that that cannot be the idea, that it was to benefit the consumer as well as the manufacturer that the home market was given, and that that benefit has followed. But leaving joking apart, laying aside the humorous style in which the Finance Minister has chosen to treat this subject, let us look at the facts. The fact is, that the reduced prices are consequent upon the glut of the market, produced by his protective policy, but these prices though no doubt referable to that policy, are merely temporary. They are certainly not constant. They began with the glut of the market which now exists; they are not consistent with profits to the manufacturers; the manufacturers are not selling at these reduced rates, with the expectation of making profits, but simply because they have stocks on hand, and will do anything to get the cash, and when the consumption has overtaken the production, they will sell at the old rates. The Minister of Finance tells us himself, that these manufacturers are "placing themselves in such a position that the reduction of prices will not occur again." He takes credit on the one hand for the reduction of the prices, and on the other hand he says that the manufacturers are taking steps to prevent such a reduction again taking place. I believe the hon. gentleman is right. He refers, no doubt, to the rings which have been formed by the manufacturers in the past and which were formed by the cotton spinners as we know, some weeks ago; by the producers of coal oil and countless other rings of that kind, of which we know nothing,

but of which the Finance Minister no doubt knows. But suppose we give the National Policy all the credit for this temporary reduction; the benefit to the consumer is just about in the same proportion as the benefit which the hon. Finance Minister conferred on the tax-payers, by his remission of taxation. For four years we have paid unusually high prices for goods, and now that a season of depression occurs, the manufacturers have, like the Finance Minister, remitted a little of what they took from us, and the amount returned will be in about the same proportion to that which was formerly and unnecessarily taken away from us, as the remission by the Finance Minister was to the amount of needless taxation. In other words, perhaps about one-seventh of what we have overpaid will be returned to us. But it is distinctly untrue—I am sure the Minister will not assert it—that on an average during those last years, during the good times, goods have been cheaper than under the old tariff. That is not a question which requires argument, because there is no man who has had to buy any protected manufactures in that time who is not as well aware of the fact as I am. And now I come at last to consider the interests of a class of people with whom I am better acquainted than with the manufacturers and workingmen—I mean the farmers. What has been the effect on the farmers, not only of the Tariff, but of the general policy of the Government? The hon. Minister says that the farmer has no cause of complaint because his tea and coffee are cheaper, his cottons and woollens cheaper, and his agricultural implements cheaper than they were under a revenue tariff. Perhaps his tea and coffee are somewhat cheaper, but everybody knows what a small proportion tea and coffee, and sugar if you choose, bear to the general expenses of a farmer. But when the hon. Minister says that cottons and woollens are cheaper, we must take that statement with the reservation already referred to, that although they may be cheaper for the moment they have been on the average much higher than they were under the old tariff. With regard to agricultural implements, so far as the older Provinces are concerned, there has been no considerable importation for many years, and it is natural to suppose that the growth of competition and the improvement of machinery have somewhat reduced the price of these articles. No thanks to the National Policy if we have that reduction here. But can we believe that in Manitoba agricultural implements are cheaper than they would be without this Tariff? Last Session the Government increased the tax on agricultural implements for the express purpose of making them dearer in Manitoba. They increased the duty from 15 to 25 per cent., in order that the farmer of Manitoba should be compelled to pay more for his implements, and in order that the manufacturer of Ontario might obtain higher profits in Manitoba, and have the control of the market. But the farmers know that they have had to bear extra burdens during all these years that this policy has been in force. And I need not delay to discuss that any further. I come to ask what has been done for the farmers in return for bearing these burdens? Has anything been done to enhance the price of their produce? The hon. Minister of Finance states that at present the farmer has a protection of from 8 to 10 cents a bushel on wheat. He says he can prove that, but he did not attempt to do so. He states it oracularly, but he does not undertake to show in what way the farmer gets this protection. The crop in Canada this year is likely to fall short of the demand, and probably some time or other before the next harvest is gathered, there will be a rise in the price of wheat. But most of the farmers have sold their last year's wheat already; most of them sold it when the price of wheat was lower than it has been on the average—and the hon. gentleman is great on averages—during the years of our low tariff, when there was no duty on wheat at all. As much of that wheat as is in existence, and not ground into flour, is in the hands of speculators or millers, and

Mr. CANN.

if any rise in price takes place in consequence of the Tariff, it will be the speculator or the miller who will get all the benefit of that rise, and not the farmer. But if the Tariff increases the price of wheat, I would like to know how the farmer of Quebec, who has to import his wheat, likes that. An hon. gentleman from Quebec, who sits behind me, says they will not like it at all. But I have to remind that hon. gentleman and the Quebec farmers that they have a district pledge from the First Minister—given I think, when the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houdé) moved an amendment to the Tariff at its inception—that if at any time the crop of wheat in Canada should fall below the needs of the home consumption, and the Tariff should begin to operate so as to raise the price of wheat, the Government would either reduce or remove that tax. So that we in Ontario, who are wheat-producing farmers, stand face to face with this fact: that we have the pledge given by the First Minister to his Quebec supporters that if at any time that duty should begin to benefit us, it would either be reduced or removed. So much for the effect of his Tariff on wheat. In regard to wool, we are getting some benefits, it is claimed, because the manufacture of woollen goods has been stimulated by the Tariff; but the difficulty is that the kind of wool used for clothing is that known as short staple, which is not largely produced in Canada, while most farmers produce long wool, which is not much used in manufactures; and the Government gave what they pretend to be protection to the wool-growers by putting a duty on the long wool, which the Canadian farmer does produce, but which the Canadian manufacturer does not use, so that it cannot increase the price paid for it by the manufacturer to the farmer. We are told by the Finance Minister that the imports of wool in the last year of the old tariff were about 6½ million lbs., against about 9½ million lbs. last year. In other words, about 3½ million lbs. more untaxed foreign wool has come into competition with native wool during last year than during the last year under the old tariff. If that is encouragement to the wool-growers of this country, I do not know what encouragement is. We all know that the price of wool has averaged lower during all these years of protection than during any similar number of years before; and last year the lowest of all. In my part of Canada, the price of long staple wool of good quality was about 18 cents a pound, and I have yet to see any wool grower who is going to make a fortune at that price. Yet the hon. gentleman says that the farmer has nothing to complain of. He will not complain, I suppose, while the goods made from foreign grown wool and which he uses are taxed, and the wool he produces is not protected. He will not complain, I suppose, because foreign hides and pelts are allowed to come in free to compete with his hides and pelts in the home market, while boots and shoes are protected. He will not complain, I suppose, although according to the figures of the hon. Finance Minister himself, the importation of hides and pelts has increased by \$700,000. Nor will it rouse any ill-feeling in the mind of the farmer when he finds that lumber for cabinet-making, such as black walnut, oak, and similar woods, are allowed to be imported duty free from the United States, while he is charged a heavy duty on the furniture made from these woods. I come from a part of the country where these fine woods form a considerable part of the wealth of the farmers, and I can assure the hon. Finance Minister that the farmers there do feel injured and insulted because their claims have been neglected in this way. These woods are allowed to come in free of duty, while the farmers are charged 35 per cent. on the furniture made from them. But the hon. Minister says that the increased cost of living in the country is largely owing to the increased price of farm produce. Well, I have just been pointing out that farm produce as a whole has not increased in average price—neither wheat,

barley, oats, peas, nor most of the grain we produce—under the National Policy. One or two articles have increased in price. Beef has; but is that owing to the National Policy? I think not. What has the National Policy ever done for the export trade in beef? The price of butter has increased in certain neighbourhoods, as well as the price of cheese on account of the export trade and not because of the National Policy. It appears then that articles of farm produce whose price has increased during these years, have been articles for which the National Policy has done nothing, while those articles the National Policy pretended to protect have received no benefit whatever. I will pass to the effect on the farmer of the general policy of the Government. I would like to ask what the farmer of Ontario or Quebec has gained by the vast expenditures of public money in the past few years? Has he made anything out of the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway or out of the great expenditure on the Welland Canal? I am not attacking these works or saying they should not have been built, but I am simply asking what benefit the farmers of Ontario or Quebec have got from them. Not a dollar. The opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the enlargement of the canals have simply the effect of bringing new competitors against him in the foreign markets in which he has to sell his grain and other products. It has the effect of bringing the grain of the Western States and of our own western prairies into competition with the grain and other commodities of Ontario in the foreign markets. Does the farmer make anything out of the bounties given to the producers of iron? or out of the bounties to the fishermen? or out of the vastly increased expenditure on militia? I do not think he does, and I conclude that the farmer, though he contributes by far the largest part of the revenue of the country, has obtained very little, if any benefit, from the great expenditure of the Government during these years of prosperity, when they seem to have been trying their best to get rid of the embarrassing surplus they had on their hands. The Government think the farmer is a very long-suffering, quiet, easy-going creature, who may be made to pay everything and expect nothing. Perhaps the Government is right, but I find there is a spirit of organization and protest stirring amongst them. I need not go back more than a few days to give proof of this spirit. When the Provincial Grange of Ontario met in Toronto a few days ago they took into consideration the question of the subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway, then before this House, and although that body was composed of representative men from all parts of the Province and of all shades of politics, they came to a unanimous conclusion and passed a resolution asking the Government not to give that subsidy. That resolution was telegraphed at once to the leader of the Government. What notice do you suppose was taken of it? It was treated with silent contempt; it was not even alluded to by that hon. gentleman as evidence which ought to have any weight whatever on his opinion or on the decision of this House. When the Dominion Grange met two days ago in this city, a body composed of representative men of the whole Dominion, of all shades of politics, an address was delivered by the Master of that Grange, from which I shall quote a few extracts, because they are worth the serious attention of the House.

"The Grange is the only organized body of farmers in the Dominion, and although we are not a political organization, there are many public questions that are of great importance to us, and should receive our serious consideration and united action. Having been trained in different political schools we fall into line and divide our questions material to our interest. But I am sure that the acrimony and bitter partizan spirit exhibited by some of the leading newspapers is shared only by very few farmers of this country. It is the unquestionable right of every farmer to take a deep interest in all public matters and affiliate with which party he may think best, but the public welfare is of more importance than party success. Every farmer should thoroughly understand the questions relating to political economy."

Now we come to some references to the Tariff:

"Money or its equivalent must be raised for national as well as domestic purposes; Governments are sustained and public improvements paid for out of the surplus earnings of the people. The levying of contributions for Government purposes has been a vexed question at all times and with all nations; indirect taxation is only perfected when every individual and every industry bears an equal proportion of the taxes in accordance with their income. Under the present system adopted in this country, men worth \$1,000,000 might pay less taxes than the average farmer; and some can make millions while the day labourer's family is in want."

We have striking instances of that.

"However much argument there may be (and I admit there is some) in fostering the industries of a young country like ours, it is very evident that the great leading industry in which we are engaged can be protected only to a very limited extent.

As I have shown, the Government has not even protected that interest to the extent to which it could be protected. He goes on to quote from an American authority:

"The Master of the National Grange of the United States (himself a protectionist) in discussing the tariff before that body, said: 'A high protective tariff which builds up monopolies by imposing burdens on the people at large is high-handed oppression.

How hon. gentlemen opposite have howled at different times when hon. members on this side said extreme protection was legalized robbery and high-handed oppression. Will they venture to treat with equal contempt this statement coming from two such high authorities as the master of the Dominion Grange of Canada, and the master of the American Grange?

"Next to production and taxation, the question of transportation to us, perhaps, is most important. With a water highway, stretching half way across the Dominion, our surplus production ought to find easy access to market. In my opinion it would be wise on the part of the Government to remove the tolls from the canals; an impulse thereby would be given to trade, and all classes would be benefited. Railways are indispensable to the prosperity of the country. Townships, counties and both Provincial and Dominion Governments have given money and lands liberally to secure railway accommodation and competition."

Then he goes on at some length to treat the question of the regulations of railways, urging on the Government that they should adopt a scheme similar to that proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) of a commission, which would see that the railways do not unduly favour one person at the expense of another.

"Powerful corporations have absorbed nearly all the railways in the Dominion, railway companies have great responsibilities and they should receive a fair remuneration for services performed by them, but the public should have a voice as to the value of those services. The price of our produce as well as that of our lands are subject to the control of the railway corporations. The public have rights that the railway companies should be bound to respect and they should not be allowed to ruin or enrich individuals at pleasure by unjust discrimination. All other classes except the farmers are organized and exercise the controlling power that follows associated efforts; while the majority of farmers stand aloof and although numerically strong, they receive but few appointments, wield but little influence and are treated as a nonentity."

I must say that I know this gentleman well, and that he is quite independent of party ties, and his utterances may be taken as impartial. I think the reception given by the Government to the remonstrance of the Provincial Grange, is about the strongest proof that could be given of the correctness of his last assertion in regard to the present Government. But indications show that the farmers are awakening to a sense of their position and that they will organize between now and the next elections; and the result will be to sweep out of existence all the petty rings and shoddy aristocracies, and those who have made themselves the tools and instruments of those rings and aristocracies in this House and the Cabinet. The farmers, at all events a section of them, have asked that their claims be considered in connection with the present change in the Tariff. The farmers of a whole Province and of the territories beyond that Province, have asked that a reduction be made in the Tariff on agricultural implements, and their demand has been treated with the utmost contempt. The hon. Finance Minister is too much occupied considering the

question of soap grease, celluloid knife handles and coleothar, what ever that may be, and, as last year, sausage skins, to consider the question of relieving the farmer of part of his burden in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. There are signs, however, though invisible to the hon. gentleman, that he will receive a rude awakening from his opinion that the demands of the farmers of Manitoba and elsewhere are not worthy of consideration. To come to the general paragraphs of the hon. gentleman's speech, what remedy does he propose for the admitted depression of the country? What economy does he propose to exercise? What cautious action does he propose to take in view of the decreasing revenue? For the depression he has no remedy but the old one, to grin and bear it. When my hon. friend who sits in front of me was in office, and told the country he could do nothing to prevent or to relieve the depression which then existed, he was told he was a fly on the wheel. What shall we call the hon. the Finance Minister now? What shall we call him, when he proposes no remedy for the depression which exists to-day? Possibly we can find no better name for the present Government, than the name given to them in a campaign speech by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fairbank). He said that, if the late Government were flies on the wheel, the present Government were skippers in the cheese, and I think the comparison was not very far wrong. If the late Government did not pretend to control the movement of the great wheel of Providence, the great wheel of commercial action, this Government while revelling in all the richness derived from the Treasury cheese, do not pretend to be able, any more than their predecessors, to provide a remedy for the depression which they admit to exist. And as to economy. That is a joke, Mr. Speaker, to talk about economy. That is the last thing the hon. Minister seems to think of, and he expressly tells us that the existence of past surpluses, though they are fast diminishing, justifies him in asking Parliament for an unusually large vote for public works. He tells us the vote for public works will be larger this year than ever before, and he justifies that on the ground of the surplus. There might be some ground for this contention in the days when the surplus was annually increasing, in the days when the surplus grew so fast that the hon. gentleman did not know what to do with it; but now, in the face of a decreasing revenue, now when the surplus is vanishing before his eyes, and he scarcely dares to estimate a surplus at all for the approaching year, why does he go on in this course? Where will he be when the home production of which he speaks has decreased the surplus still further, and the revenue comes down to the point at which it was in 1879—and I see no reason why it should not at a very early day come down to that, for our taxes are no higher than they were then, and, if our people grow poorer, they will import no more than they did then. What will he do then, with the enormous expenditure and the expensive undertakings he will have on hand? This constant frittering away of the surplus has had at first sight the appearance of mere recklessness. But perhaps it has not been caused by pure recklessness. Perhaps it has been done with design. Indeed, it is hard to avoid the suspicion that the surplus was purposely got out of the way, in order that, when depression at last came upon us, as they knew it must, the Government might not be compelled, in view of the surplus remaining on hand, to reduce the high protective taxes to which they are bound hand and foot. I believe there is something in the suspicion that the intention of the Government to stick by their friends the manufacturers through good report and evil report is so strong that they would scarcely hesitate about adopting this means of getting rid of an argument which would otherwise involve a reduction in the Tariff. I admit that, at the present

Mr. CASEY.

time, it is hard for them to economize. I admit that it is hard for them to see a way of doing without any of the revenue we at present receive. This policy of getting rid of the surplus from year to year, has been effective. Our masters of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and their loyal Minister the Minister of Railways, have ably assisted the Minister of Finance in getting rid of it, and we are now in such a position that we can scarcely do without any of the revenue derived from the Tariff, we are in such a position that we can scarcely see where to economize in our expenditure. Protection to one trade has compelled us to give bounties to another. Dissatisfaction in the gentleman's own ranks, caused by extravagance in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, has led him to try to allay that dissatisfaction by a further expenditure of public money in the Province of Quebec. One extravagance constantly leads to another. The monopoly which has been saddled upon Manitoba calls for some recompense to be given to that Province, and it will have to be a recompense in hard cash or a grant of public lands, or something of value given by the Dominion to that Province as a compensation for the monopoly imposed upon it. The Government is just in the same condition as an involved speculator—when he has got to the end of his tether; they have to throw good money after bad in the hope that they may save some little out of the wreck. He says the Opposition see no daylight in the outlook, and he blames us for that. I think we see daylight enough to show us the dangers that lie ahead of us, and to show us that these dangers are avoidable by the exercise of the most ordinary prudence and common sense on the part of the gentleman who pilots the ship of state. Seeing this, is it not our duty to point out those dangers, and to call for the exercise of that prudence? I think it is our duty to do it, though I fear the cry will be in vain. If the cry is in vain, if our warning is unheeded now, as the warning of my hon. friend the late Finance Minister was unheeded in 1873; I fear the result in the next few years will be as disastrous as it was in the years that followed that warning and its rejection; I fear the country will again find itself saddled with tremendous expenditures, laid upon it by hon. gentlemen opposite, without the means of meeting them. As far as the condition of the country goes at present, I claim that we have cause for anxiety, though not for panic. I do not know that with careful management we would have cause even for strong anxiety. We believe the resources of the country are greater than ever, we believe the common sense and prudence of the people are as great as ever, we believe that everything in the country itself is calculated to pull us through the coming crisis, but to do it safely we require a steady man at the helm. As I have used the comparison of the ship of state, I may as well stick to it. But the pilot of the ship, although the prow of the vessel is among the breakers, has no advice to give us except to crowd on still more sail, and to push on, no matter what rocks may be ahead of us, in the hope that, even if we strike the rocks, the impetus may carry us over into deep water beyond. I earnestly pray that such may be the result, and that the ship may get over safely, though strained and leaky in every seam, as she probably will be. But, when we see dangers and the man at the helm blind to them, have we not cause for fear? Must not that situation that, with ordinary care, need only give us ground for caution, give rise to the most serious apprehension of grave danger. Either the hon. gentleman does not see these dangers, does not know how to avoid them, or, knowing that the course is dangerous and that there are rocks ahead, is compelled by forces unseen to us but felt by him, forces outside of this House and outside of public opinion, to go on in the dangerous course which he has followed so far. When I opened my remarks I made a jocular comparison of the hon. Minister to Wiggins, the

Canadian false prophet. Perhaps I was mistaken in comparing him to that great seer, for if the hon. gentleman does not see the dangers of his present position, and does not see whither we are driving, and believes his policy of reckless expenditure and heavy taxation will lead us into a port of safety, he is a more dangerous individual than any Wiggins, he is more dangerous than any dreaming star-gazer. He must be a fanatic, he must be an El Mahdi, he must be the false prophet of a false religion, who is leading his devotees who follow him so blindly to a yet unseen and a yet unmeasured abyss of ruin.

Mr. BENSON. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), in his comprehensive speech, left unnoticed one point to which I wish very briefly to allude. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his criticism of the Budget Speech, said :

"In England, as the hon. gentleman knows, or as he ought to know, care is taken to provide that every man who earns less than say \$2.00 a day—less than about £150 a year—should be—except on his free will and proper motion—exempt from taxation; and it is one of the best features of the English system that it is so. Here our taxes are so arranged that they press more heavily on the men who are called upon to support their families out of their daily earnings than on any other class in the community."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman knows, or ought to know, that in England at the present time nearly \$100,000,000 is collected annually from Customs duties, and unfortunately these press far more heavily upon the poor than upon the rich. On tea last year about \$20,000,000 was collected at 6d. per lb., or about one-third its value. Tobacco produced about \$43,000,000, or about three times its value. On coffee there is a duty of 14s. per cwt. when raw, and when kiln dried, ground or roasted, 2d. per lb.; while on cocoa there is 1d. per lb., so that while England taxes those things which she can not possibly produce, she leaves free to competition with the foreigner those articles which the poor man manufactures, every order given to the foreigner being one less to the British workman. While he is paying these heavy taxes and while these manufactures are admitted free, he pays as much on his coffee, tea, tobacco, or cocoa as the Duke of Westminster with his income of \$10,000 per day. From the Excise, also, England derives \$132,000,000; and surely the hon. member cannot deny that the poor man bears his share of this. So, I say, that although the poor man may escape a little direct taxation, he is still not only taxed but taxed, very heavily. I wish briefly to allude to another subject that has caused me great surprise since I came into this House. All the speakers on the Opposition side of the House seem to take it for granted that England's prosperity and the increase in her trade, which took place about thirty-five years ago, were somehow or other caused by Free Trade. Now the repeal of the corn laws at that time was a step quite consistent with our theory of protection, and quite consistent with the spirit of our National Policy; because, as neither England nor her Colonies could produce sufficient food for her consumption, what she admitted was tantamount to her raw material. But forasmuch as the repeal of the corn laws only cheapened the four pound loaf less than one-half penny, surely we cannot believe that less than one cent on four pounds of bread can make a difference between national prosperity and national adversity. The impetus given to the trade of England was caused by a series of wonderful discoveries and improvements in science and mechanics. For instance, the application of steam power to locomotion caused a rapid interchange of products between one part of the United Kingdom and another. The land was mapped out by the railways until they covered the country like a net work. The construction of these railways caused a great demand for iron, and a very great increase in the consumption of coal. The ocean became a commercial highway. Instead of having to trust to the uncertainty of wind, the power of steam carried British manufactures to

foreign countries with celerity and despatch. Then between 1848 and 1850 gold was discovered in California. This caused an immense increase in trade, because at that time nearly the whole of America was supplied with British goods. Greater gold discoveries took place in Australia in 1854, and in New Zealand and other places in 1861. We heard comparatively little of those later gold discoveries, and yet, by the official returns, I find that £30,000,000 worth were discovered in New Zealand alone between 1861 and 1870. I might also allude to the electric telegraph and, as a sequence, our Atlantic cables. Then, in 1870, the application of the compound engine to ocean steamers reduced the consumption of coal to one-third, so that these steamers could make longer voyages, and freight was reduced to something like one-half. Now it would be strange, indeed, if the country having all these advantages did not progress, and England for a long time did progress, and progressed rapidly, notwithstanding Free Trade. So long as she was the workshop of the world she got on splendidly, but now that other nations have begun to manufacture, the whole thing seems to be changed. Had she exercised common sense and protected herself and her colonies from those nations that would not admit her manufactures free, she would have had a reciprocity with a great many of them that would have kept her trade to herself. But instead of that she neglected the substance for the shadow, and would worship mere theory. The consequence is that when she threw her ports open expecting that other nations would follow her example, instead of doing that they began to manufacture for themselves to such an extent that she is now losing her trade. For instance Coventry, that used to be a prosperous city, is now doing nothing; her glory has departed. In Macclesfield all the large mills are closed; and in Spitefields the only trade left is the manufacture of a little umbrella silk of the best quality. But I am glad to see, Mr. Speaker, there is yet left what Mr. Matthew Arnold would call a remnant. This remnant, seeing the error of the majority, are now clamouring for a return to protection under the name of fair trade, and though this agitation may only be in its infancy, though it may be only a cloud the size of a man's hand, yet I believe and trust it will spread and spread and grow and grow until it becomes a tempest which will hurl those theorists from their high places. I might say, in conclusion, that England with all thy faults I love thee still; but this makes me mourn and lament, that she has entrusted her destinies to a set of hot-headed enthusiasts who have led her, and are leading her, astray; and, therefore, instead of looking up to England as a great example we should follow, as hon. members here try to persuade us, we should look upon her as an awful example and avoid her errors and look to the promotion of our own interests while the opportunity is ours.

Mr. VAIL. If I were not one of the representatives of the Maritime Provinces, I would be disposed to allow the Resolutions to pass without saying a word; but if I were to remain silent, my silence might be construed into an admission that everything was satisfactory there, and that the protective policy of the present Government was quite suited to that section of the Dominion. I shall, therefore, ask the attention of the House for a very short time, while I explain why, in my opinion, this protective policy is not suited to a country situated as is the Province from which I come. I may be charged with being somewhat sectional in my opinion, and that my remarks would tend to show that I desire to throw discontent into those Provinces, and that they were not quite satisfied with their position in the Union. But that is not my desire. My desire at present is to point out to the Government of the day where I think they have made mistakes, and why the policy is not suited to our people; I wish to see all parts and sections and Pro-

vinces of this Dominion in a happy and prosperous condition. I say this much so that I may not be told hereafter that when I point out that the people of the Maritime Provinces are not fairly dealt with, I may not be accused of doing so in order to create discontent. Before we were confederated—and I say we have been unfairly treated, because of the information given and the statements made by gentlemen before the Union took place—we were told by the present Finance Minister, who was then a leading man in the Province of New Brunswick, that under no circumstances would the taxation of the country be increased beyond 15 per cent., that a 15 per cent. tariff would yield \$15,000,000, and that would be ample for the requirements of the Dominion. This statement was followed up by that of the present hon. Minister of Railways, who was then leader of the Government of Nova Scotia. He did not go quite so far as the Finance Minister did at that time; but he led the people of Nova Scotia to suppose that after Confederation was accomplished, although the taxes might be increased to some extent, they would be kept within a reasonable limit, and that the taxation of the country would not amount to very much beyond what the Province was paying at that time. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression, as were a great many others, that as the tariff in old Canada had been reduced from 20 per cent. to 15 per cent., it was very probable after Confederation, having a larger country, it would not be necessary to increase the rate beyond 15 per cent. But I am led to believe that the reduction was only made with a view of bringing into Confederation the smaller Provinces that were then very lightly taxed. In this connection I will trouble the House by reading a small portion of a speech delivered by the present hon. First Minister at Parkhill, in Ontario. I suppose when he had been speaking of the protective policy he had been charged with having at one time been opposed to such a step, because he had reduced the tariff of old Canada from 20 per cent. to 15 per cent. At that meeting the hon. gentleman said, in reference to reducing the tariff prior to Confederation:

"But there was another reason—the Government were anxious to bring Nova Scotia and New Brunswick into Confederation. They found it was absolutely necessary for the good of the country that instead of consisting of several scattered Provinces we should be one great Dominion, and a source of strength instead of weakness to the Empire. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had been accustomed to a much lighter taxation than the people of Canada, and therefore in order to induce them to come in, the duty was settled at 15 per cent. Again he said the duty was reduced, because they wished the people of Nova Scotia to join the Confederation, and because they could reduce the tariff without injuring any industry in our country."

It appears that if such was the opinion of the hon. gentleman at that time; he certainly must have changed his opinion since, if it was now necessary to increase the Tariff for the protection of certain industries in the Dominion. For the information of a number of hon. members who have not visited Nova Scotia and do not know much about our position, I may say we have a coast line of 600 or 700 miles, where the harbours are open and easy of access in winter as well as in summer. Our Province is peopled by those engaged in trade and commerce, by lumbermen, fishermen, shipbuilders, seamen, and by those engaged to a limited extent in the few manufactures we have, and also by a few agriculturists. It will easily be seen by hon. gentlemen that a country of that character does not produce or grow anything that the upper Provinces require, and consequently we are obliged as a maritime people to look outside the Dominion for a market for almost everything we grow, produce or manufacture, I qualify that statement to a certain extent, because a portion of the coal we raise in Nova Scotia finds a market in Quebec or Montreal, and it is just possible that some of the sugar now manufactured in Halifax, finds a market in the Upper Provinces; but, with the exception of those two articles, nothing we produce finds a market in the western Provinces. Even the fish which we

Mr. VAIL.

should like to send west we are prevented from sending on account of the increased freight as compared with the transportation from ports in the United States. Fish which costs 17 cents per 100 lbs., from Boston or Portland to Western Ontario, costs 28 or 30 cents per 100 lbs., from the Maritime Provinces. It is therefore impossible for our people to compete with the Americans in that market, which would otherwise be open to us in the west. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to show the effect of the Tariff in regard to the taxation in Nova Scotia as compared with the taxation previous to Confederation. The Blue Books are very deceptive in this particular, and are in fact no guide at all as to the taxation which this protective policy has brought on the country. I have prepared a table which I think will show, as nearly as possible, what the people of Nova Scotia now pay as compared with what they paid formerly; and I think the hon. Finance Minister will agree with me that it is a fair comparative statement. In 1866 the population of Nova Scotia was, as near as may be—because we have the population of 1861, and we have the population of 1871, and I have taken a fair increase upon that of 1861—the population of Nova Scotia in 1866 was, I say, 355,000. Goods entered for consumption which we imported in that year amounted to a little over \$13,000,000, which would be equal to about \$37 per head of the population. In 1862-83 the population was, say, 441,000, and on this number, at \$37 per head as in 1866, the value of dutiable goods consumed in Nova Scotia at the present time, would be \$16,317,000. Now, Sir, the Province of Nova Scotia only imported of dutiable goods last year to the value of \$6,550,887 by the trade returns, and the duty collected, according to the trade returns, amounted to \$1,833,470. Now if Nova Scotia paid \$1,833,470 on an importation of \$6,550,887, the same rate of duty on the goods actually consumed, that is, \$16,317,000, would amount to, \$4,568,760. To this we must add the amount collected by Excise, \$262,231, making a total of \$4,830,991. It may be said that the people of Nova Scotia, having used the manufactured goods of the Upper Provinces, have got them at a little less rate. I doubt if that argument holds good. I find that in all cases where importations were made either of dry goods or flour or anything else from the Upper Provinces, they come into the Maritime Provinces just a shade lower than the imported goods. The millers of the Upper Provinces have their prices current from New York every day, and they know exactly what flour can be delivered at in the Maritime Provinces, duty paid, and, of course, they put their flour at about 10 cents per barrel cheaper at Halifax or any other port, so that if the consumer does not pay the whole 50 cents per barrel on flour, he pays 40 cents. So in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may not have any cause to find fault I have taken off 5 per cent. on the difference between our importation last year and our consumption. This difference amounts to \$448,305, thus bringing the actual taxation down to \$4,382,685, instead of \$1,833,470, as shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns. Take this \$4,382,685, and compare it with the amount of taxation in Nova Scotia in 1866, which was \$1,229,504, and we have a difference of \$3,153,182 between the amount paid by Nova Scotia at that time and the amount paid at the present time. This is a statement which if hon. gentlemen opposite will look into, I think they will make up their minds is a fair statement of our taxation. Now, Sir, it is a remarkable thing that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are charged with having changed their views. The Finance Minister himself the other day referred to a speech made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) a year or two ago, and he undertook to say that there was some inconsistency between the views of that hon. gentleman at that time and the views which he now entertains. Now, I do not think that

the hon. gentleman who occupy the Treasury benches at the present time are themselves altogether free from charges of that kind. We will take for instance a gentleman who has been in the Cabinet only two or three years, but who is a man of great weight in the Government, and one whose views ought to be respected by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us see what Senator Macpherson said at one time in reference to the taxation of the country and how it affected the several Provinces of the Dominion. It was at a time when the people engaged in the salt industry in the Upper Province were desirous of getting some assistance from the Government, by way of bounty or otherwise, and on that occasion the hon. gentleman made the following remarks:—

"He believed it to be exceedingly unsound to impose a duty on coal or breadstuffs, or any natural products that were now free. If it had been the object to devise a Tariff that would set one Province against another, that would create and perpetuate sectional jealousies and antipathies, the Government had certainly succeeded. Breadstuffs were to be taxed in order to please the Province of Ontario, but he believed it was great injustice to the agriculturists of Ontario to suppose that they were prepared to accept such a Tariff or that it would be a protection to them. The market where their surplus produce was disposed of fixed the price of the whole, and the duty could not be any positive advantage so far as the price of breadstuffs was concerned. Then the duty would be a great obstruction to trade throughout the country, which should, according to the true principles of commerce, be left as unrestricted as possible. Not only would the Tariff be worthless to Ontario, but it would be most burdensome to other sections—to the fishermen and the great masses of the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as well as Quebec; for it was a well known fact that a large quantity of breadstuffs was yearly taken into the latter Province from the United States. Then, as a part of this great 'National Policy' a duty was imposed on foreign coal as a means of propitiating the people of Nova Scotia. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec were taxed to satisfy Ontario—Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick were taxed to please a minority in Nova Scotia. Nothing could be more calculated to create dissension and disturb the harmonious working of Confederation than this legislation. \* \* \* He believed that a protective duty was unjust and could not be supported on true principles. \* \* \* Was the House ready to subsidise every little enterprise that might be established in this country without reference to the masses of the people? The whole amount of capital invested in the salt interest in Goderich could not exceed \$100,000; and if it was the wish of the Government to encourage that interest artificially, it was better to give it a direct subsidy than to increase the cost of the article by a tax on the consumers. The same argument would apply to the coal of Nova Scotia. If it was the intention to encourage monopolists at the expense of the people, then let it be done directly out of the Consolidated Fund, and we would soon know what it cost."

Well, we find that Senator Macpherson has changed his views and is now a member of a Government who seem to think that no policy is so suitable to this country as the high protective policy inaugurated a few years ago. What I am about to read now is the opinion of another gentleman who now happens to be a member of the Government. It will be remembered that when my hon. friend from South Huron made his Budget speech in 1875, he announced that it was the policy of the Government at that time to raise the tariff from 15 per cent. to 17½ per cent.; and after my hon. friend had concluded his speech, the hon. Minister of Railways, then in opposition, immediately arose, and delivered a speech in which he made this observation:

"I fear that the hon. Minister is seeking to introduce the thin edge of the protection wedge, which will eventually work ruin and desolation to the Maritime Provinces. Let the hon. Minister look at the neighboring Republic, and he would find that the policy of that country had swept their flag off the seas and given to others the carrying trade of the world. He (Mr. Cartwright) says we have a surplus of half a million. I say the Government have no right to have a surplus. If they have a surplus they should endeavour to get rid of it, and the best way to do so is that pursued by us and by the Government of Great Britain, by lightening the taxes on the people."

If that was the opinion of Sir Charles Tupper at that time, he has certainly changed his views on the trade question since. Another hon. gentleman who seems to be very much in favor of this protective policy, and who spoke the night before last, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) formerly held different views; and although my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) referred to it, I may just repeat what he said:

"A fifteen per cent. tariff means more than fifteen per cent. protection to manufacturers. There is the cost of transport of goods from the other side of the water, which amounts, on an average, to at least five per cent., so that there is now a protection equal to twenty per cent. That ought to be sufficient for any industry suited to the country, and as to others it would be unwise to attempt to sustain them by fiscal props."

So, it seems that Mr. White, who is supporting the Government in their fiscal policy, has somewhat changed his views on that question. Then, another hon. gentleman who was closely allied to the Government, the ex-High Commissioner, since the introduction of this protective policy, and has stood as a sort of godfather to it. He made speeches on the other side of the water to show that a protective policy was suited to the Dominion of Canada; that, in fact, the great object of a protective policy was to reduce the importations from the United States and to increase the importations from England; and that, therefore, it was a policy that England, at all events, had no reason to find fault with. Well, I happen to have an extract from a speech delivered by that hon. gentleman in the Montreal Chamber of Commerce a short time before he was appointed High Commissioner, in which he said:

"I do not believe it is possible to develop manufactures on any large scale by high duties. Our market is too limited, we have only four millions of people to supply, and it must be perfectly clear that the result of high duties would be to create an artificial industry, which does not rest on its own intrinsic merits. It is to be observed that protection, high duties, enhance the cost of every other article as well as that in which a particular manufacturer may be interested. It renders it more expensive for every manufacturer to manufacture his goods. If everything the boot and shoe maker uses is protected by high duties, it is evident that his goods must be dearer. The result would, consequently, be that the exportation of our surplus goods to foreign countries would become absolutely impossible. We cannot have an export trade if our goods are artificially made dear in this country. We have in the United States a most complete example of that."

Now, Sir, having shown that hon. gentlemen opposite have somewhat changed their views in regard to the protective policy, I desire to show that the Province of Nova Scotia was led to believe that the taxation would not be increased. Certain speeches were made in 1878, and before that time, which led the country to suppose that there was no intention, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, to impose increased taxation on the country, but that their object was to readjust the Tariff without increasing the taxation. The hon. Minister of Finance, in a speech delivered in St. John, N.B., made use of this language:

"I am now going to touch upon a delicate question, and I am well aware that I will be held responsible in Parliament for any expression of opinion that I may now give. If I had been in Parliament I would not have voted for increasing the duty on the non-enumerated articles from 15 per cent. to 17½. The Government supporters have been spreading the report all through the Dominion that the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald and his followers is to increase the taxes of the country. It has been stated that Sir John even named the rate to which he proposed to increase the tariff at 35 per cent. No such idea entered into his head, or any of his followers. The tariff is always governed by the necessities of the country. It requires about \$13,000,000 yearly from Customs duties and \$5,000,000 from Excise to carry on the ordinary public services of the country. How best and most judiciously to levy this is the question for the Government of the day to consider. I do not think this amount is equitably levied at present, and, therefore, I am in favour of a readjustment of the tariff which will render the tax equitable to all classes of the people throughout the Dominion. But this word readjustment does not suit our opponent. If you support the Opposition, they say, you will vote for increased taxation. This cry that is now raised about increased taxation reminds me of an incident which occurred during the Confederation campaign. A gentleman who was opposed to Confederation went into a house during his canvass and putting a fine boy on the head said: 'You do not wish this boy to go to fight the battles of Canada?' That settled the matter. We want no increased taxation, but we do want the taxes properly imposed."

"He would now come to the question of taxation, which was an important one in the present election. If a supporter of his was met by a Government man, he was told that the Opposition proposed putting a duty on flour, coal, &c., and increasing taxation greatly. When Mr. Burpee made the assertion that he (the speaker) was in favour of a reciprocal tariff with the United States, Mr. Burpee stated what he had no right to say, as he (the speaker) had never made any statement of the kind. Had the Government of which he is a member been in power during the last five years, he was satisfied the average expenditure would not have exceeded \$22,500,000, whereas it had reached \$24,000,000. It would have been the duty of the Government, before levying additional taxation, to have ascertained what reduction could be made in

the expenditure, and had the present Government acted on this principle, they would have only been carrying out their declared policy while in Opposition; but they took no such course, and abandoned another plank in their platform. In fact, instead of decreasing, they largely increased the expenditure, for which they are justly censurable."

That was taken from the speech delivered by the hon. Finance Minister in St. John, N.B., in 1878. Now, in 1878 the hon. Minister of Railways made a speech in this House, and a portion of that speech was published in Nova Scotia. It was printed in capital letters in the organ of the Dominion Government, the *Halifax Herald*, and sent broadcast over the country to show there was no intention on the part of the then Opposition, if they came into power, of increasing the taxation of the country. He said:

"I trust I have satisfied the House that it is not a question of high or low taxation any further than this, that inasmuch as we governed the country with a small taxation, and inasmuch as we are prepared to govern the country again without those extravagant expenditures made by the present Government since they have been entrusted with power; all we ask is not that the taxation of the people shall be increased because we do not require so much money as the hon. gentleman opposite, as we have shown by our economy in the past, and which we are prepared to practice in the future."

I think that I have shown plainly that the utterances of the hon. gentlemen opposite in 1865, 1866 and 1878 were calculated, at all events, to deceive the people of the Maritime Provinces, if the people of the Upper Provinces were not deceived. I may be told, but you have had an election since and Nova Scotia has returned a majority of supporters of the Government. Well my answer to that, is that, in the first place, the people of Nova Scotia did not believe, they could not be made to believe, we were going to have an election at all, until the House was prorogued, and the Government, even in the speech proroguing Parliament, made a statement that was calculated to deceive the country. They said that they had information that millions of dollars were already on the other side of the line, or in foreign countries to be expended in the Dominion in the erection of factories, but that these people did not feel disposed to invest their capital until this question was settled for another five years, and therefore the Government dissolved the House a year before the regular term expired. The people were taken by surprise. It happened to be a time when business was in a healthy state, everybody's attention seemed to be turned to making money, and it was very difficult to get them to leave their business and turn their attention to politics. Therefore, I do not believe that the test then taken of public opinion was a fair test at all. I may be told, but there have been two elections in Nova Scotia since. There are however reasons why those elections resulted in favor of the Government which it is not necessary now for me to mention. They are well known in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. member for Halifax knows why these elections resulted in the return of gentlemen supporting the Government. I am justified in saying, therefore, that in the present state of things, Nova Scotia has good cause to complain that the people are taxed to this extent. The amount of taxation is not known to the people, and fortunately for them it is not. I may be told, as I was told last year, that I am trying to make out Nova Scotia to be the poorhouse of the Dominion. Not so; Nova Scotia, considering her area, population, and resources, is equal to any Province of the Dominion in wealth and enterprise. Her industries are so varied that it is impossible for this or any other Government to tax her to such an extent that the people will not be still in a moderately prosperous state, because if one industry fails we have another to fall back upon, and I therefore look upon Nova Scotia as one of the safest Provinces in which a man can invest his capital and enter into business. But, I say, if the present Government had put their heads together in order to devise the most effective means by which they could restrict the trade of a Province situated as Nova Scotia

Mr. VAIL.

is, they could not have done it more effectually than they have in their present trade policy. It may be said that the coal interest of Nova Scotia has been protected to some extent. I admit that, but I am prepared to show that if the coal interest has been protected by a duty on American coal, that duty has tended more to prevent English coal going to Montreal than to keep out American coal. The effect of the increased duty has been to keep out English coal; and Nova Scotia coal, therefore, has come into competition with the English instead of the American coal. I think I will be able to convince the House that the Nova Scotia coal interest has not derived very great advantage from the protective policy. I hold a copy of a letter written by a gentleman who is very well known in Nova Scotia as an authority on coal matters, and who at one time was appointed by the coal owners there to come to Ottawa to interview the Government in connection with the duty on coal. I refer to Mr. J. R. Lithrow, well known all over Nova Scotia, as being largely interested in coal mines. This is a letter which was addressed to the *North Sydney Herald*. After attempting to show that the 50 cents per ton duty on coal was by no means a protective tariff, after showing that the coal owners would be worse off under a 50 cents duty with our protective policy than under the old trade policy with no duty at all, he proceeds to say:

"But again, along with a moderate revenue duty on coal and coke have come greatly increased duties on colliery plant and materials. For example, wire rope—free for ships—for mines, 25 per cent.; iron which formerly paid 5 per cent. pays 17½ per cent.; castings of all kinds, 17½ per cent., now pay 25 per cent.; rails formerly free, now pay 15 per cent.; engines, boilers, steam pumps, car wheels and axles, and leather belting and hose, formerly paying 17½ per cent., now pay 25 per cent.; bolts, washers and rivets, formerly 17½ now pay 30 per cent.; nuts pay 1 cent per pound and 10 per cent.; horse-shoe nails and hardware generally, formerly 17½ per cent., now pay 30 per cent.; fire brick hitherto free, now pays 20 per cent.; miners powder formerly paid 17½ per cent., now pays 3 cents per lb., equal to 30 per cent.; dynamite and other blasting material pay 5 cent per lb. and 20 per cent.; they formerly paid 17½ per cent.; India rubber and packing for engines, etc., now pay 7½ per cent more than before; picks, shovels, riddles, screws, lamps, olive, linseed, lard and other oils, also paints, pay from 2½ to 7½ per cent more than formerly; screws pay 35 per cent. just double the old duty. In short, anyone acquainted with the wants of a colliery in Nova Scotia will tell you that the new Tariff about doubles the duties payable under the old Tariff, and that the duty now imposed on colliery plant and supplies, average more than the duty levied on coal and coke. If the House of Commons and Senate now in Session could visit the Pictou and Cape Breton collieries and see the deep pits out of which the coal is raised and rivers of water pumped day and night; the great engines, pumps hoisting apparatus, railroads and coal waggons, etc., etc. under and above ground in a well equipped colliery, they would not be surprised, at no money being made out of \$1.50 per ton of screened coal, considering the royalty payable to the Province and the from 17½ to 35 per cent. duties levied on the numerous articles in continual use. Sir, when I think of how the National Policy—"

This is a strong supporter of the Government; he has been, and is at the present day. He says:

"Sir, when I think of how the National Policy proposed to foster our mining interests, of how Mr. Tilley proposed to impose such duties as would give to home industry the home market, and then think of what it and he has done for our coal mines I—well, better not swell my feelings lest the Pallistines will rejoice—"

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). May I ask what the date of that letter is?

Mr. VAIL. I will give you the date in a few minutes.

"My conviction is the Cape Breton collieries are much worse off under the new, than they were under the old Tariff. They cannot now get any more for their coal; they cannot now put their coal into Ontario and they have now to pay about twice as much duty as before. Messrs. Redpath and Drummond, I will venture to say, will make more profit within one year under the new Tariff, than all the Cape Breton collieries will under ten years, say, or fifty years protection the new Tariff affords them—"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Do you want the duty taken off?

Mr. VAIL. Yes, off imported articles.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Off coal?

Mr. VAIL. Not off coal.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He says he would be better without it.

Mr. VAIL. The letter goes on:

"The Tariff and reciprocity disheartens coal owners, and that those who have anything to invest cannot be expected to sacrifice their means in preparations for a trade, which in a year or two may be *non est*. I know how a permanent coal trade between Ontario and Cape Breton could be established, but I will not add more to this already too long letter."

That is dated Halifax, April 17th, 1879—after the protective policy was introduced—and it was printed in the *Halifax Herald*. It was said that the great object of the protective policy was to assist our struggling industries. Well, I cannot see, for my own part, that the struggling industries have been helped in the slightest degree. It is true that the protective policy has led to increased manufactures in some parts, and there are more running now than in 1878, but I think, when we find that the cotton stocks, for instance—and that industry has been more benefited than any other industry by this policy—are worth now about 60 per cent. of the par value; and they were, even under the old trade policy of the Government of the member for East York, worth from 80 to par, that it will be easily seen that the cotton industry has not been very much benefited. While on that question, I would refer to a remark made by the member for Cardwell in regard to the prices for cotton. I think it was unfair on the part of that hon. gentleman to compare the prices in the United States with the prices in the Dominion last year. Everyone knows that last year there was a surplus quantity of cotton lying in the manufactories in this country, and that in the Maritime Provinces the agents were offering to sell cotton goods, delivered last autumn, and consider them as being delivered in the spring of this year, in order to get them off their hands. It will thus be seen that the over-production and the quantity they had on hand made a competition which reduced the value of cotton very much lower than it had been, and it was therefore an unfair thing to take the price last year and compare it with the price in the United States. I say the cotton industry was the only industry that could be benefited to any extent by this protective policy, and I have shown you the effects of it. It may be said that we have in the city of Halifax a sugar refinery or two, and a cotton industry, which were started there a little while ago. But, Sir, when I tell the House that the sugar refinery has been in operation for three years, and the stock of the cotton factory and the sugar refinery is owned by the people of Halifax, who have been subjected to \$30,000 a year loss of interest for three years, in order to have those two manufactories running there, they will agree with me that they have not been much advantaged to the stockholders.

Mr. TUPPER. How about monopoly?

Mr. VAIL. There is not much monopoly about that.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). What becomes of the sugar nabobs?

Mr. VAIL. I will tell you where a monopoly comes in. The matter was brought to my mind the other night by a remark of the hon. member for Cardwell, when he talked about making the Dominion a slaughter market for the United States. I contend that, in many instances, the Province of Nova Scotia is made the slaughter market for the Upper Provinces, and my hon. friend, the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) knows this; and I do not think he will contradict me, that it is the rule of one of the manufacturers of Montreal, who manufactures manilla cordage, to give instructions to his agents that they are to sell his cordage in Halifax a quarter per cent. below what Mr. Stairs can sell his cordage for. That is where the monopoly comes in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. VAIL. What is the cheering about, I should like to know? I suppose the gentlemen will tell me that the people get their cordage cheaper?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. VAIL. But they say that people are not benefited by that, but by the high price and a high Tariff, and that, because they have certain manufactures in the country, and they are taxed for it, it is really a benefit to them. It has been a benefit in this way, to the people of Nova Scotia: The Government increased the duty on cordage last year, and therefore the people have had the price of cordage increased by this protective policy beyond what it was a few years ago.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. VAIL. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out that while the policy of the Government was calculated to increase the price of goods consumed, it is not much advantage after all to the smaller manufacturers in the Maritime Provinces, inasmuch as the older Provinces, with a larger market, could undersell them by a small percentage in certain manufactured goods, and I instanced the article of cordage amongst others. It will be remembered that last year the Government increased the duty on cordage from 15 to, I think, 20 per cent. and of course that was done in the interests of the manufacturers. This year that seems to have been further increased by instructions from the Department of Customs. I have here a copy of an order that was issued on the 1st of February, 1884, and I suppose it is pretty much a copy of the instructions that have been issued from time to time to the collectors in the several Provinces. They have put Manilla rope, when imported from the United States, at from 15 to 15½ and 16 cents per lb.; while it is very well known that manilla rope can be purchased, and has been purchased, recently in the United States, at 10½ cents. I have in my possession a letter written by a gentleman in Halifax the other day, in which he complains of this matter, and he asked me to see the Minister of Customs on the subject. He complains that when he makes a purchase of cordage in the United States at 10½ cents per lb., he is required to enter it in the Custom House at Halifax at 15½ and 16 cents, which was about 5 cents higher than the actual cost. So that, in the first place, the Government increased the duty on cordage, and now they oblige the importers of that article to enter it at 50 per cent. more than its real cost, and that of course enables the manufacturers to put their prices up and take an additional amount of money out of the consumer. It is quite true that the Montreal people have been selling at a small percentage under the price of the manufacturers at Halifax; but after all, when you take into consideration the increased duty, and the increased duty on account of the increased price that the importer is obliged to enter it at, the consumer has to pay a very high price. I wish now to pass on to another subject. I was referring to the coal industry and some other industries in Nova Scotia. I know that when some hon. gentlemen opposite come to reply to me they will say: "Oh, well, if the people of Nova Scotia, especially the fishermen, have been obliged pay an increased price for their goods, they have received an offset in the way of the bounty paid to the fishermen." Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider that they ought to be under any obligations to the Government for having granted \$150,000 to the fishermen of the Dominion, when in reality the Government was in duty bound to give them the interest on the whole amount of the Fishery Award, which would be about \$240,000 or \$250,000; so that they are really getting \$100,000 less than they are entitled to. I consider that the interest of the Fishery Award really belongs to the fishermen of the Dominion. Now, Sir, if the

fishermen did derive some little advantage from that bounty, when I come to tell the House that last year the people of Nova Scotia paid a duty on breadstuffs—and that is largely paid by the fishermen of the Province—of no less than \$71,000, it will be evident that the advantage derived from the bounty is very much lessened by this tax. This duty on breadstuffs is largely paid on corn meal, and I think the amount paid on corn and corn meal is \$40,000, which is largely paid by the fishermen. Therefore, I say I do not think the fishermen need be under any obligation to the Government for the small amount of their own money that they have received back in the way of a bounty. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words in reference to the position of the Provinces, as compared with what it was when they entered the Union. In the first place, I believe it will be admitted by all who are acquainted with the conditions of Union, that when the Lower Provinces entered Confederation they did so on the understanding that the Tariff would be 15 per cent.—probably not any higher; and the amount of money that they were to be paid out of the public funds annually after Confederation, and to be used for Provincial purposes, was based upon that 15 per cent. tariff, and each Province was allowed 80 cents per head on the population. Now, if that be correct—and I hold that it is, because it would be unreasonable to suppose that the smaller Provinces would have been willing to cast in their lot with the larger Provinces had they imagined that they were to give up everything, including the right to tax the people to any sum the Dominion thought proper, for there is no other means of raising a revenue left the Provinces but the right to impose direct taxation. The Lower Provinces have no revenue from licenses to sell liquor or from any other licenses, as the Upper Provinces have; they have no other means in the world of increasing their revenue except by direct taxation. Therefore, they were called upon to give up a great deal, and it is reasonable to suppose that if they had been under the impression that they would be called upon to pay a higher duty than 15 per cent., they would not have been willing to enter Confederation. Now, Sir, the Government have gone on increasing the duty from 15 per cent. to 35, 40, and, in some cases, to 60 per cent. Now, it would appear that the smaller Provinces, which are in very straightened difficulties at the present time, have a fair claim upon the Dominion for an increased subsidy, somewhat in comparison with the increase in the Tariff. I mention this because I see some of the Provinces are intending to ask the Government for better terms, and I hope the Government will take this matter into consideration and give them what they are fairly entitled to. They do not ask anything to which they are not fairly entitled, or to which any other Province would not be fairly entitled under the same circumstances; but at the same time, the Government will agree with me that the smaller Provinces are entitled to something in the shape of additional subsidy as compensation for the increased amount taken from them by the increase in the Tariff. Before you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I referred to what had been said from time to time in Nova Scotia, and to some extent in New Brunswick, in regard to the increase in the Tariff, and I am sure there is one hon. gentleman in the Cabinet who will fully agree with me and will endorse what I have said—I refer to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Perhaps no hon. member in this House is in a better position to point out what the great increase in taxation to Nova Scotia is at the present time, and there was no man prior to Confederation who more eloquently or more loudly pointed out the great risk which Nova Scotia was running in entering the Confederation than that hon. gentleman who is now a member of the Government. He pointed out to the House of Assembly at that time, and to the then leader of the Govern-

Mr. VAIL.

ment, Sir Charles Tupper, that Confederation meant increased taxation, and it was folly for him to intimate that their taxes would not be largely increased, that it must be necessarily so, and he warned the people against taking that step. The present Minister of Railways, in replying to the hon. gentleman said that this cry was raised only to frighten the House of Assembly and the people and induce them to reject the Union Resolutions. If the hon. gentleman will turn back in his memory to those speeches delivered in the Nova Scotia House of Assembly, he must concur in the opinions which I have set forth. I now pass on to another question, and will consider the position of that industry. The object of the protective policy was stated to be, at the time it was inaugurated, to encourage the struggling industries of this country. I think I have shown that, with the exception of the cotton industry, it has not been of much benefit to any other industry. There is a very important industry that I think has been neglected, and it is one which has suffered more than any other from the introduction of the protective policy—I refer to the lumber industry. I was myself not aware of the magnitude of this business until my attention was called to it a short time ago and some figures given to me, which I looked over very carefully revised and extended, to show the position which this industry occupied in comparison with other industries in the Dominion. The following comparative statement will show the exaction of the Tariff, as bearing on the lumbering interests of the Dominion, for the years 1878 and 1883, respectively:—

Articles.	1878.	1883.
Steam engines and boilers, machinery and water wheels, mill saws and files, machinery oil.....	17½ per ct.	25 per ct.
Steel, for shoeing sleds and for hand-spikes and peevies.....	Free.	\$5 per ton.
Chains.....	Free.	5 per ct.
Harness and boots.....	17½ per ct.	25 per ct.
Hay.....	10 per ct.	20 per ct.
Woolen clothing.....	17½ per ct.	10c. p. yd. & 25c. p. ad valorem.
Duck, for jumpers and overalls.....	17½ per ct.	2c. p. yd. & 15c. p. ad valorem.
Pork and beef.....	1c. per lb.	1c. per lb.
Oats.....	Free.	10c. per bus.
Cornmeal.....	"	40c. per bbl.
Wheat flour.....	"	50c. per bbl.
Beans.....	"	15c. per bus.
Butter.....	4c. per lb.	4c. per lb.
Lard.....	1c. per lb.	2c. per lb.
Axes.....	17½ per ct.	30 per ct.

It will thus be seen that our present Customs Tariff, with the exception of tea and molasses, bears very heavily on the lumbering industry, while we admit woods of foreign countries free of duty into Canada, in competition with those of our forest. The gross value of the forest for the year ending April 4th, 1881, was \$38,541,752.00. This amount was credited among the various Provinces as follows:—

Ontario.....	\$16,601,175.00
Quebec.....	10,542,649.00
New Brunswick.....	6,532,826.00
Nova Scotia.....	3,094,132.00
Manitoba.....	885,173.00
Prince Edward Island.....	240,153.00
Territories.....	95,218.00
	<b>\$37,991,426.00</b>

The value of the product of this industry, for 1881, is therefore equal to about \$9 for every inhabitant of the Dominion, the population by last Census being 4,344,810. The following statement will show the number of saw mills engaged in manufacturing in the various Provinces of the Dominion and the number of hands employed:—

	Lumber Mills.	Shingle Mills.	Stave Mills.	Men Em'p'd.
Ontario .....	1,761	204	27	18,010
Quebec .....	1,729	377	1	13,312
New Brunswick .....	478	85	...	7,494
Nova Scotia .....	1,190	114	3	4,435
Manitoba .....	37	....	...	583
Prince Edward Island .....	165	16	...	459
British Columbia .....	27	5	...	404
Territories .....	3	....	...	44
	5,390	801	31	44,740

It will thus be seen, by the foregoing statement, that 44,740 persons were directly employed, in 1881, in the mills manufacturing the produce of the forest. This does not include the lumbermen in the woods, nor the log drivers on the rivers and streams. If they were added, it will be found that the number of hands directly employed in the lumbering industry is not much short of 80,000 or 90,000, and if we take the number of persons in each household, as shown by the Census returns to be five, the lumbering industry in 1881 was giving a livelihood to about 400,000 of our population. The amount of capital invested in this industry was estimated at \$25,059,680, divided among the several Provinces, as follows:—

Provinces.	Capital.
Ontario .....	\$11,397,889
Quebec .....	7,673,603
New Brunswick .....	3,058,436
Nova Scotia .....	1,704,133
Manitoba .....	609,350
British Columbia .....	344,350
Prince Edward Island .....	207,919
Territories .....	64,000
	\$25,059,680

The following statement gives the total value of the export of the produce of the forest, for the year ending June 1883:—

Ontario .....	\$ 9,280,238
Quebec .....	8,015,485
New Brunswick .....	4,724,422
Nova Scotia .....	1,587,041
British Columbia .....	362,871
Prince Edward Island .....	20,098
	\$23,990,155

When it is considered that the sum total of capital invested, in 1881, in all of the industrial establishments in the country, was \$165,302,622, and of this sum the lumbering interests contributed \$25,059,680, and that its produce exported in 1883 reached 25 per cent. of the sum total of all Canadian products exported to foreign countries, we may conclude that the lumbering industry is one of the most important industries in the Dominion, and is entitled to some consideration in framing a Tariff. Now, that we may fully understand what this protective policy is costing the Dominion, I have taken a few figures from the Trade and Navigation, which will show the amount collected in 1883 as compared with the sum collected in 1878, under our old Tariff. The imports into the Dominion, entered for home consumption, in 1878, under the old Tariff, amounted to \$91,199,577; and the importations under that head in 1881, strange to say, amounted to \$91,611,604, or very nearly the same amount as in 1878. Now, the duty collected in 1878, under the old Tariff, was \$12,795,693. In 1881, the duty collected was \$18,500,766, or nearly 50 per cent. more than in 1878, on the same quantity of goods. Now, will anybody tell me that the taxation of the country was not increased when we paid 50 per cent. more than we did in 1878—when we paid \$18,000,000 instead of \$12,000,000. It would be an insult to the people of this House and to the people of the country, for anybody to tell them that there was no increase. The Minister of Finance told us, the other day, that the amount of the surplus had been pretty large, but, at the same time, that it had been employed in such a way as to do away with the necessity of

borrowing money in Great Britain. Now, let us look at the surplus on Consolidated Fund, in 1881, it was \$4,132,743; in 1882, it was \$6,316,351; in 1883, it was \$7,064,492, making in those three years a surplus of over seventeen and a half millions. Will anybody tell me that this surplus could be taken out of the people's pockets and put into the Treasury of this country without increasing the taxation? It is quite impossible; the taxation of the people was increased to that extent exactly—no more, no less. If the Finance Minister could, in some way, have raised that amount of money without taking it from the pockets of the people, I would say that it was all right enough; but I do not think that he or the Government is entitled to a great deal of credit for taking that large amount of money out of the people's pockets, in order that they would not be obliged to go to England to borrow money to pay the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, it never was intended that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be built without the money being borrowed. It never was intended that the money should be taken out of the pockets of the people, year by year, to pay the principal of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why it would be a monstrous thing that this country should be called upon at the present time to pay the principal. It is quite right that the country should be taxed to pay the interest, and what might be a fair amount for sinking fund, to retire the capital amount within a reasonable time. I say that the people of the present generation should only be called on to pay the interest and a fair proportion of the principal, and that coming generations who would be benefited by this expenditure and by the Canadian Pacific Railway, should pay the principal, when they are called upon to do it. That is the proper way; and it is no answer to the people at the present time, when they say that they are taxed to this extent, that the Government want the money for the purpose of expending it on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the objects of the protective policy were, it was stated, to assist our struggling industries, to put money into the Treasury, and to reduce the importations from the United States. It has certainly put some money into the Treasury; it has not been any great advantage to the struggling industries of the country—at all events to the lumbering industry and to a number of others; and it has not had the effect of increasing importations from Great Britain, or reducing the importations from the United States. The importations, from Great Britain, in 1880, I see by the returns, were \$34,461,224; in 1883, they had increased to \$52,052,465, making a difference of \$17,591,241. In 1880, the importations from the United States were \$29,345,948; in 1883, the last year for which we have returns, we imported from the United States \$56,032,233, making a difference of \$26,585,255, or a difference of nearly \$9,000,000 in the increase of importations from the United States over the increase of importations from Great Britain. One word with reference to emigration. We were told the other day that the returns which had been given from the United States were unreliable. I do not know whether they are reliable or not, so far as the Upper Provinces are concerned, but I believe they are reliable with regard to Nova Scotia. By the United States Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that the number of emigrants from Ontario and Quebec was 53,449. From Nova Scotia, the number was 9,364. As I said before, I believe these returns are correct as regards Nova Scotia, and for this reason: All the people who go from Nova Scotia to the United States must go by steamer, and I know that their system is such, on board those steamers, that there cannot be much discrepancy between the number that actually go as given by the returns. As soon as an American steamer leaves the wharf, the clerk goes round among the passengers, taking down the name, the age, the sex, the place where they are from, the place to which they are going, whether they are going to return, or whether they

are going to remain in the United States. All these particulars are taken as to each passenger. I know this to be the case, because I have seen it myself; and they are very particular in every respect. On two or three occasions, I have myself looked over their lists, to see, for my own satisfaction, how they kept their returns and whether we could rely on them or not. I found that their system was so perfect that there could hardly be a mistake. I believe that the number that went out of Nova Scotia, according to the returns for the year ending on the 30th of June, 1883, was as nearly accurate as possible; and, strange to say, the percentage that left the Province to go to the United States is just about the same as the percentage which is given in the American returns as having left Ontario and Quebec. It appears to me, therefore, that this is rather a proof that the statement there given is as nearly correct as possible. Now, Sir, I have spoken for some time, and although I do not speak very often, I have no doubt the House will be glad to hear me say that I do not intend to trespass on their time very much longer. I was really in hopes that the hon. Finance Minister would have been able to close his speech without stating that hon. gentlemen on this side were only too glad to cry out "blue ruin, and were not able to see daylight, nothing but gloom and darkness everywhere." Well, Sir, we are not disposed to take a gloomy view of things; we hope to see the dawn of better times before a great while. There is no reason why hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, or the Liberal party of this country, should deery the country or feel a desire to say that the country is on the broad way to ruin. The leading men of both sides of politics are, I think, as nearly balanced as possible. I believe, that taking them man for man, the Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada hold just as much property, are just as much interested in the country and desire the prosperity of the country just as much, as the other party. I do not think there can be any question about that. There would be no reason for our attempting to deery the country, and I protest against that argument being used on the other side of the House. I am only speaking for myself, and, as I said in the early part of my speech, I desire to see every part of this Dominion obtain justice, and the Dominion at large in a condition of prosperity. Having said this much, I cannot close without pointing out to hon. gentlemen opposite that if we did make use of this opportunity in order to show that the country is not in a prosperous state, hon. gentlemen on the other side should be the last to complain. Why, Sir, in 1877 and 1878, if there was a \$5,000 failure in the country, if there was a prospect of a short crop, if the shipping business was dull, if the coal trade was not in a flourishing state, if people were going out of the country, hon. gentlemen opposite took advantage of the circumstance and proclaimed it from every platform in the country. Their papers were instructed to print these things in double-leaded type, and to scatter them broadcast from one end of this country to the other—for what purpose? Merely that they might occupy the treasury benches after getting the existing Government out. I say, therefore, that they ought to be the last to complain, if we tell the Government what we feel it our duty to tell them. It is a painful duty, but it is, nevertheless, a duty devolving upon us. It is our duty to point out to them where we think they have erred and pursued a mistaken policy, in order to induce them, if possible, to inaugurate a different system of taxation, and one that will do justice to individual Provinces as well as the Dominion at large. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to weary the House any longer, and I conclude with saying now that we find we are face to face with the same difficulties that confronted us in 1878. When the wheat crop has been at least a partial failure, when the shipping business is so dull that steamship com-

Mr. VAIL,

panies are hauling up their ships, when the lumber trade is in a worse condition, in my opinion, than it was in 1878, when bank stocks are depreciated in value, when cotton and sugar stocks are not worth more than 60 per cent. of their par value, when the West India trade is exceedingly dull, when people are going out of the country by thousands, all of which is largely due to the trade policy of the Government, coupled with their extravagant expenditure, we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we must speak with bated breath for fear that we shall be heard outside of this House. Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite told the people, in 1877 and 1878, if they succeeded to power they would not only keep the people in the country who were already here, but would bring back those who had left for want of employment. They told the people they would not only make the country prosperous, but they would ensure its continuance. I say they have not done so; and I tell them that the protective policy has been a failure in everything except in taking money out of the peoples' pockets, to build railways, which every person was led to suppose would be built with borrowed money.

Mr. STAIRS. Mr. Speaker, being a little interested in some of the remarks of my hon. friend from Digby, who has just sat down, I will, if the House will bear with me, take up a few moments in reply. He commenced his remarks this afternoon by enunciating a very good sentiment indeed. It was, that he desired to see all parts of this Dominion in a happy and prosperous condition. I am sure there is no member in this House who will not agree with him in that desire; and I think I may say that a very large majority of the people of this Dominion, being of that opinion, sent the present Government to power in 1878 and continued them in power in 1882. In my criticisms of what the hon. gentleman has enunciated, I may be a little disjointed, for I have not taken my notes very closely; but I must refer to a few things in his speech that need to be answered. He accused the hon. Finance Minister of saying that, under no circumstances, would the taxation be increased beyond 15 per cent. That, I presume, was prior to 1867. I would like to ask, Sir, who, in the first place, is to blame for the taxation having been increased beyond 15 per cent. I would like to ask if the rate of 15 per cent. was not continued down to 1873 or 1874. I would like to ask if, besides, it is not true that during that time the duties were taken off tea and coffee and if there was not remitted back to the people of Canada a very large portion of the taxation they were paying in 1867. And I would like to ask who is to blame, in the first instance, for the change in the rate of taxation? The Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. Did they not, during the time they were in power, increase the ordinary taxation of the Dominion from 15 to 17½? Did not they put back the taxes upon tea and coffee, thereby taking from the people a large proportion of the money which had been remitted to them by the Government of the right hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman says the people of Nova Scotia are a sea-faring people, and that they can find no market in Canada for their productions at all. I deny that statement altogether. Though they are, to a large extent, a sea-faring people, the hon. gentleman forgot to mention that Nova Scotia has a large manufacturing and mining population, as well, who are benefited to a great extent, as I shall show a little later, by the National Policy. The hon. gentleman was very wrong in belittling the agricultural population of Nova Scotia. Every one acquainted with census statistics knows that the agricultural population of every community, even of those that are generally accounted to be principally manufacturing ones, form a very large proportion of the whole population; and have not the agricultural population of Nova Scotia been benefited to a very large extent by the increased market

afforded them in the Province itself, through the increased mining and manufacturing operations carried on there. Is not this the principle way in which an agricultural population is benefited by a protective policy? Does any one suppose the agricultural population of the United States would at present go back on the protective policy which has been in force there for years? Is it not evident that, advantageous as it may be to have a market abroad, it is still better, in every respect, to have a market at home, so that the farmers may be able to sell to advantage at their own doors farm products which cannot properly be exported at all? Until the last few years, it was impossible to export cattle from the United States to England and the Continent, and is it not impossible to export many large classes of agricultural products because they would be damaged by being kept so long a time in transit. The hon. gentleman's statement is not true, that the people of Nova Scotia engaged in manufacturing and mining have no market in Canada? They have a very considerable and increasing market in the Upper Provinces of the Dominion for everything they have to sell, and the people of Nova Scotia will agree with me when I say that this market will continue to increase. The hon. gentleman made a very curious remark when he said Blue Books were very deceiving and were no guide as to the taxation the protective policy has brought upon our Province. I was rather surprised at this, because he referred to those very Blue Books for the figures he presented to this House, to show that the state of Nova Scotia, at the present time, was very bad indeed. I am sorry to say that I could not take down his figures very closely, but the principal thing, as far as I could judge, that he said, was that the present importations of Nova Scotia, the amount that is really used by that Province, exceeds \$16,000,000, of which a revenue of \$4,000,000 would be collected instead of \$1,800,000 as shown by the Trade Returns. I think the figures given in the Blue Books are not so deceiving, by any means, as those the hon. gentleman gave us. There is no doubt that his statements are fallacious, mere assertions, gross work in every respect. In showing the measure of taxation, as he attempted to show it, he made no allowance at all for the amount of \$3,000,000 imported yearly, of free goods, into Nova Scotia and the amount of duties that are paid in Nova Scotia for the other Provinces. In answer to his statement that the taxation of Nova Scotia now amounts to \$4,000,000, and his implication, therefore, that Nova Scotia is paying a very large proportion indeed towards the revenues of the Dominion, a much greater one than it receives in return, I have only to refer him to the words of the leader of the Opposition, which I will read to the House very briefly. During the Session of 1880, the hon. leader of the Opposition said:

"I have an interesting table of the results as to the collection and distribution of our revenue for the first ten years after Confederation."

A little further down he says:

"In Nova Scotia the receipts (that is the receipts for the first ten years after Confederation) were \$19,112,000, and the expenditure \$21,175,000, making the deficit \$2,063,000. We find, therefore, that Ontario and Quebec have to provide and have provided for the bulk of this vast undivided expenditure resulting from the Confederation of the various Provinces comprising the Dominion. It will be seen from these statistics that some of the smaller Provinces, heavy as their contributions are, are not yet adequate contributors to, on the contrary they are heavy drains on, the revenues of Canada; and it will be further seen that the bulk of the expenditure—I may say every shilling of the expenditure—on the North-West and on the Pacific Railway, is contributed by the Province from which I have the honour to come."

After this the hon. member for Digby need not charge against the Dominion of Canada that Nova Scotia is paying a very much larger proportion of the expenditure of the country than is proportionately its due. But perhaps this is not the whole of the matter. It

may be that the leader of the Opposition, in 1880 was not right or it may be that the hon. member for Digby is not right now. They can settle that question between themselves. My own opinion, and I believe it is that of the majority of the House, is that they are both entirely wrong. The hon. gentleman referred, in the course of his remarks, to something that had been said by Mr. Macpherson respecting the duty on flour and coal. I would say, in reply, that since then circumstances have changed. The great majority of the nations of the world have adopted a protective tariff. With the exception of Great Britain and perhaps one or two of the Australian Colonies, there is no really free trade country in existence to-day. With reference to the duty on flour and corn meal, it is clear these duties are in the interests of the whole Dominion. We can see that from the fact that England did not abolish the Corn Laws until it was proved beyond doubt it would be in the interests of the whole country to do so, and I think it was remarked by one hon. gentleman who spoke on the subject that even that measure was a protective one—that England abolished the Corn Laws in order that her manufacturing population might have cheap food. The hon. gentleman said that he might be told that Nova Scotia returned supporters of the present policy. I think that is a very good argument indeed against many of his criticisms of the policy of the present Government. But he went on to qualify it by saying that, in 1882, the people did not know of the elections, that they were taken entirely by surprise. This I deny altogether. I think, in Nova Scotia, as well as in the rest of the Dominion, the people were aware in the early part of 1882, that the elections were coming on, and when the members went back to Nova Scotia, they found that Province pretty well prepared for it, and I think I can prove to the satisfaction even of the hon. gentleman himself, that they were not taken by surprise by the result of the local elections in that year, in which the Liberal Conservative Government had the misfortune to be defeated. In 1878 the Province of Nova Scotia supported the Liberal Conservative party because they enunciated a National Policy, and in 1882 they reaffirmed it. There was no dissatisfaction. Does he mean to say to the members of this House that, if in Nova Scotia there had been that great dissatisfaction with the policy of the present Government, that he pretends exists, it would have been possible for this party to be supported by the majority they now have. And, with respect to the two elections that came on since, he appealed to myself, and said I knew very well why it was that those two elections were carried by the Liberal Conservative party. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only reason I can think of or give is, that I presume the electors in those counties wanted to support the Government of the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and I think it was a very good reason indeed. He said the amount of taxation was not known to the people and I presume he applied that to the people in the Maritime Provinces. If it is not known, whose fault is it? Whose business is it to tell the people of the different Provinces what is the burden they have to bear? Is it not the duty of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition? I think he is mistaken, however. I think they have, in the last four or five years, very ably put before the people of the different Provinces the amount of taxation which, they say, they are obliged to bear, both by their party leaders and by their press. But I disagree with him in the assertion that it is not known. I say that the people of Nova Scotia and the people of Canada know very well, indeed, what the amount of taxation is which they are labouring under, and they know it is not at all the extravagant sum which it is represented to be by the hon. member and his friends. I come now to his remarks upon the coal duties. He says the coal duty is no advantage to Nova Scotia. I tell him he had better go to some of the mining districts of Nova Scotia,

and say there that it is no advantage. If he thinks it is no advantage, I ask him why he does not move in this House to have it taken off. He quoted the letter, as I understood it, of Mr. J. R. Lithgow, in support of his contention that the National Policy had been no benefit to Nova Scotia, or to the coal trade especially. Does he not know very well that Mr. Lithgow, though a strong supporter of the Government, and a supporter, I believe, because he considers, on the whole, that the policy they enunciated is a very much better one, even for his own industry, than that of the hon. gentlemen opposite, was no supporter of the National Policy. What was it the hon. Mr. Lithgow always advocated and wished to have brought about? He wished a straight *ad valorem* Tariff on all imports into the Dominion, an *ad valorem* Tariff of 20 or 25 per cent., whatever might be necessary to yield sufficient revenue for the services of the country, on everything—coal, iron, raw material of every kind. He said this would be sufficient protection to all the industries here, and would be the fairest and most just tariff. He even went so far as to argue that this should include liquors and everything, all luxuries, all kinds of goods. I presume, when Mr. Lithgow found that this Tariff could not be adopted, he felt a little sore, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that Mr. Lithgow, even if in every detail he does not agree with the policy of the party in power, is very far from wishing to have the coal duties taken off. I can assure him that, in conversation not long ago with Mr. Lithgow, he expressed most strongly the opinion that it is better for the coal mines of Nova Scotia to keep the duty on at the present time, than to take it off and have it also removed in the United States. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, said cotton is the only industry benefitted in the Dominion by this Tariff. He is entirely mistaken in this. Woollen, sugar refining, iron, all the general manufacturing of the country has been benefitted to as great, or nearly as great, an extent as the cotton manufacture, and he referred to the sugar refinery in Halifax to prove it was the case. He said the shareholders had been taxed for several years to pay the interest on their investment. I was ashamed to hear the hon. gentleman, make that statement, which implied that it was because of the policy of the present Government that this sugar refinery had not prospered. I am sorry and ashamed to confess that it was entirely owing to mismanagement in the first two or three years of its existence that it did not pay very good dividends indeed to its shareholders. He spoke of the Canadian competition in the Lower Provinces, and he did me the honour to allude to an industry with which I am myself connected. I do not like to refer here to an industry with which I am personally connected, as I do not think it good taste to come here and get a little gratuitous advertising by talking about my own business in this House. But some of the assertions of the hon. member were very absurd indeed, and I will show one of them. Speaking of the trade in Halifax he said they had to get an increased duty to enable it to compete with other Canadian factories. Did any hon. gentleman ever hear a more ridiculous statement? Does not everyone here know that the thing is absurd? If the hon. gentleman knows so little about trade as that, he should not take up the time of the House in lecturing them upon the state of Nova Scotia or upon the state of any industry at all. He referred, however, when he resumed after dinner, to something which I think, perhaps, I had better notice. He mentioned a circular which had been issued by the Customs Department, giving the price at which certain kinds of cordage should be entered for duty. I have only, in reply to him on this question, to tell him the Act under which that circular was sent out, was one passed by hon. members opposite when they were in power. In the 31st clause, 10th chapter, of the Acts of 1877—I think this was

Mr. STAIRS.

when the hon. Mr. Burpee was Minister of Customs—it is provided:

"In all cases where any duty is imposed on any goods imported into Canada, *ad valorem*, or according to the value of such goods, such value shall be understood to be the fair market value thereof, in the principal markets of the country, whence the same were exported directly to Canada; and every appraiser and every collector, when acting as such, shall, by all reasonable ways and means in his power, ascertain the fair market value, as aforesaid, of any goods to be appraised by him, and estimate and appraise the value for duty of such goods, at the fair market value, as aforesaid."

And then, in the 32nd section, it goes on to show how that market value shall be arrived at:

"The fair market value for duty, of goods imported into Canada, shall be the fair market value of such goods in the usual and ordinary commercial acceptance of the term, at the usual and ordinary credit, and not the cash value of such goods, except in cases in which the article imported is, by universal usage, considered and known to be a cash article, and so *bond fide* paid for in all transactions in relation to such article; and all invoices representing cash value, except in the special cases hereinabove referred to, shall be subject to such additions as to the collector or appraiser of the port at which they are presented, may appear just and reasonable, to bring up the amount to the true and fair market value, as required by this section."

I think it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. member to criticise the action of the Customs Department in issuing that circular, because they were only carrying out the law which those hon. gentleman themselves had passed. Though the law has been amended to a slight extent since then, I believe that in the last edition of the Customs Act it is, in effect, entirely based on the clause I have just read to the House. As to his imputations against Confederation and Protection, I think I need not do more than to quote himself. He implies that a protective policy is a breach of faith with Nova Scotia when it entered Confederation. Now, let us see what the hon. member himself stated in 1867. After speaking somewhat of the condition of affairs in the Maritime Provinces, he said:

"While Canada, being peculiarly situated, requires a protective policy in every sense of the word."

Sir, I think the hon. member has no right to come here, at this period in our history, and claim that a protective policy was not expected in Nova Scotia in 1867. He exclaimed very grandly, indeed, against Confederation, and says he was always known to be opposed to it. I would like to ask him how it is that in the last Session of this Parliament he voted for a sum of \$5,000 to paint a picture of the founders of Confederation? To be consistent he ought to have, at least, voted against it. Now, I have some information to give him with reference to the effect of a protective policy on living in Nova Scotia, which, I think, will also be of interest to this House. In the Nova Scotia Legislature, the other day, Mr. Fraser, in the course of his remarks, said:

"He believed that Nova Scotia was a cheap country to live in, that it was, in fact, one of the cheapest countries in America, but what he meant to say was that it was not as cheap as it might be made, and that it was becoming dearer year by year."

The hon. Mr. LeBlanc also stated as follows:—

"He believed that Nova Scotia was the cheapest place on the globe to live in. He had travelled over the globe a good deal, and could assure the House that he knew what he was talking about. While in command of vessels, he had had occasion to buy ships' stores in many parts of the world, and knew that he could buy almost anything cheaper in Nova Scotia than anywhere else."

Now, Sir, you will see that in Nova Scotia the general opinion is that it is a cheap country to live in; a fact, however, which does not at all tally with the statement of the hon. member, in his criticism of the present policy of the Liberal Conservative party. He made a great many strictures on the past conduct and policy of the Minister of Railways and Minister of Finance. I need not make any reply to that, because those hon. gentlemen are well able to take care of themselves. I would say, however, that when they spoke, as he has quoted them, the circumstances were entirely different from those which were in force when they

advocated the protective policy which is now in operation. Trade in the United States had altogether changed; the interests of the Dominion required a change in the Tariff, and a large majority of the people in 1878 approved that policy, and returned the present Government to power, simply that they might carry it out. He said that when the Lower Provinces entered Confederation they were under a Tariff of 15 per cent. I have pointed out whose fault it was that the Tariff had to be raised. He said we were receiving only 80 cents per head of the amount thus raised. I presume his argument was, though he did not state it very clearly, that it was unfair that the Lower Provinces should only receive 80 cents per head, a sum based on the Census of 1867 and on the 15 per cent. Tariff then in force, when that Tariff has now been very much raised. I will ask every hon. gentleman in this House if the same argument does not apply to the larger Provinces of the Dominion as well as to the smaller ones? Do they not all receive a subsidy on the same basis—80 cents per head? Have not the smaller Provinces the same resources for local revenue that the larger ones have? I cannot at all see that there is any question between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the smaller Provinces, as to the matter of better terms. They all stand, with reference to the Dominion, upon exactly the same footing; because, if an increased revenue has been collected from these Provinces, there has also been a very much greater expenditure made for the benefit of all. He hopes that if Quebec gets better terms, the smaller Provinces will get better terms also. Of course, we all expect that. If there is any better terms to the larger ones, no doubt all the Provinces will be treated with equal justice. He also said, in his remarks, that the cotton industry was the only one that had been benefitted by the National Policy. He asserted it, but he did not prove it. There was nothing at all in his remarks that went to prove that the cotton industry was the only one benefitted by the National Policy. He made some remarks about the lumber industry, and the additional duty which those who are engaged in that industry have to pay upon the supplies they use, but he did not attempt to prove that this additional duty had any effect whatever upon the present depressed state of the lumber industry. I think, Sir, when he stated that a protective policy puts money into the Treasury without protecting manufactures—which he did in the latter part of his remarks—he said something that, in my opinion, was not very judicious, and was not true. A protective policy, pure and simple, does not produce revenue; to produce revenue, it must be a revenue and not a protective one, though, of course, you can have a revenue and protective Tariff combined. Take the case of the United States Tariff; is it not well known that the United States Tariff is a wonderful combination of these two principles, and that while it produces an enormous revenue there is also a very large protective principle in it? It is well known that just as soon as a Tariff commences to act as a protection for any particular industry or article, it at once ceases to produce a revenue. And, Sir, if the Tariff of the Dominion, at the present time, is producing a large amount of money, as it has during the last few years, that is not incidental to a protective Tariff. The money might have been collected without there being an element of protection in it at all; or you might have had a protective Tariff which would have produced no revenue at all. Suppose you wanted a protective Tariff, pure and simple, you would only have to put up the duties high enough to shut out goods altogether. With regard to the exodus to the United States, I may have to say something afterwards about it, but I desire to refer to it in this connection, as the hon. member for Digby has stated that he believes the entries of the people going from Nova Scotia into the United States are correct. I should like to ask him if he thinks, in

all cases when entries are made, the officials deduct those who return? I do not believe it. I have just as good a right to assert that, as the hon. gentleman has to make his statement. I do not think the returns of immigrants to the United States from Nova Scotia are at all correct. The hon. gentleman had a very curious way of proving his assertion. He said the percentage of those who left Nova Scotia was the same as those who left Ontario, and that proved that the Ontario returns were correct. I hold that it does not prove that the Ontario returns are correct, but it proves the Nova Scotia returns are incorrect. I am just as apt to be right as is the hon. gentleman. In concluding his remarks, the hon. gentleman said he saw no reason why the liberal party should deprecate the country. That is another very wise remark—something like the remark with which he commenced his speech. Is not that the very thing which hon. members on this side of the House have been trying to teach his party for the last four or five years; but now that he has taken it in hand, we may hope they will learn it. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) asked why should we deduct the surplus in calculating the taxation of the country. I think the reason is very simple indeed. The surplus revenue of the country is being spent in Canada, on public works, it is being spent on works chargeable to Capital, and is, in effect, nothing but a loan, in a certain sense, from the people of Canada to their capital account, and it is money which can be returned whenever the Government deems fit. It is quite possible for the Government to have, during two or three years, a large surplus, and then may come a time of deficits, and it is perfectly fair to take a balance between the two.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. STAIRS. I believe that policy was enunciated by the hon. gentleman himself, when he was Finance Minister.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. STAIRS. And I believe it is the correct one. The Government have, in my opinion, a perfect right to hold, that money spent on Capital account is not taxation, because whenever they please they can get it returned. I desire to offer one or two remarks on the general question of Confederation, and the effect that the protective policy has had on the Province of Nova Scotia. I think I may refer to this, because it cannot be said that in saying anything favourable to Confederation I am attempting to bolster up a cause of which I was an ardent supporter at the first. I should like to point out a few of the benefits which could not have been secured without Confederation. We have heard, during the last few years, in Nova Scotia and the lower Provinces, a great deal about the Fishery Award. We have heard it said by the Opposition press and by Opposition speakers in Nova Scotia, and probably in the other Maritime Provinces, that were it not for Confederation, those Provinces would have had the spending of that money. I hold, that even if they had had the spending of the money, it would not have been expended to so good advantage to the fishermen as if expended by the Dominion Government. But I believe another point can be made in favour of Confederation, and it is this: Would it have been possible, in the isolated condition in which Nova Scotia was in 1867, to have secured the clause in the Treaty of Washington which resulted in the Fishery Award, and would those Provinces have had sufficient interest to present the case in such a manner as to secure the award? I think it may reasonably be claimed that had the Provinces remained in the isolated condition they occupied in 1876, separated as they were, it would not have been possible to have secured the Fishery Award. Therefore, to that extent, at least, the fishermen of

the Maritime Provinces have been benefitted by Confederation, and that is one of the respects in which Confederation has actually benefitted the whole of the sea-faring Provinces of Canada. Furthermore, with respect to some arguments put forth against Confederation in Nova Scotia, during the last few years, I would like to point out that there are a large number of manufacturing industries prosecuted in Nova Scotia which could not have been prosecuted had it remained an independent Province. I will refer to a few of these. In the first place, there are a good many iron works in Nova Scotia. There are the large iron works of Londonderry, and although it has been said they are not prospering at the present day, it is not asserted that they are not prospering because of difficulties in the Tariff or any conditions in Nova Scotia or Canada which make it impossible to manufacture iron at a profit. The difficulty arose altogether from mismanagement at the inception of the enterprise, hundreds, thousands and even millions of dollars having been sunk at its inception, which remain largely unproductive; but it is firmly believed that the industry will yet get on its feet and flourish under the Tariff. Had it not been for Confederation, I am quite sure this large industry would not have been established in Nova Scotia. Iron and steel industries have been started in the neighbourhood of New Glasgow, in which between \$200,000 and \$300,000 of capital has been invested, and in which, when thoroughly in operation, from 260 to 300 men will be employed. There are glass works which could not have been started without Confederation, because the Nova Scotia market was too small to pay any large industry to carry on operations. I need only refer further to the cotton factories which are possible under Confederation, the sugar refineries, the increased prosperity in our machine shops, and indeed generally throughout the country. We have heard, Mr. Speaker, a great many ills charged against Confederation in Nova Scotia. Most of these are really due to the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty. That was a very serious matter, and it could not have been counterbalanced in any possible way except by the Confederation of the Provinces and the adoption of the National Policy, which Confederation eventually brought about. Have not the coal sales of Nova Scotia increased from about 600,000 tons, in 1878, to 1,200,000 tons, in 1883? I have not the figures, but speaking from memory, these quantities are about correct. Not only have the sales in the Province itself, produced by the stimulating effect of the National Policy on manufacturing industries, increased, but also throughout Quebec (and eventually throughout Ontario) there will be a very large amount sold. If Nova Scotia had continued in an isolated position as an independent Province after the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, and had not the National Policy been put in force in 1879, I feel sure the coal sales of Nova Scotia at the present day would have been very little, if any, larger than they were in 1878. In order to reply to some remarks which have fallen from hon. gentlemen opposite, I have taken the trouble to prepare some statistics, to ascertain how the increase in the population of Nova Scotia compares with the increase in the population of the New England States. The circumstances of those two countries are very much alike; the soil is somewhat alike, and they are, to a very large extent, engaged in the same occupations. The only thing is that in some of the New England States there are large manufacturing interests, and it is those which show an increase over Nova Scotia. The following are the increases of the six New England States, during the various decades, from 1840 to 1850, and in Nova Scotia, in the decades from 1839 to 1851.

Mr. STAIRS.

	1870 to 1880.	1860 to 1870.	1850 to 1860.	1840 to 1850.
Maine .....	3·5	-0·2	7·7	18·2
Vermont.....	0·5	4·9	0·3	7·5
Massachusetts.....	22·3	18·3	23·7	34·8
New Hampshire.....	9·0	-2·3	2·5	11·7
Rhode Island.....	27·2	24·4	18·3	26·5
Connecticut.....	15·8	16·8	24·0	19·6
Total average.....	14·8	11·4	14·9	22·0

Increase from 1840 to 1880, or 40 years, 79 per cent.

	1871 to 1881.	1861 to 1871.	1851 to 1861.	1839 to 1851.
Nova Scotia .....	13·6	17·2	19·82	63·0

Increase from 1839 to 1881, or 42 years, 160 per cent.

We find, Sir, from these figures, that in three of the New England States the increase has been less than in Nova Scotia during the corresponding periods, and in three others of these States it has been more. I find that the average increase in the six New England States, from 1840 to 1850, was 22 per cent., against 63 in Nova Scotia, from 1839 to 1850. From 1850 to 1860, it was 14·9, against 19·8 from 1851 to 1861, in Nova Scotia. From 1860 to 1870, it was 11·4, against 17·2, in Nova Scotia, for the corresponding period. From 1870 to 1880, it was 14·8, against 13·6 in Nova Scotia, or only 1 per cent. less in Nova Scotia than in the New England States, for the last decade. These figures show, I think, that the state affairs in Nova Scotia must have been, on the whole, very prosperous. They show that this Province—situated as it is, the most easterly of the Provinces of the Dominion, and almost the most easterly part of North America, and subject to that strong westward tendency which has characterized, not only the Dominion, but the United States, Europe, and all parts of the world—has been able to hold its own, as compared with the New England States, and I think it is something of which we may justly be proud. In conclusion, I wish to point out that those of the New England States in which the increase has been greater than Nova Scotia, are the very ones which have been benefitted to the greatest extent by a protective policy.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before this House goes into Committee on the Resolutions, I wish to offer two or three remarks. I have been thinking, during the discussion of this question this Session, and during a similar discussion last year, that if a stranger had been in the gallery and had heard the speeches, and especially those of the other side, he would have come to the conclusion that this great nation of ours was almost exclusively a nation of manufacturers; that we had here and there a few miners, a few engaged in lumbering, a few engaged in fishing, occasionally a farmer or two, a few professional men, and once in a while a poor labourer. As far as I can see, the whole object seems to be to prove that the manufacturing industry of the country is the one great industry, the only great source of revenue, the one great source of wealth to the country. Now, in order to set this matter on a proper basis, allow me to submit a comparison of our various branches of export—for that, I hold, is the true test—and let us see how they compare. During the past year, we exported of the produce of the mine, \$3,106,-

880; fisheries, \$8,856,920; products of the forest, \$26,648,441; of agricultural products, that is, animals and their products, cereals, and all other agricultural produce, \$50,680,437, while of manufactured goods we only exported \$4,114,424. Not only so, Mr. Speaker, but we have been led to suppose that these manufactures have been enormously increased, so that we could not only supply the wants of our population, but that they must have been a source of great increase to the revenue and of wealth to the people. Allow me to give a comparison of the export of manufactures in the year 1878, the year before the National Policy was first introduced, and the year 1883, which has just closed. In 1878, before we had the National Policy at all, and when our manufacturing industries were supposed to be languishing, and just on the point of expiring, we exported \$1,681,759, while last year, after four years of the working of the National Policy, they fell off to \$4,114,424, or a difference in favour of 1878 of \$267,335. That is a startling fact, but yet it is the natural result of the National Policy—it is just the result which the opponents of that policy predicted would flow from its introduction. The fact of the matter is, that just as soon as a nation introduces protection into its manufacturing and other industries, it cuts those manufactures off from all the markets of the world. The fact is that when you introduce the policy of protection, when you protect one industry you must protect them all in order to do them anything like justice, and the natural result is that the increased cost of production handicaps the manufacturers and places them at a disadvantage when competing with less highly protected countries. We see that natural result in the state in which our manufactures are to-day. Now, Sir, let me briefly draw the attention of the House to the way in which this protective policy affects the different classes of the community. A protective policy, to be just, ought to treat all classes alike. If it does not, if it favours one class at the expense of another, it is not just; and this is precisely what this precious National Policy of ours does. Let us see how it affects other classes. So far as the miner is concerned, it does not add anything to his wealth; in fact, it decreases it. I need not tell you that if you increase the price of every thing the miner has to buy without providing a better market for his produce, you have done him an injury financially; and this is exactly what the National Policy has done. It has increased not only the cost of the material he has to work with, but the price of the clothes he wears, and almost everything else he needs. So far has this been the case, that at the last Session of this House, the hon. Finance Minister was forced to bring in a policy of bonusing one class of miners in the Province. As regards the great national industry of our fisheries, the same rule holds good. Unless you can do something to increase the quantities or the price of the products of his toil, you injure the fisherman to that extent; still more do you injure him if you increase the price of everything he has to purchase, and this is exactly what the National Policy does. It does the same with regard to the lumberman. There is not a single article which enters into the lumber industry that this National Policy has not increased the price of. But we shall be told that it has increased the price of the lumberman's product, lumber and timber. What folly! Why, Sir, where is the market for our grain and lumber products to be found? Why, is it not in the United States and in Great Britain? And how can the taxation of all that the lumberman has to purchase increase the price of his products in these markets? Then so far as the farmer is concerned, the same thing holds good. I know that we were told that the National Policy was going to increase the profits of the farmer by securing a better price for everything he has to sell; but it has not had that result. On the other hand, it has had the result of increasing the price of everything the farmer has to buy.

We were told that it would diminish the imports into the country, and that that would benefit the farmer, because it would give him a home market. But, Sir, if there is one fact better established than another, it is that when any country has a surplus to sell, the price of that surplus in the market to which the country takes it, fixes the price of the portion left in the country; and let us see how the National Policy has benefitted the farmers in the matter of imports. In 1878, before we had the National Policy, we imported 3,755,400 bushels of wheat; in 1883, after four years' experience of the National Policy, our imports of wheat had risen to 4,954,174 bushels. In 1878, the country imported 275,359 bushels of barley, and in 1883 it imported only 16,465 bushels. We all know that we export an enormous quantity of barley, from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 bushels every year. We do import a few bushels. Before the National Policy was inaugurated, we imported this free, and when it was brought into the country, it was either for the speculation of carrying it through the country, in order to make money by selling it to the Americans again, or it was bought as damaged barley and our farmers had the benefit of it, and sold their own produce at a higher price, and so made a profit. Then, with regard to oats, in 1878 we imported 766,184 bushels, and in 1883 we imported 222,635 bushels. This is an article of which there is not generally a large import; but last year, I understand there was quite a failure in the oat crop in New Brunswick, and I think in Nova Scotia too, and the farmers there were forced to import pretty largely; and will any man tell me how these farmers were benefitted by having to pay a duty of 10 cents a bushel on what they imported. Another great source of profit to the farmers of the Dominion, at one time, was the production of wool. In 1878 we imported 4,608,825 lbs. In 1883 the importation of wool had risen to the enormous amount of 9,803,419 lbs. In 1878 we exported 2,479,484 lbs. of wool, and in 1883 our exports had fallen to 1,375,572 lbs. In the matter of wool, the National Policy is a positive injury to our farmers. In fact, the whole system, so far as wool is concerned, is a sort of mockery to the farmers of the Dominion. What did the Government do under pretence of protecting the farmer? They laid a duty on coarse wools, the wools that we do not want to import a single pound of, but want to export, and they made free the wool that was coming into the country to compete with ours; so that the farmers, instead of having the benefit of the home market, find that the competition of the foreign wool has more than doubled. The fact of the matter is, that the National Policy injures all classes in the country except the manufacturers, by raising the price of everything they have to buy. Now, Sir, allow me to draw your attention to a class of goods that the farmers have to buy very largely—that is, agricultural implements. Last year, the House is aware, the Tariff on agricultural implements was raised from 25 to 35 per cent. The great object of this, we were told, was to give our own manufacturers the benefit of the home market. Well, we find that in 1883 we imported 1,528 threshing machines and reapers, of which 134 were imported into Ontario, at a value of \$20,443, and 1,093 into Manitoba, at a value of \$141,516. Of ploughs and cultivators, we imported \$127,919 worth, of which \$12,280 worth were imported into Ontario, and \$108,367 worth into Manitoba. The total value of agricultural implements imported during the year amounted to \$581,959. We see how enormously the importation had increased even over the preceding year. We see, also, that this enormous increase to the tax on agricultural implements did not give our manufacturers even the control of our own market. In 1878 we imported mowing, reaping and threshing machines to the value of \$63,175; in 1882 the amount had risen to \$131,112; in 1883 to \$581,959. Why is it that in the face of this enormous Tariff our people have been forced to buy all these imple-

ments in a foreign market? The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), the other evening, said that there were three stages in the history of protection to manufacturers; the first was, when the manufacturers who engaged in business when the system was introduced made enormous profits; the second was, when others were induced by this prosperity to rush into the business; and the third stage was when the market was overdone, when there was no longer a market. But for the buyer, the consumer, the farmer, the great mass of the people, there is only one stage, and that is when they buy an inferior article at an enhanced price. But we are told competition is going to regulate all that. There cannot be a greater fallacy imagined. As the hon. member for Brant said the other evening, there are three stages, and the last is when the country will become full of manufactured goods and the market will be overcrowded. In this country we are very little over 4,000,000 consumers; our market is very limited, and just as soon as you inaugurate a protective policy you cut out the manufacturers from the other markets of the world, our own market becomes overstocked, and what is the result? Hon. gentlemen opposite say you will get cheaper goods. Do not imagine anything of the kind. That is just the time the rings come in, and combinations are formed to keep up prices. The banks, which furnish the money for producing these goods, must carry these manufactured goods for the producer. They dare not allow them to be thrown on the market, because the result would be loss, loss and ruin, not only to the manufacturer, but to the banks themselves. They are, therefore, obliged to carry the manufacturer over the hard times; and what is the result? The result is a stringency in the money market. The money that ought to be engaged in profitable pursuits is looked up in these heavy stocks, and the manufacturers must stop producing until these stocks have had time to become considerably reduced. That is the direct result, and with the exception, for a short time, in exceptional cases, the consumer never gets any benefit. But they will tell us these manufactured goods and these manufactured implements are as cheap now as they were before Protection was first introduced. Supposing that were the case, what has that to do with the question? The simple question is, how do these manufactured goods, which we are forced to buy, compare in price with the manufactured goods of other parts of the world, which we would be allowed to buy if it were not for this protective system. That is the thing we have to consider. We were told that it was the producer who was going to pay the Tariff on the articles we imported. There cannot be a greater fallacy than that. The fact of the matter is, no nation, no people, will import goods unless it needs them. If it needs them and lays on a tax, and then imports them, it is clear the people must pay the Tariff. How is it with the agricultural implements? The larger part, as I said before, have gone into the North-West; and here I wish to remark that not only have you to take the productions of our own factories at an enhanced price, but an inferior article at an enhanced price, because the moment you protect our manufacturers you destroy the stimulant to excellence in production. The manufacturer has no motive in improving his goods, because he knows the consumer is compelled to buy them at his own price. That has just been the result in this country, and the simple reason why we import these manufactured goods of other countries is, that our people have found that the best is the cheapest, even though they have to pay the duty on it. If there is any hon. gentleman opposite who thinks this is not the proper view, who still holds to the old foggy notions that the producer pays the duty, let him go into the North-West and settle on a farm. One of the first articles he will have to buy is a self-binding reaper, and let him, instead of buying it from the agent, go to Mr. McCormick's, in Chicago, where

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

these implements come from in the North West; let him pay say \$200 for one, and when he comes to the Custom House at the border let him, on the demand of the Custom House officer, pay over \$70 for Customs duties, and he will have a pretty strong sense that the consumer pays the duty. Then as far as the other articles are concerned, let him just examine into the matter of clothing; let any hon. gentleman go into our dry goods stores and tell the storekeeper he wishes to buy a suit of clothes and ask him what he would recommend; whether Scotch or Canadian tweed, and he will find, when the clothes are placed before him on the counter, that if he will take the matter of colour, quality and finish into account, the Canadian tweed is as dear as the Scotch. I know it from experience, because I have had to buy both tweeds myself. Yet we are told that the protective Tariff does not enhance the price of goods to the consumer. As far as ploughs and other articles are concerned, I have shown that an immense number are being imported into the country, notwithstanding the high Tariff. The same law prevails there that prevails in other cases, that the best is the cheapest, and our people are beginning to understand this. I have never been in the North-West, but I have been told by those who have been, that through the country, go almost where you will in the central portions of it, you can find stacks of Canadian ploughs piled up almost everywhere, and no settler in that country will buy a Canadian plough, unless he is a greenhorn; and, if he does, it is not very long before he is obliged to buy one of United States manufacture. In the part of the country I live in, in almost every farm, you will find the South Bend, Indiana, plough. The fact is, as I said before, that the same law holds good here—the Canadian maker, not having the stimulus of competition to stimulate him in producing a good article, has produced an inferior one, expecting that he will be able to compel the Canadian farmer to use his plough. There is one other matter that I wish just to touch on; that is, the plea that the National Policy helps the farmer, by laying a tax on the grain that comes into competition with him. I have shown that it has not had that effect. The only class of grain of which the import has decreased much under the National Policy is Indian corn. It seems that we must always have a certain quantity of that imported into the country for distilling purposes; but there was another industry that was rising up just at the time that Protection was introduced; that was the feeding of American corn to Canadian stock. I, as a Canadian farmer, and many others whom I knew, engaged in that. We found that we could import the American corn, in the winter of 1878-79, and I and my neighbours bought large quantities of it and fed it to stock, and sold the stock for the Old Country market, and we could get it laid down, ground, for \$1 per hundred; and we made beef of it, we fed it to cattle, they were exported to the Old Country, and we made a profit off it; and who will say that the country was not richer by the operation? The introduction of the National Policy completely put an end to that industry. After the Tariff was laid upon the corn, it was found impossible to feed it with a profit, and this last year we had the misfortune in the west to have our corn killed by the frost, and almost all of us had to buy less or more corn to feed our hogs; but, instead of getting it, ground, for \$1 a hundred, as in 1878-79, we had to pay from \$1.30 to \$1.35 a hundred for it, unground. On this matter of feeding corn to cattle for fattening purposes, to send them out of the country, allow me to ask what is it that enables the farmer in Great Britain to pay at least four times the rent that a farmer in America can pay for his land, and the enormous taxes they have to pay there besides? It is simply the fact that they have been wise enough to make Great Britain the feeding ground for the coarse grains of the world,

and the soil has, in consequence, been enriched to that extent that they are able to pay from three to four times the rent a farmer in this country can afford to pay. Now, Sir, as far as Protection affects the operatives, we were told, I think it was by the right hon. the Premier in that speech at Parkhill, or some other where, that has been quoted to-night, that, if Protection was inaugurated, the operative would get a fair day's wage for a fair day's work and would always be employed. Well, that prophecy has been falsified. For a time, when everything was flourishing, when the markets of the world were prosperous, when manufacturing was being carried on briskly, it is true that the operative had comparatively good times. But how is it now, when over-production has been brought about? It is only a month or two since two of the best friends of the Government, in the city of London, offered as a reason for deferring the collection of the taxes till next spring, that there were from 1,200 to 1,400 mechanics unemployed in that city. I believe they stated what was true, and I have means of knowing that the number has been increased since—that there are more unemployed now than there were then. And that is a solitary instance; it is the same all over the country, where manufacturing is being carried on. And what have they to live upon now? They can only fall back on their earnings in the times past, and how long will these last them? The result will be that they will have to engage in some other occupation, or to move off to some other country where they can get employment in their own line of business. Since this debate began, a great deal has been said about the unpatriotic course followed by the Opposition, because they refuse to state the condition of the country in a better light than in truth they could, and we have been told by speakers on the other side that it is our duty, as patriots, to do everything we can to keep up the credit and the character of the country. I admit it; but I question whether it is the part of any honest man to speak the thing that it is not true for the sake of bragging up the country. The statement has been made, and made confidently, that we have the best half of this continent, and great fault has been found with the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), because, sometime in his life, he ventured to question whether we had the best half of the continent or not; whether, even, the nation on the other side of the line had not a little better half than we had. I am not going to say which has the best half. I have not been over both halves of the continent, so as to be in a position to say which is the best. But it has struck me as strange, as we both started about the same time in the race, and both countries began to be populated at about the same time, how it is today that we stand in regard to population only as about one to eleven. How can we account for the fact, if we have the best half of the country, and started about the same time, and during the Revolution we know that we drained away an immense number of the best inhabitants of that country—I refer to the United Empire Loyalists—and yet, in this year of grace, 1884, how is it that we find that in this country we are only a little over 4,000,000, while that country has 55,000,000 of inhabitants? It cannot be blamed because of Reform rule. It cannot be said it is because our friends opposite have not had the management of the country. Why, if my memory serves me right, they have had the management of the country almost continuously, from the time it was a country until the present. There was a time when the Baldwin-LaFontaine Government held power, there was a time when the Hincks-Morin Government held power, but from 1854, when the right hon. gentleman who now controls the Government took office, thirty years ago, down to the present time, except one short period of two years, when the Macdonald-Sicote Government held office, and five years, when Mr. Mackenzie's Government held office, during those thirty

years, with these short interregnums, those hon. gentlemen opposite have had control of the country. I would like to know how they reconcile the position of the country with that fact. Now, Sir, before concluding, I wish just to state my firm conviction that it is a matter of impossibility, except in very exceptional cases, and for a very short time, for any one nation to tax another. We were told, when this policy was introduced, that we were going to tax the people of the United States. Well, Sir, the wise Disposer of all events has established a law that has made it, as I said before, except in certain exceptional cases, and for a short time, utterly impossible for one nation to tax another. Do you suppose that at the end of the great war on the other side, if the Americans could have taxed the people of Canada, they would not have compelled them to pay the greater portion of their debt? The fact of the matter is, the laws of trade are as inexorable as the laws of morals, or the laws of physics, and one of these laws is that we cannot tax the people of another country, that the people who impose the taxes are the people who have to pay the taxes. Sir, I believe that the world, sooner or later, will waken up to these facts; I believe, Sir, that the world is already waking up to them. On the other side, we see an agitation going on for a revenue Tariff, and for reducing their enormous duties, and it will not be long before that agitation reaches other countries. Sir, we may not live to see it, but I believe the time is not far distant when all the barriers to trade will be broken down, when every man will be allowed to do the best he can, to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. We know that so long as we maintain a cumbrous, clumsy policy of raising a revenue from Customs duties, so long as we maintain all along the border line an army of Customs officers, at an enormous expense, so long as we keep on with this policy which is trying to blind the people, by pretending that we are not taxing them, when we are picking their pockets all the time by Customs duties—so long as we continue that system, we will have to impose enormous taxes in order, not only to pay the expenses of the Government, but to support that large army of Customs officers in every town and city of the Dominion. Sir, I believe the time is not far distant when the people will be wiser, when they will adopt a more sensible policy. It may not be in our day, but I believe it will yet come when the expenses of the Government will be defrayed by money collected directly from the people by the tax collector; and not only that, Sir, but I believe it will be collected from the people in a way that is just—that a man will have to pay taxes in proportion to the property he owns and the income he possesses. It will be collected in such a way that the poor man, the labouring man, will not have to pay almost as much as the independently rich man, as he has to-day under our present system. It may be that it will be a good while before that system is inaugurated, but come it will. I have not lost hope in humanity, nor have I lost faith in Providence, and I believe the time is not far distant when these results will be accomplished, when the world will become wise enough to do away with this cumbrous and costly system that is robbing the poor, and will adopt a wiser fiscal policy.

Mr. TAYLOR. We listened this afternoon, for some two or three hours, to the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), trying to prove that the farmers of Canada were not satisfied with the National Policy. We have also listened to the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), trying to prove that the National Policy is not acceptable to the farmers of this country. Now, let us appeal to the farmers of this country, and see what they will say in respect to this National Policy. Let us go to the Ridings which those hon. gentlemen represent. We will ask Mr. John Clunas, farmer, and Justice of the Peace, at

South Dorchester, in the county of Elgin, and see what he will say in reply to the question: "Has the imposition of a duty upon corn proved beneficial to the farmers of this country?" and his reply is:

"That the effect is good on all kinds of coarse grain—on oats, rye, corn, peas and barley. These cereals are all better prices now."

In reply to the question as to whether the cost of agricultural implements has increased, he says:

"Think the cost has not increased. There is an increase of manufactories, which causes competition in reapers, mowers, seed drills, threshing machines, ploughs, and in fact all implements."

And in winding up he says:

"Taking things as a whole, on the protective Tariff since the National Policy came into operation, I think it has done good to the whole Dominion of Canada."

That is the testimony of a gentleman who, I have no doubt, is a warm supporter of the hon. member for West Elgin, from the fact that these questions were sent out by the members representing these counties to leading men in their Ridings asking for these answers. Again, we find that Mr. Cline, Reeve of South Dorchester, county of Elgin, answers this same question in this way:

"The price of oats had been greatly benefitted; rye about the same as before; corn and barley, very materially benefitted; peas not grown on account of the bugs."

I presume the bugs up in that country are the same as they are in this section, a small insect that bores a hole into the pea; and I fancy there are other kinds of bores besides the bugs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Humbugs.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, in reply to the question as to the cost of farm implements, he says:

"The cost of farm implements is about the same, but they are of better quality; reaper, mowers, drills, &c."

Then, in answer to another question, he says:

"There would have been hundreds of men driven from Canada in search of employment if it had not been for the Tariff, and, furthermore, it has been the means of bringing Canadians back from the United States, and a great many Americans as well."

Now, Sir, here is Mr. Wesley Bunting, farmer, Strathroy, county of Middlesex, and in reply to the first question he says, respecting taking the duty off corn:

"It would not, as it would make a slaughter market of Canada.  
 "It has raised the price of our peas from 80 cts. to \$1.12½ per bushel; oats have also risen from 25 to 40 cents per bushel.  
 "It does not pay to grow rye or corn, as this section is better adapted for wheat.  
 "The effect has raised wheat from 90 cts. to \$1.28; we do not grow spring wheat."

I could cite a great many others to the same effect.

An hon. MEMBER. Read something from the other side.

Mr. TAYLOR. I fancy these are all supporters of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The argument made by those hon. gentlemen goes to prove that the National Policy has had an injurious effect upon the prices of grain in this country. The hon. member for West Elgin said it did not help wheat, it did not help barley, it did not help oats, it did not help peas, or any of the farm products of the country. I am not surprised at hon. gentlemen opposite trying to divert attention from the real cause of the injury to part of the cereals raised in this country. I refer more particularly to barley. Barley is the grain principally exported from Canada. The hon. gentleman who spoke last, made the statement that we exported from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 bushels of barley; he is pretty nearly correct, so far as these figures go. I am one of those who believe in the law of cause and effect; that is, if you see a certain effect produced you can define the cause. We cannot charge the National Policy with having worked injuriously in regard to the price of barley;

Mr. TAYLOR.

but we can find out what was the cause. I make this statement, and I make it without fear of successful contradiction by hon. gentlemen opposite, that if anything has had a depressing effect on the price of barley it has been the action of the Ontario Government. Previous to 1882, the Brewers' and Maltsters' Association of the United States, which wields as much power as any other association across the lines, was in the habit of sending agents through the different States and to all the principal exporting points in Canada, to make enquiries as to the coming barley crop. After visiting all the grain markets, and looking over the country generally, they returned to the United States and compared notes, and on the result of their visit depended, to a certain extent, the price of barley for that season. In 1882, the paternal Government of Ontario stated to the Brewers' and Maltsters' Association: You need not come here, we will furnish you with all the information through our Bureau of Statistics. And what did that Bureau say? In the report for May, 1882, it announced that there were 248,617 acres sown with barley, that the probable yield, at 28 bushels to the acre, would be 2,545,059 bushels. But in November, just when the crop was commencing to move, the Bureau stated that the probable yield would be 24,284,407 bushels in Ontario. What was the effect of this report going over to the brewers and maltsters of the United States. They said: They have 24,000,000 bushels in Canada. They require about 6,000,000 for their own use and there will be 18,000,000 to come over here, twice as much as they ever sent before. We will lay back and let the crop come forward and will buy it when it arrives at Oswego and other ports on this side. That was the effect it had on the American brewers and maltsters. I was in the business and shipped to Oswego. The brewers would not readily buy, owing to what were considered confidential reports issued by the Ontario Government. How did the crop turn out? The quantity received in the United States, on which duty was paid, from all ports of the Dominion, in the shape of barley and malt, was 11,094,470 bushels. We malted in Canada, for brewing purposes, about 1,000,000 bushels. According to the Ontario Bureau of Statistics we require for seed 1,500,000 bushels. Then I have an estimate for feeding purposes, which I claim to be a liberal one, for every farmer knows that very little barley is fed, as the farmer preserves his seed and sells the balance. I put down, however, 2,500,000 bushels as the quantity fed. These quantities give a total of 16,094,470 bushels, leaving a deficit of 8,189,937 bushels, as compared with the quantity reported by the Ontario Bureau of Statistics. After having done that in 1882, one would imagine that in the interests of the farmers of Ontario, and in the interests of the Province at large, the Bureau would have acted more fairly in 1883. In its May report for 1883 it was stated that the crop would reach 20,613,496 bushels; but in their November report they announced that the crop would produce 18,620,360 bushels, or an average of 24.87 per acre. The Americans said: Canada will have 18,000,000 bushels; deduct from that the quantity which will be required by the Dominion, and there will be 12,000,000 exported. And I am prepared to say that when the returns come in on 1st June, it will be found that the Dominion will not have exported 6,000,000 instead of 12,000,000. What is the effect on the American market? The buyers say they will have more than last year; they wait till it arrives and then proceed to buy at low prices. The action of the Ontario Government, which I believe was done purposely, was taken with the object of depreciating values in the barley market and leading the people to believe that the National Policy worked injuriously against the barley interest; indeed I know the principal argument used in the Lennox election was that the National Policy had produced injurious effects on the barley trade. I see no reason why those figures should have

been published by the Ontario Government, except with the object of injuring the National Policy, and in doing that they have injured the farmers of Ontario and the country generally.

Mr. IRVINE. Of course, I may say at the outset, that I did not intend to take any part in this debate. I have not made any notes or looked at any Blue Books; but as a practical man, as a labouring man, as a man not in the habit of clothing my remarks in very nice language, I would beg to offer a few observations on what has been already said. It strikes me as a very remarkable circumstance, from my standpoint, that you can prove anything in the world from the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen have undertaken to prove that it will increase the exports, increase the imports, benefit the manufacturers, benefit the mechanics, the labourers and the farmers, and indeed every man in the country. It has astonished me very much that hon. gentlemen have tried to make it appear that, above all things, it has benefited the farmer. This has been especially the case with the lawyers and professional men, who understand the business of the farmer best. It surprised me very much to hear the statement read by the hon. gentleman who preceded me. When I hear such statements read, I wonder whether the man is sane or not who has given those answers. Any hon. member who stands up in this House, where men are supposed to be informed, and urges that we may be benefitted by a protective duty, even when we have a surplus to export, indulges in a wonderful stretch of imagination. I do not understand how that can be. Of course, he read a letter from a gentleman in some part of Canada, stating that the price of oats had been raised from 27 to 40 cents. If it did so at one time, it certainly has gone back on its good name, for I can tell him that at the present time, in New Brunswick, in my own part of the country, and I am not sure but it is nearly the same in Ontario, oats are selling to-day for 27 cents. Last year they sold for 50 cents a bushel, and I would ask why it is that the National Policy made them sell high last year and low this year? Surely, it must be a most marvellous policy. If the Finance Minister has devised a plan to have them high one year, why does he not keep them up to that pitch; he should give it another turn of the screw, in order to keep it up as high one year as another. I have had several letters this year from farmers, pointing out to me that oats have gone down from 50 to 27 cents, and imploring me to go to the Finance Minister and ask him to try to give his National Policy a little turn, so as to bring oats up to the old figure again. But how it benefits that crop, when we export nearly 4,000,000 bushels, and mostly to the United States, is something that, for the life of me I cannot conceive. I remember last year, the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B. (Mr. Mitchell) telling the House how this policy burdened the lumbermen, and saying that their axes, their chains, their oats, &c., were heavily taxed under that policy. I heard another hon. member, a lumberman, the member for Gloucester, reply to him, and he said that the National Policy had not oppressed the lumbermen—that it had put no more duty on pork than formerly. Then the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wigle) got up and said: "See how the farmer is benefitted by the duty on pork." So this wonderful policy has benefited the farmer by putting a duty on pork; it has benefited the lumberman by not putting a duty on pork; and, according to the hon. member for Northumberland, it burthened and oppressed the lumbermen. I may say, with regard to the farmers, that in my part of the country they are selling their hay for \$5 a ton. I cannot say whether the National Policy is to blame, but that is a very low price; and I wish the hon. gentleman would fix his policy so that it would increase the price of that article too. It is very well known how the farmers of this

country are treated, with reference to the price of wool. It is well known that we are manufacturing foreign wool, and that this policy, instead of being a blessing to the farmers of this country, is—I was going to say a curse, but perhaps that would be putting it too strong. However, I wish hon. gentlemen, if they wish to speak of the benefits of the National Policy, would talk about some other class than farmers. We are satisfied to live under our grinding taxation, and pay our share. We want to live in peace, we will help to build the railway, we will help the manufacturers of the country, but we do not wish to be stultified by our being told continually that this policy is doing something for us; for the fact is, that it is burdening us with taxes which we would wish to see removed.

Mr. MOFFAT. The hon. gentleman has not given us an opportunity of having the opinions of farmers in his own county other than himself, but I will read the opinion of a gentleman in the adjoining county of York, who says:

"I think it would not be in the interests of the farmers to admit any produce free, because it would tend to lower the price of their own products. It (the National Policy) has the effect of keeping oats higher, as the lumbermen do not use meal as much as formerly. I think I am in a position to know about a good many of the questions asked, and the information given is by comparing the prices as they are now, and even before. I have been in business about ten years as merchant and general dealer."

That, I think, is a sufficient answer to his statement. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) is evidently a gentleman of patience. He is quite willing to wait for future generations to have better times. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) has spoken of something which he evidently knows little about, when he asserts that the National Policy has acted against the lumber trade. We know that the price of lumber is low, that it has been low for some time, but what is the cause? The cause is over-speculation, and people attempting to do business which they do not control. That is the great cause of the depression in the lumber trade. I believe we are on the eve of a reaction and that the prospects are now better than they have been for years.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On Resolution 1 (page 653),

Mr. BOWELL moved that the item: "Fibre, vegetable, for manufacturing purposes," be struck out. He said: This leaves the article in the free list.

Motion agreed to.

On Resolution 2,

2. Resolved that it is expedient to provide that the following articles shall be subject to and charged with the rates of duty set opposite to each, respectively, from and after the date of the passage of this Resolution, viz:—

1. Acid, Acetic, twenty-five cents per Imperial gallon ..... 25 cts p. I. G.

Mr. BOWELL. Acetic acid is now charged 20 cents per gallon. It is proposed to increase it to 25 cents, for the reason that it is brought in very strong and afterwards diluted, and made into vinegar at a very cheap rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose to deal separately with acetic acid, brought in merely for manufacturing purposes?

Mr. BOWELL. No; we treat it all in the same way. We could not very well make the distinction, as the hon. gentleman will see.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I merely wanted to know if the point had been considered as to how it would affect those particular manufacturers who employ acetic acid.

Mr. BOWELL. The question was considered from various standpoints. One was to accept the standard vinegar

—No. 6; but it was found that this would necessitate the purchase of a large number of instruments and would require a great deal of instruction to be given to the Customs officers throughout the country, unless the article was transferred to the test of Inland Revenue officers and the ports restricted at which it could be imported, which would be a great disadvantage to the importers. It was thought better just to increase the duty on the article or whatever purpose imported.

2. Caplins, unfinished Leghorn hats, twenty per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 20 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. The duty on this article, of which Leghorn hats are made, has been 25 per cent. It is now reduced to 20 per cent., which gives a protection of 5 per cent. to the hat maker.

3. Celluloid, moulded into sizes for handles of knives and forks, not bored nor otherwise manufactured, ten per cent. *ad valorem* .... 10 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. This is a reduction. The article now pays 20 per cent.

4. Carpeting, matting and mats of hemp, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. This change is made merely from a customs standpoint. Matting of hemp has been imported and entered as jute, which pays 25 per cent., and we propose to make them both pay the same rate of duty.

Mr. VAIL. Does this apply to all kinds of carpeting?

Mr. BOWELL. Not at all; only to matting and mats of hemp. Woollen carpets pay a much higher duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is just possible that importers might raise a question about the punctuation.

Mr. BOWELL. I will call the attention of the Law Clerk to the matter, so as to have that guarded against. It will be seen, however, that the item reads "carpeting, matting, and mats of hemp."

5. Jeans and coutilles, when imported by corset makers, for use in their factories, twenty per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 20 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. This is a reduction. Under the Tariff at present, these articles are included in the 27½ per cent. list. It is thought inadvisable to keep them at so high a rate of duty when they are imported for corset making. It is a reduction of 7½ per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. The general public has to pay 27½ per cent., while those who import for this particular trade are to pay only 20 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman knows that on several occasions he has had to alter his Tariff in particulars in which he has one rate for an article when imported for one purpose, and another rate for the general public. He has found that importations have been made under the guise of the particular purpose, but have gone into general consumption; and he has found that the importations for the particular purpose have swollen abnormally. It is a very objectionable mode to have two rates of duty for the same article. What is the amount of duty that he expects to receive from this lower rate?

Mr. BOWELL. That will depend on the number of corsets manufactured in the country. I fully realize the objection made by the hon. gentleman. If it were possible to meet these cases, it would be better to have but one rate of duty; but it is impossible to pass any law to prevent men from making false entries. The sole object of this change is to enable the corset makers to manufacture the article in this country so as to compete with the imported article.

6. Printed or dyed cottons, not elsewhere specified, twenty-seven and a-half per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 27½ per cent.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. BOWELL. The jeans and coutilles, and the printed or dyed cottons, are all at present in the 27½ per cent. list. We have separated them, leaving the printed or dyed cottons, which are about to be manufactured at Magog, in that list, and have placed the jeans and coutilles at 20 per cent. when imported for the manufacture of corsets.

7. Cotton, 42 inches wide and over, when imported by manufacturers of enamelled cloth, for use in their factories, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 15 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. For what other purpose is this imported besides this?

Mr. BOWELL. For various other purposes. Goods of this width are not manufactured in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should it be imported at a lower rate if not manufactured in this country. The principle of production does not apply here. Why should two rates be struck?

Mr. BOWELL. For revenue; you have to consider both points in framing a Tariff.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give us an idea as to the quantity the hon. gentleman supposes will be imported of this particular article on which he proposes to alter the duty?

Mr. BOWELL. There is very little imported and the amount will depend upon the success of this new enterprise which is being started, I think, in the city of Kingston. The promoters of this new factory represented to the Government that, in order to place them in a better position, the duty upon 42 inch width cotton, when imported for the purpose of manufacturing enamelled cloth, should be lowered, so as to enable them to go on with their work. For that reason this change was made.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the *ad valorem* equivalent to the present specific and *ad valorem*?

Mr. BOWELL. I will take a note of it and answer the hon. gentleman on Concurrence.

8. Cotton Warp, No. 60 and finer, 15 per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 15 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. This is for the encouragement of manufacturers of hosiery. There is no warp manufactured in the country finer than 60.

9. Earthenware, decorated, printed or sponged, and all earthenware not elsewhere specified, thirty per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 30 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. This is not a change in the Tariff but only in the wording. A dispute arose in Montreal as to whether certain classes of earthenware were 20 or 30 per cent. The Department ruled this particular kind of ware as common "C C" ware and the importers contended it was not. They paid their duty under protest and entered an action to recover the difference between 20 and 30. The court decided our ruling was correct, and in order to prevent any difficulty, in the future we now propose to change the wording of the Tariff, so as to bring it within the decision of the court and the intention of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to make a brief statement with reference to the operation of the duty on these goods. I have more than once called the attention of the hon. gentleman to the practical operation of the Tariff upon the cheaper earthenware goods, in consequence of the imposition of duty on packages as well as on the goods themselves. I think the duty is an extremely objectionable one, for various reasons. In the first place, because it is laid at a lower rate *ad valorem* upon the highest class of china, than upon the lowest class of goods, the cheap earthenware. The class of goods which is used by the wealthier classes is admitted at a lower rate *ad valorem* than the class of crockery re-

quired by the poor, and the objection is still greater when you consider the inevitable incidence of the Tariff on the latter description. This article is very cheap in the market of production, but is, however, very bulky, and the cost of packing and of freight forms a large proportion of the laid down cost. And as the cost of packing and of freight is the same in bulk, it is less in proportion to the value for the higher priced than the lower priced goods. The practical operation of the Tariff is therefore to add an imposition of a very high rate upon an article which, under the circumstances of the country and the article itself, is one which has to bear an immense advance upon the cost of production before it reaches the people here. Now, as far as I can understand, the only works of any kind in this country are the works at St. Johns, of which it is said the gross product is somewhere from \$70,000 to \$80,000 a year, while our importation of white granite and "C. C." ware—this is "C. C." ware, the hon. gentleman says—for 1882, the entries for home consumption amounted to \$388,000 and those of china and porcelain to \$189,000, and for 1883 white granite, and "C. C." ware were entered to the amount of \$423,000 and of china and porcelain to the amount of \$175,000. The unreasonableness of making this charge of a duty upon the packages is shown in detail by considering what the result is to importers, and of course, necessarily to consumers, who have got to pay for the loss. A flour barrel, containing an average value of \$3 of these low classed goods, costs 35 cents in the market of the production of the article. The duty charged upon that is 10½ cents, so the cost to the importer of his barrel, irrespective of the contents, is 45½ cents; he sells it for 12½ cents, after unpacking; the loss therefore, in that particular, being 32½ cents. Then, with reference to boxes, the same observation generally applies; and, as to crates and hogsheads, their cost is about 17s. sterling, or \$4.12½. The duty charged is \$1.37½. So the cost of the crate or hogshead laid down is \$5.50, while, after being unpacked and repacked, they sell at \$1. The result is that the laying of the duty on these packages, in a case which, I believe, is almost exceptional, because other goods packed, as a rule, are not charged duty on the packages—

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLAKE. No; not on the packages.

Mr. BOWELL. Unless the package forms part of the value of the article it contains.

Mr. BLAKE. The practical result, I believe, is that this is almost the only class of goods in which the duty is laid upon the packages.

Mr. FARROW. In salt it is charged duty.

Mr. BLAKE. I say there may be some; I do not say all, exclusively, but almost all. And largely, in the neighbouring Republic, the duty has been taken off packages. Now I wish to give three or four examples of the practical operation of the duty, and of the other charges upon goods of this description, as indicating what the advance is to lay down these goods. I have before me an invoice of last year of eleven crates of white granite, the cost of the goods being £72 6s. 5d. The packages of these goods, which are a cheap class of goods, cost £9 7s., or an addition of 13 per cent. on the goods. The duty was £24 9s. 6d., which, though nominally 30 per cent. on the article, was really 33 per cent. on the article, the excess being occasioned by the duty being laid on the package. The inland cartage and freight, £5 8s. 9d., and £9 18s. 3d., and wharfage 8s. 8d., made 22 per cent. on the value of the article; and, adding cartage and breakage at 11s and £2 12s. 6d., a total is reached of £53 15s. 6d., or 74 per cent. of the value of the article, to lay it down in Montreal. I bring

that before the Committee, because I want to point out, by a practical example, what a very large sum necessarily, even irrespective of duty, is added from the character of this article, its fragility and its bulk, to the cost in the market of production; how much in advance the people of the country have to pay beyond the people who live in the country where it is produced; and I show you that, with the duty and with these various charges that are added, an addition is made, in this cheap class of goods, of no less than 74 per cent. to lay it down at Montreal. Now, for protective purposes, I do not believe any such duty is required. I want to make this clear to the Committee, that the duty, under the circumstances in which the Canadian manufacturer stands, is an enormous duty as a protective duty; while, as a mere revenue duty, we ought to have a lower rate, because, under any circumstances, even if you add no duty at all, this article is, from the necessities of the case, costing enormously more than it ought to cost to the people of the country. If you will allow me, I will compare the charges at the St. Johns factory, as given to me, for the same number of crates and for freight. Freight and package, St. Johns to Montreal, \$3.25 per crate, which for the eleven crates is \$35.75; cartage, \$2.75; or a total of \$38.50, being £7 14s., as against £50 3s. 8d. That is, £7 14s. represent the charges to bring the goods from the factory at St. Johns to Montreal, packing, freight, and cartage, while the same items and duty represent to the importer from England £50 3s. 8d., being a difference or advantage of £42 10s., which is 60 per cent. on the £72 6s. 5d., the cost of the article. So that, in this cheap article, by reason of the comparative cheapness of wood in this country and consequently the comparative cheapness of the packing, and by reason of the saving of the freight, and by reason of the duty, an advantage, from a protective point of view, is given of no less than 60 per cent. to the Canadian manufacturer. I do not suppose that it will be contended that 60 per cent. advantage is an adequate or reasonable advantage, that it is other than an exorbitant advantage. So I think I have established that, from a protective point of view, the duty is unnecessarily heavy, while I think it will be clear from the other circumstances that, from a revenue point of view, this is not an article which ought to be taxed so high, because, as I have said, it is an unequal tax in its practical bearing, and because, adding the other necessary charges incident to the importation, an enormous advance is made beyond the cost in the market of production. Then, by another invoice which I have, white granite (bests) costs £145 18s. 8d., the packages £22 19s., or 15 per cent. upon the goods; the inland charges and freight were £30 19s. 4d., or 21 per cent. advance; the duty £51 7s., which is 34 per cent. upon the goods, by reason of the duty being laid on the package; cartage, £1 7s.; breakage, £7 5s. 11d.; wharfage, £1 5s., so that we have a total of £115 3s. 3d., an advance, to lay down in Montreal, of over 80 per cent. Then, I have another invoice of twenty-five crates of white granite (thirds). The invoice price is £96 2s. 4d., packages £11 5s., or 22 per cent.; inland and ocean freight, £23 18s. 8d., or 24 per cent.; wharfage, £1 1s.; breakage, £4 16s. 1d.; duty £35 3s. 1d., or 37 per cent., making a total of £86 3s. 10d., or a cost to lay down of 90 per cent. advance, that being the very lowest class of goods. So with another invoice which I have, of the third quality of white granites, used by labourers, in which the invoice price is £218 6s. 2d.; packages, £41 14s. 10d., or 19 per cent.; inland charges and freight, £23 6s. 8d., and £42 6s., or 30 per cent.; duty, £76 2s., over 34 per cent.; freight and cartage to Toronto, for this is a Toronto invoice, £13 2s. 6d., making a total of £196 12s., or an advance of 90 per cent. upon the cost in the market of production. Now, Sir, I have said that not merely was the cost of the class of goods which are used by the masses and the poorest of the community enormous, but also that by the combined

operation of a lower rate of duty on the packages, and of the cost of packing and transport of this particular class of goods, the duty was practically a very unequal duty, in that the result was that the person who was wealthy enough to afford to buy his china or porcelain, instead of cheap crockery, bought it very much cheaper. I wish to elucidate that proposition by two practical examples of invoices of china. The first is an invoice of £111 3s. 6d., and the package was £5 7s. 6d., or under 5 per cent.; inland charges, £4 7s. 4d., and the freight, £6 14s. 5d., aggregating £11 1s. 9d., being about 10 per cent. of the value of the goods; cartage, 7s.; duty, £29 2s. 6d., being under 26½ per cent. of the value of the goods; breakage, £5 11s. 2d., the total being an advance of about 46 per cent., as against 80 to 90 per cent. in the cheaper goods. Now, here is an invoice of a hogshhead of china of a comparatively thick description, for farmers' use. The invoice was £24 4s. 6d.; the package, £1 5s., or 5 per cent.; inland charges, 19s. 8d.; freight, 18s. 4d., or 7½ per cent.; the breakage was £1 4s. 3d.; wharfage, 1s. 6d.; being a total of £4 8s. 9d.; duty, £6 7s. 5d., or 26½ per cent. The aggregate charge is £10 16s. 2d., being a cost to lay down of under 45 per cent. Now these are practical results of the present operation of the trade and of this duty, from which it is made quite clear that upon the value of the goods you charge—those which are required by the poorest of the people—a practical duty of from 33 to 37 per cent., say 35 per cent., while you charge on the china and porcelain that is used by the richer classes, something like 26½ per cent., and that in a class of goods, as I have pointed out, in which naturally there is an unequal incidence, in which naturally those who are poor and are obliged to buy the cheapest goods, are charged more than the rich, because the cost of the package and the cost of freight are so enormously disproportionate, with reference to the value in the one class and in the other class. We know the result is that the lay-down cost, when duty and charges are added, is twice as much per cent. upon the value of the earthenware and the lower grade of goods, as it is upon the higher goods, or nearly 90 per cent. in the one case and 45 or 46 per cent. in the other. It does seem to me that the duty on this class of goods calls for revision, that it ought to be lower, and that a duty of 20 per cent. instead of 30 per cent., or the omission of the duty on packages, and the making it 25 per cent., would be much more in accordance with the general view which is taken. I am not now suggesting—of course it would not be reasonable to propose to the Committee a reversal of the Tariff policy of the Government, with reference to some one article, that Tariff policy either considered with reference to revenue, or considered with reference to Protection. I am not engaged in any such attempt; I am simply endeavouring to point out, that in accordance with the general principles of this Tariff as to revenue, and in accordance with the general principles of this Tariff with reference to Protection, this particular duty, laid, as it is, both upon goods and upon packages, is an oppressive and exorbitant duty; that a duty which gives, when you combine with the duty the other advantages as to package and freight, of which I have spoken—an advantage of something like 60 per cent. to the Canadian manufacturer, is too high for protective purposes; and a duty which adds to the lay-down cost such an enormous sum as this does, and so increases the cost to the people of the country, is too high for revenue purposes, properly considered. A duty that operates so unequally as between the rich and the poor, the finer and the lower class of goods, is also a duty which is imperfect and which ought to be changed.

**Mr. BOWELL.** The case is not so bad as the hon. gentleman has made it. In the first place, he objects to the duty of 25 per cent. on china, and 30 per cent. on the "C.C." or common ware which is manufactured in this country.

**Mr. BLAKE.**

The principles of the Tariff apply to this particular article as to all others of a similar character. China is not manufactured in this country, nor is it likely to be; hence it is admitted at a lower duty for revenue purposes than that which is and can be manufactured, and has been for a number of years. That is the only reason, and it is a good reason, from a protective standpoint, and also in view of our object in maintaining in existence a number of manufacturing which have been built up and are still growing in the town of St. Johns, in the Province of Quebec. I understood the hon. gentleman to say there are but one or two factories in that town.

**Mr. BLAKE.** No; I said except the factories in that town.

**Mr. BOWELL.** It is a very important industry in that particular part of the Province, and there are, no doubt, at the present time, under this Tariff, some six or seven factories of various kinds, some of them engaged in the manufacture of the better classes of ware, that is, the "C.C." stone ware, or what is called the flint, or strong ware made from flint, down to the common Rockingham ware. Any attempt to reduce the Tariff at the present time, considering the fact that they have to import from other countries nearly every article out of which this common ware is made, would result in closing these establishments. The flint has to be imported from England and from France; the wood to which the hon. gentleman refers, and which he says is very cheap in this country and not so cheap in England, is not a material that is used in the manufacture.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I did not speak of wood for the packages.

**Mr. BOWELL.** Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. But when you consider the fact that nearly all the articles out of which this ware is manufactured are imported, you will understand that the manufacturers have not as high a protection as has been represented by the figures laid before us. Now, the question of packages is not a new one. When the hon. gentleman was assisting in the Government of this country, neither he nor the Finance Minister of that day thought it advisable to change the rate of duty which was imposed upon packages. It has remained on the Statute Book ever since Confederation, or nearly so. The hon. gentleman is not correct in stating that it applies to this particular article. The packages are chargeable in all cases separately, except where the package is a part and parcel of that which it contains. If the hon. gentleman turns to the Tariff Act, he will find that there is very little difference between the provisions of that clause as it stands upon the Statute Book and what has been the rule for the last ten or fifteen years. Whether the principle of imposing a duty on the packages be correct or not, is a matter which should properly come up when discussion takes place on the Customs Act and the Tariff Act proper. But the hon. gentleman forgot to state, when he made the assertion, that this common ware was sold to the people of this country, at a much higher rate than in the country of its production, that the packages are also made in a foreign country, and that the rate of duty imposed on those packages is not on the value here, but on the value of the article, in the market in which it is manufactured and sold. So that if a person in England purchases in Staffordshire, or wherever the ware may be made, and the packages be sent to any other part of the Kingdom, the consumer has to pay as if it was sent to this country, less, of course the duty. Hence the purchaser, except he goes to the factory, stands relatively, adding the duty and the difference between the freight on goods sent from Staffordshire to any part of the United Kingdom, and from Staffordshire to Canada, in the same position as the purchaser here. I do not sup-

pose hon. gentlemen opposite propose to annihilate the distance or that they could by any Tariff or means reduce the value of the article in that particular respect. We have found it necessary, as far as we could possibly do so, to take off the duty on almost every article which enters into the manufacture of this particular kind of ware; and notwithstanding that fact, and the high duty of 30 per cent. and the amount which is added by charging the duty on the packages, as in all other cases, this being not an exception, it is no more protection than that particular industry requires, if we desire to keep it in existence in this country. When we come to compare the prices of this particular kind of ware in Canada, it will be found to be as cheap if not cheaper than it was seven or eight years ago. You can go to the potteries in St. Johns and purchase a much better article than you could purchase a number of years ago, and obtain it equally as cheap, notwithstanding this duty; and with this protection, and with the policy that has been pursued, and with the production of this ware at a cheaper rate from better material—just as in proportion as we have a better class of article, and in proportion to the quantity produced in our factories, so in proportion will the article be lowered in price to the consumer. At the present time, consumers are not paying any more than they did a number of years ago, when there was a lower Tariff in operation and a much less quantity manufactured in the country.

Mr. HESSON. In regard to this trade I desire to offer a remark or two. The leader of the Opposition in his calculations, appeared to omit the fact that there was a rebate on all of this class of goods imported from the old country, running from 15 to 25 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. HESSON. Did you take that into account?

Mr. BLAKE. Why, of course, I did.

Mr. HESSON. The importation of these goods covers a certain amount of unfinished goods, articles of luxury, which come into this market, and are actually finished by hand. At one place, to my certain knowledge, which I visited, there was a large amount of unfinished ware, burnt, burnt and completely finished. That comes in in the same package.

Mr. BLAKE. That is china?

Mr. HESSON. It is finished to a considerable extent here. That should be taken into consideration, in calculations respecting the importation of common ware, and so reduce to some extent the expense. If it is the means of giving employment to our people, that fact should also be taken into consideration. The question of levying duty on the packages is one which has always, to my mind, been a difficult problem to solve, and if we could get rid of the package question entirely it would be in the interest of the whole country. I must say, however, that if it would conflict with the industries established under the National Policy, I believe the general wish of the public would be that the Minister acted properly in maintaining the duty on packages. If you consider the question of packages, it might be extended further, so as to cover flour barrels belonging to foreign importations, as such barrels are of foreign manufacture and compete with the industries of this country. But it is a question, of course, which has to be considered as a tax upon the people; and objection should not come from the leader of the Opposition, who appears rather to favour the reduction of taxation whether it affects the industries of the country or not. He does not appear to realize the fact that the wish of the people is to protect our various industries. The hon. gentleman has not come to learn that yet; I presume the people will teach him by-and-by. The hon. Minister should be maintained in the

position he occupies, as against that of the hon. gentleman, which was, that it was desirable, in the interest of the country to obtain cheap goods for a time, though in the end they might be dear. If we were paying, at the present time, a little more for common qualities of ware, it might be possible within two or three years to cheapen the price, as was the case with cotton goods, which hon. gentlemen said would be very much increased by the National Policy, as well as woollen goods. I think it is just possible, within two or three years, by a little encouragement of our own industries, to give employment to our people and obtain cheap goods as well. I hope the hon. Minister will pursue his policy in the interests of the industries established, and not take measures which might cripple them; it matters not in what Province of the Dominion they may be established.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in his meanderings, which it would be rather a difficult thing to do; and I suppose we are here to discuss the question of crockery and common ware. I was a little surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say this was an article of luxury. So far as my experience goes, it is an article of common use and necessity, and the particular ware to which the observations of the leader of the Opposition were directed, is in general use throughout the country. I think the Minister of Customs is mistaken in one statement, and that is that the particular kind of crockery in question is cheaper now than it was seven or eight years ago. That does not accord with my own experience. It is dearer, and decidedly dearer. With regard to the question of duty on packages, the hon. Minister failed to seize the point, or, at least, to reply to the position taken by the leader of the Opposition, with respect to this particular kind of package, used for the packing of this common ware. As the leader of the Opposition said, these packages are very costly in comparison to their contents, and for this reason the duty upon them becomes peculiarly oppressive. I am just as well aware as is the hon. Minister that, so far as the principle of imposing duty on packages is concerned, he and his colleagues are not responsible for it. That principle, which I consider a very faulty one, was established some time ago. But the contention of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and a perfectly reasonable one as I think, was that owing to the great cost of the packages used in packing this ware in connection with the duty itself, the enhancement of the price of something which goes into common use in this country is made very great. Nothing which the Minister of Customs said was, to my mind, at all a satisfactory or effective reply to the position taken by the leader of the Opposition, that the duty is excessive. It seems to me that this is carrying the principle of Protection to such an excess as to make it unreasonable. If, in order to establish and make prosperous an industry, we have to grant it a protection of 60 or 70 per cent., I think we had better turn our efforts in some other direction.

Mr. ORTON. Though I quite agree with the general ideas expressed by the Minister of Customs, in reference to the importance of protecting this particular industry, I also agree with the leader of the Opposition in the remarks he made as to the inconsistency which appears to exist in the mode in which duties are imposed, when we find such an excess of protection given to one class of industry and a very deficient protection given to another. The article of flour has been mentioned. The duty on flour is a specific duty of 50 cents per barrel. There is no duty on the package or barrel, and when we recollect that it requires four and a-half, or four and three-quarters bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour, if the Tariff were consistent, there would be at least 65 cents per barrel on flour. When we consider this fact in connection with the fact that our railways discriminate in favour of the American manufacturers of flour,

I think it would be proper to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that the millers of this country do not receive the protection which they should; and I say further, in connection with this question, that the Canadian farmer does not receive the protection which he should receive upon his wheat. During the six months ending the 31st December, the amount of flour imported into this country was 224,946 barrels, of the value of \$1,069,000—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to a point of order. We are discussing the question of crockery, not flour.

Mr. ORTON. I thought packages was the question.

Mr. BLAKE. Packages of crockery?

Mr. ORTON. I wish to discuss the duty on packages—the duty on barrels containing flour.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is, Mr. Chairman, is flour crockery.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a "flowery land" at any rate.

Mr. ORTON. I have no desire to be out of order, but if I understood the remarks of the leader of the Opposition, they pertained chiefly to the duties imposed on packages.

Mr. BLAKE. Packages of crockery.

Mr. ORTON. Then the hon. gentleman was very much out of order during the latter portion of his remarks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman is quite in order. The question before the Committee is certainly the question of packages—the duties on packages of crockery—and the argument on the other side was that there was an excessive duty on this particular article, as compared with others. My hon. friend behind me has followed up the same argument. He says the duties on crockery are excessive, and he compared it with the duty on the package in which flour is contained. He goes on to argue in the same line of argument as the leader of the Opposition, by comparing the duty on the packages on this article with the duty on the packages on another article.

Mr. ORTON. I wish to carry on the same argument that my hon. friend did, and to show, from the fact that no duty is imposed on the packages on which flour is contained, that the Government are hardly giving fair play to the milling industry, and further, to the wheat raising industry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. ORTON. I still maintain that the leader of the Opposition went on to argue, during his remarks, that the duty placed on packages was a great injustice to the consumers of cheap crockeryware, and his chief argument was with reference to the duty on packages. I am replying to that argument, and I maintain that it is still perfectly in order for me to point out the injustice that is done by this defect. All I wish to say, in conclusion, is that in six months we imported the large quantity of 224,000 barrels of flour, amounting to something like 1,000,000 bushels of wheat, and that it was not only an injustice to the milling industry, but the wheat producers of this country.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sorry, if I was out of order in attempting to speak before, but as the hon. gentleman tried to sit down three or four times, as I thought, and did not quite succeed, I must excuse myself to the House, on the ground that I was under a wrong impression. I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman through his argument, but I wish to allude to one suggestion he threw out, that the farmers are not sufficiently protected. I wish to enter my protest against that idea. I think if there is one class above another who are prosperous and doing well in this country,

Mr. ORTON,

it is the farmers; and coming, as I do, from a consuming part of the country—from a lumbering and fishing country—I wish to protest against what I imagined to be the drift of the hon. gentleman's remarks, in calling the attention of the House to the fact that the farmers were not, as he contended, sufficiently protected. I hope I did not understand my hon. friend to desire that a duty should be imposed on packages of flour.

Mr. ORTON. Yes; I desire to see a duty placed on every barrel brought into this country from a foreign country.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I must distinctly dissent from the proposition put forward by my hon. friend. Sir, there was only one justification for imposing a duty on bread-stuffs, which enter so largely into the consumption of this country, particularly the poorer classes. I admit that it is a policy which was forced upon us from necessity; it is a policy which went to build up our country, to protect us from being flooded by foreign manufactures. It was necessary to adopt a policy which would keep our people at home and protect our industries. But there is a limitation to it, and we should not run Protection to the ground; and I think the course suggested by my hon. friend should not be adopted, or any course that would put any addition on the duty which would weigh upon the poor man and the labourer—a duty which, I think myself, should never have been put on, if possible to avoid it I do not hesitate to express that opinion. I shall say no more on this point. The proposition is too ridiculous to require refutation, and, therefore, I think it is unnecessary to occupy the time of the House any longer about it. I am just going to make a remark on one or two points that struck me in relation to this debate. I entirely agree with the proposition put forward by the hon. member for West Durham, in reference to the packages of crockery. Everybody acquainted with the import trade of this country knows that the value of the packages in which this common ware is imported, bears no proportion to the value of the article imported. I can understand that there may be a certain class of packages which, after they are brought into this country, may be used for some other purpose after the contents are removed, so that they have an intrinsic value nearly equal to their original cost. In that case, a duty should be imposed on the packages. I think it is in such cases that the Minister of Customs should exercise his discretion in submitting a measure of this kind to Parliament. But every one knows that one of these crockery crates, after the crockery is removed, has comparatively no value, and becomes almost a nuisance to the importer. In that particular item, I think the Minister should revise the class of duties which are now under the consideration of the House. There is another point to which I wish to call the attention of the House, and to which I called attention last Session, when the Minister of Customs was consolidating and revising the Customs laws of this country. On that occasion I endeavoured to get some of the incongruities and inconsistencies in the Statute remedied; but I found that the hon. gentleman was quite impervious to the suggestions I made. He had made up his mind, and when he does it is pretty hard to change it except by necessity or force. I told him that I had been informed by a gentleman largely engaged in the crockery trade, in Montreal, that there were certain classes of packages in his trade, upon which he paid duty, and certain other classes upon which he did not pay duty. I will give the illustration now that I did then. I said that if you import a case of lamp burners and chimnies, you will have to pay duty upon the packages which contain the chimneys of the lamps, but the packages which contain the burners, which are metal, are not charged duty; and I pointed out that that being the case, a discrimination was made in favour of the hardware men and against the crockery men of the country. I think that ought to

be remedied. I feel that it is useless for us to attempt to get this Tariff materially altered. I do not want to see anything done that will interfere with the policy of protecting our industries; but I do not want to see that policy run into the ground, and our industries protected too much. Where there is discrimination against one trade, I desire to see that discrimination removed; and I think I have shown that discrimination does exist in regard to these packages. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, and I do not know that I would have said anything but for the suggestion of the hon. member for Centre Wellington, in favour of further taxing the food of the poor man.

**Mr. BLAKE.** The hon. Minister of Customs, in answering my observation, made use of one of the arguments frequently made use of when attacks are made on a Tariff of this description. He declared that goods were cheaper now than they were seven or eight years ago. My hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), denies the accuracy of that proposition. I have not myself enquired into the matter, and cannot raise my voice on one hand or the other; but this I will say, that the hon. gentleman can make no pretence of establishing the proposition, that any lowering in the price of these goods is due to this Tariff. I have given the amount of the importations in 1882 and 1883, which is an increasing amount—about five times as great as the amount of the domestic production. To state, under these circumstances, that the Tariff has caused a reduction in the price of the imported goods, at a time when every cent of the protection, direct and incidental, is necessary to keep the factory alive—that is, that the goods cannot be sold cheaper and live—is, it seems to me, absurd. An addition of 70 per cent. has been made in the duty on these goods, and the result has been to increase the price proportionately, unless by some occult manner, the cheaper the English goods become the higher the duty is raised. But the hon. gentleman says it is not so, because the English maker has to pay part of the cost. He says that he has to pay the cost of the package, too. He has to pay for a package, but there is the difference. In the first place, it is a package of a different description, and in the second place, it is worth more. He pays the cost of a wooden package in England—a barrel, a box, a crate, or a hogshoad, and that barrel box, or crate is worth more in England than here. In many cases, in England, it is returned to the factory and the loss is simply the return freight; or if not returned, it is saleable at a higher rate, and consequently the cost of the package does not, to anything like the extent to which it falls upon the consumer here, fall upon the consumer in England. Of course, if a crate cost 17s. and you pay \$1.35 duty, making that crate cost in Montreal \$5.50, and the importer is to realize only \$1 on it, that balance of \$4.50, with profits upon it, must be borne by the consumer here. But if, on the other hand, the English retail merchant, purchasing from Staffordshire, is able to send his crate back to be filled again, or is able to sell it at something approximating the original cost, this item becomes an insignificant one. Here, however, the importer does not realize even the duty he pays, so that the carriage and prime cost is all loss to the consumer, besides the duty. No effort has been made to refute the proposition that the duty imposed is grossly unequal, as between the rich and the poor, and inequality occurs in a case in which the necessary incidents of the trade are such as to produce an inequality even if there was no duty; so that such inequality is exaggerated instead of being mitigated by the incidence of the Tariff. Nor is any proof brought forward in contradiction to the proposition I have advanced, viz., that for protective purposes, having regard to the advantages the Canadian manufacturer has in the saving of the freight on this bulky article, in the cheaper packing of an

article of this description in this wooden country of ours—the advantage he obtains from the duty, freight and package is so enormous that it amounts to a protection of about 60 per cent. on the lowest class of goods. As to the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson), who informs us that these articles are luxuries; I always supposed they were necessities, and I invite the hon. gentleman to discuss that subject with his constituents, of whatever rank in wealth, when next he visits Perth, and ascertain from them whether they do not regard the crockery they use in their drawing room, dining room and chambers as rather a necessity than a luxury. The hon. gentleman says we must look to other considerations. Why, he says, there is a large quantity of this crockery that comes out to this country, and it is actually decorated here; crests are put upon it and it is hand-painted; and, he says, the poor man who is charged this enormous additional advance on the cost of his goods is to be consoled and gratified by the reflection that the wealthy man who has his crest put upon his goods, has it done in Canada.

**Mr. McLELAN.** I have seldom heard a stronger argument, whether in this House or elsewhere, in favour of the protection and encouragement of the manufacture of goods in this country, than that delivered by the hon. gentleman. He has proved to us, by figures, that it is impossible for a poor man ever to obtain cheap crockery in this country unless it be manufactured here.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Not at all.

**Mr. McLELAN.** Unless we can encourage the manufacturers in this country, until they are masters of their business. The hon. gentleman has shown by figures that there is an enormous percentage of cost upon this article, on account of the packages; that the prices charged by English manufacturers for packages are far in excess of what they charge in the case of any other description of goods sent to this country. He has shown that the cost of the crate is a large percentage, that the wharfage, and the freight, and the breakage of the articles forms another large percentage, and adding all these together, he gets about 60 per cent. additional cost, inclusive of the duty. This condition of things will always exist. You can never get clear of that percentage of cost as long as you are importing the article from England. The hon. gentleman has told us: You can get it from the St. Johns manufactory; that that which has cost £9 or £10 sterling, in package, from England, will only cost \$2 or \$3 in St. Johns, and the freight and charges in Canada are comparatively trifling, so that if we want cheap crockery for the poor man, we must have it manufactured in this country. The hon. gentleman said that the Minister of Customs declared manufacturers would not be able to live if we reduced the duty. We are not changing the duty. Everyone who has had experience in manufacturing knows that, for the first year or two, the operations are not very successful.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** How long is this factory established?

**Mr. McLELAN.** For two or three years. If the manufacturer be able to maintain himself for the first two or three years, he becomes gradually master of his business and gradually manufactures cheaper, so that, by giving this protection for a few years, we shall, in the end, obtain for the poor man cheap crockery. There was a cotton factory started in the city of Halifax twelve months ago. One of the directors told me that when they first ran, it cost them for the first few months about 40 cents per pound to manufacture a pound of it into cloth, but they had at last become masters of the position, to such an extent that they were now able to manufacture that same pound of cotton wool for 6½ cents. From this, it will be seen that if you uphold the manufacturers for a time, you will get the cheapest

crockery; whereas if you do not, we will never get rid of these 50 or 60 per cent. extra charges.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is certainly ten or twelve years since these factories are in operation. I have seen very good ware on exhibition in several parts of the country, certainly eight or nine years ago; and as for the question of time, our American friends have been trying for a hundred years to protect their iron industry, and their present Tariff averages 60 to 80 per cent. on this industry. So that, if this be an indication of the time it will take to raise these infant industries to a self-supporting condition, the poor man will have a long time to wait for his cheap crockery. We are constantly told that things are cheaper. Perhaps they are; perhaps they are not. I notice the hon. Finance Minister was exceedingly shy about giving any facts or proofs of the cheapness he alleged to exist, nor has the hon. gentleman opposite condescended to give any proof of that statement. But, Sir, what is the fact? We know this, that the whole nature of manufactures all the world over is and ought to be to go on making things cheaper, by reason of the various inventions that are coming to maturity from time to time. We ought to get manufactured goods cheaper all the time, and we would have them cheaper in this country if it was not for this Tariff and for the excessive misgovernment which we have in this country now.

Mr. HESSON. I would like to correct a misapprehension conveyed by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake), when he said I would have to meet my constituents on the question of this crockery imported into this country being a luxury. Now, I consider that a certain quality of it is a necessity in every household, and my remarks did not imply that it was a luxury; but I spoke of that quality which is brought into the country which the hon. gentleman spoke of as a common crockery, unfinished, which is finished in this country by hand painting, upon which you could have the family crest—if you were distinguished by such a mark—and I said that was a luxury. I said nothing about the cost to the country; but, after all this, I come back to the actual facts of the case, and what are they? A package costs about £1 sterling in the old country. On an average, it contains about 100 dozen of cups and saucers. The duty on that would be about \$1.25 or \$1.50, at the outside, which would be about 1½ cents per dozen. I have been in business for thirty odd years myself, and I have yet to learn that the first head of a household has had occasion to complain because of the extensive cost of the necessities, as my hon. friend would say, of crockery ware. Now, the finer wares may be costly. They will be costly, because there is no competition, and there is not likely to be, in the manufacture of these in this country; but I still hold that the principles which govern the legislation of the country to-day, and the Tariff, and the policy of the Government, is that of Protection; and, viewing it in that interest, I cannot see any occasion for the Minister consenting to alter this policy, whereas it may have an influence, or possibly produce the disaster that would arise by any change of that policy, to certain industries that are established, with that principle in force at present. I feel that that is a matter of very vital importance to the men who have invested their capital in it, and the tax does not press very heavily even on the poorest family, because they do not buy a great many dozens of crockery in the year, for the housewives of Canada are prudent, and try to save their crockery, as they do other things which are common necessities of a household. It is not a very extravagant tax, and my remarks were intended to show that that class of goods covered the unfinished ware brought into this country and finished here, and that gave employment to the people of Canada, and that finish was paid for by those who could afford to pay for it.

Mr. McLELLAN.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the observation of the Minister of Marine, it seems to amount to this: that the greater the natural advantages of manufacture in this country are, the greater the natural advantages that the domestic manufacturer has over the foreign producer of the goods, the more circumstances favour him, the more it is essential that you should add to these advantages by a high Customs wall besides. I pointed out advantages which circumstances gave the manufacturer, that have been alluded to in the course of the debate on the Tariff, and that were alluded to in the course of a discussion the other day, when a quotation was made from a speech of an hon. gentleman, who pointed out very properly that a 15 per cent. Tariff did not mean a 15 per cent. Tariff for protective purposes, but a 20 per cent. Tariff, because there was 5 per cent. on the average to be added for freight. Well, 5 per cent. on the average, of course, means less than 5 per cent. on some goods and more than 5 per cent. on other goods. I pointed out that there was an enormous proportion of these goods, and I gave the freight which gives that advantage to the domestic manufacturer. I pointed out also that, this being a wooden country, he had another advantage in reference to his packages; I pointed out the combined effect of these two advantages, and I argued that this ought to be taken into account when you deal with this Tariff from a protective point of view—that you must take the natural advantage he has and the artificial advantage you propose to add to it, and I pointed out that this was equal to an advance of 60 per cent., and I declared, and I repeat, that that is an exorbitant advantage.

Mr. ORTON. I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) to pass without notice. He charged me with making ridiculous remarks in this House, and with being the enemy of the poor man. Although I shall not characterize his remarks on this and other occasions as being ridiculous, because it is unparliamentary to do so, I may say, in regard to who is and who is not the friend of the poor man, I think the man is a friend who speaks in defence of those who consume the crockery ware which is imported, and which we are discussing to-night, which produces the wealth which sets in operation our manufactories, and gives employment to the labouring man and the poor man, who are the consumers of the fish, even which the fishermen of the Lower Provinces catch and send into our country. Where can you find a better friend of the poor man than the man who tries to advocate the interest of the farmers of this country?

Mr. FARROW. I think myself that there is a great deal of truth on both sides of the question. I am glad it has brought out one confession from the opposite party. They have a great deal to say about the poor man's interests just now. They had not always that story to tell. When they taxed the tea that was worth \$1 a pound, at the same rate as they taxed the 25 cent tea, then where were the poor man's interests? I suppose, if they got into power to-morrow, or ten years from now, or, as my friend here said, last year, fifty-four years from now, they will be able to redeem their ways, and will follow, after another plan, that they will give the poor man some advantage. I think I know a little about this crockery business, too, and I agree with the hon. member for West Durham to a certain extent. I really do think that this duty is pressing a little on the poor man, and I must confess, from my own knowledge, having begun to sell crockery about the year 1858, and continued for a good many years looking after it, that I did happen to go into a store the other day—I am pretty well acquainted with most kinds of store goods—and I really thought, and I still think, that there is a little advanced price on this kind of ware that the hon. member for West Durham is speaking about. There is another thing strikes me, which I would like to mention. Is this country adapted for the production of this

kind of ware? It is not a luxury; it is in the poor man's house, and in the rich man's house also. The hon. Minister of Customs said that certain articles that entered into the manufacture of this ware had to be imported from the old country, and ground up and prepared in order to manufacture it. I did not know that before; therefore, I came to the conclusion that this country was not specially adapted for the production of this kind of ware. If we think it is pressing upon the poor man rather more than upon the rich man, let us do as the judges do in the Courts of Justice—give them the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to make one observation in reply to the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) who is very smiling this evening, and whom I always listen to with great satisfaction—at a distance—and feel that he occupies, perhaps, a good deal of time in the House, quite as much as I do myself. I would say this in reply to the hon. gentleman's remark about the people of our section of the country being indebted to the far west for the consumption of their fish. Sir, a very small percentage of the fish we catch in our Province finds a market in the hon. gentleman's county, and where they consume one barrel of our fish we consume, at least, ten barrels of their flour. When I felt it my duty to call attention to the fact that, in addition to the heavy duty already imposed on the article of flour, and suggesting that the duty put on these packages in which flour is carried is adding to the duty upon the farmer's bread, I think I was quite in my place in doing so, and I was only performing that duty which I am called upon to perform as one of their representatives. Look at the relative position of the two sections of the country. My hon. friend's county is a farming community. He is the mouthpiece of the farmers of this country, and he attends to their interests pretty well. I am not finding fault with him, from his standpoint, for attempting to increase the duties on agricultural products, but I do find fault with his attempt to increase the duty on packages. I call that rubbing it in rather too stiff, and running Protection into the ground. In my county, one of the first counties in the Province from which I come, we have no Protection of any kind; while my hon. friend's constituency is largely composed of farmers, who have protection upon almost everything they raise out of the ground. And if I stand here to-day as a protectionist, representing a county that gets no benefit from Protection, I do it upon the broad principle that it is not alone for the county that I have the honour to represent that I sit here as a legislator. While looking out for their interests when I can do so, I come here to legislate for the country at large, for the Dominion of Canada, to adopt and sustain a policy that will protect Canada against foreign importations that would make a slaughter market of our country; and it is because of that apparent inconsistency in the course I pursue and in the votes I give, in sustaining a protective policy that does not specially benefit my locality, that I feel it necessary to make this explanation. Sir, I hold that while we have a duty to our respective counties, we have a greater duty to our country. And standing in the position of a representative of a county which gets no protective advantages, which has its pork taxed, its flour taxed, and which, from the standpoint of my hon. friend would also have its barrels taxed—I say it will be inconsistent for this House to run Protection into the ground by adopting the policy which my hon. friend advocates. After the pledge I got the other day—though, I admit, it is a very doubtful one—from the hon. Finance Minister, who, I am sorry to see, is not in the House, in reference to corn meal, I do not intend to say anything further about it; but I do wish to say, in the presence of the Ministry, that in that article of corn meal, which enters largely into the consumption of the labouring classes, the fishermen and lumbermen of our country, I do hope that those hon. gentle-

men will not be so inconsistent as to continue the duty on corn meal, an article that cannot be grown, and is not generally produced in our country.

Mr. ORTON. It can be grown.

Mr. MITCHELL. If it can be, it is not grown, and it cannot be grown to advantage. The remark is very *apropos* in illustrating the observations of my hon. friend, who always speaks common sense when he gets up. There are certain industries that cannot be profitably pursued in this country, and the growth of corn is one of them; just as in many manufactures the business cannot be profitably pursued. In regard to Protection, my view is this: That everything that can be profitably prosecuted in this country in which there is an inherent profit, shall be afforded a reasonable protection; while everything that cannot be so produced by reasonable protection, I would oppose a protective duty upon it, at the expense of certain classes in the country. And I hold that in the article of corn meal, which is an article largely consumed by the poorer classes of the community, the Government of the day ought to take off that duty, even although it would bring corn meal into competition with the coarser grains which are grown by our farmers at large. The farmers are pretty well protected in this country; they get a great deal of consideration from this House, and the men who live down by the sea—and I am glad to find my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Stairs) endorsed the sentiments which I have uttered—the men who live down by the sea, who have no Protection, should have some consideration at the hands of gentlemen who direct the affairs of this country. I am glad I have had an opportunity of stating these views thus publicly, notwithstanding I may differ from my hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), whose good opinion I esteem so highly.

Mr. MILLS. It is pretty obvious that some heterodox views are creeping into the political orthodox economy of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have had remarks from several hon. gentlemen on that side of the House on this subject, and amongst others the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, complaining of the tax upon various articles, and asking that these taxes should be removed, in the interests of the poorer classes of our population. Now, Sir, those were not the views that were put forward by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches during the past five or six years. They told us the taxes were paid by the foreigners; that the tax on the corn meal, the tax on the flour—

Mr. MITCHELL. I never told you that.

Mr. MILLS—and the tax on all those various articles was borne by the foreigners, by those who produced those articles, and from whom the people of this country purchased them. Why, Sir, we have been told, over and over again, that the people across the border were imposing taxes upon the products of this country sent across the line, and that we ought to imitate them and impose taxes on their products, and collect taxes from them as they had collected taxes from us. Now, Sir, one hon. gentleman has told us about the inequality of the tax on tea—that the cheap tea and the dear tea were taxed alike; that, in fact the poorer classes of the population, whom he assumed, used the very cheap article of tea, paid an undue amount of tax. Well, Sir, I supposed from the line of argument adopted by those hon. gentlemen, that it was the Chinese who paid the tax, and that it was a matter of no consequence to us, whether we impose a tax upon Chinamen who send abroad a cheap article of tea, or a tax upon Chinamen who send abroad a dear article of tea. What difference does it make to us? Why not remove these taxes, if they are not borne by our population. If what the hon. Minister of Customs has told us this evening, that the more taxes that are imposed on these foreign productions the cheaper these goods

are to the consumer, be true, why should not all these taxes be removed, and why should not the Minister impose additional taxes upon these foreign people, who are so foolish as to send to this country their goods to our market?

Mr. ORTON. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Customs has told us this evening that these goods are cheaper than they ever were before. An hon. gentleman has said he does not want to see this country made a slaughter market. We were told some time ago that it was being made a slaughter market.

An hon. MEMBER. Order, order.

Mr. MILLS. I am discussing the observations made by the Minister and hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken. They have told us that the tax on these packages was removed, and I am calling attention to the fact that the taxes on these packages they have hitherto told us were borne by the foreigners from whom we purchased the goods—

Mr. BOWELL. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman told us this evening that you could get these goods cheaper to-day than ever before. How can you get them cheaper unless some person pays these taxes? How is it possible that the price of goods can be lowered to the consumer unless some other party than the consumer pays the taxes? That is the view the hon. Minister has been putting forward, the view which hon. gentlemen opposite have all along put forward, although they took precious good care, when a reshipment took place, that the taxes should be remitted to the party whom they say never pays them.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). This question will soon right itself. I happen to have some little knowledge as to the preparation of the ordinary crockery which has been spoken of to-night. I am quite satisfied, and I can assert it as a fact, that in our North-West Territory we have thousands of square acres of finer clay than that which we now import from Glasgow and New Jersey for manufacturing purposes in Quebec and elsewhere. I know this, because I am practically in the business, and have men engaged at St. Johns and Quebec. I saw thousands of acres of better material on the Saskatchewan and Bow Rivers than that which we are importing from those two points to day.

Mr. BLAKE. How much more would it cost to import the material from Saskatchewan and Bow River than from Glasgow.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will make the calculation and hand it to the hon. gentleman in detail.

10. India rubber, vulcanized handles for knives and forks, ten per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 10 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In this item we provide that India rubber, vulcanized handles shall pay 10 per cent. and in the next we provide that iron forks shall pay 10 per cent. I can understand well enough that the hon. gentleman may desire to encourage particular industries, but I do not understand that an industry for the putting together of imported handles and forks is one worthy of a subsidy. I call the Minister's attention to the fact for this reason: I was informed in former years that in the United States such practices were frequent and that articles were, by some arrangements, brought here in pieces and put together. I hope the hon. gentleman will not encourage such practices. The object of this, I suppose, is to benefit some industry that is to be established.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not to encourage an industry that is to be established. There is already an establishment in

Mr. MILLS.

Montreal, and this induced the Government to reduce the duty upon handles, which are used in the manufacture of the completed article. There is not sufficient business to warrant the importation of machinery required to manufacture iron forks; and it is proposed to allow the forks to come in in the rough, just as they come from the mould or the press, the polishing and finishing to be done here.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the duty upon the completed fork?

Mr. BOWELL. Twenty-five per cent. Twenty per cent. when they come in in the rough.

11. Iron, cast-iron forks, not handled, ground or otherwise further manufactured, ten per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 10 per cent.  
12. Labels for fish cans, and other uses, printed or painted, a specific duty of six cents per pound, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*..... 20 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. The reason for making this change is to prevent the undervaluations which are continually made in the entry of these goods, and it was deemed advisable to place upon those articles a mixed rate, so much per pound and an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent., instead of the 30 per cent., in which class these goods are now. Upon a more close calculation it was found that 6 cents per pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem* was not in many cases as high a duty as the 30 per cent. they now bear; I would therefore move that the item be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

12. Labels for fruit, vegetables, meat, fish, and confectionery; also tickets and advertising bills and folders, a specific duty of ten cents per pound and twenty per cent. *ad valorem* ..... } 10 cents per lb. and 20 per cent.

Motion agreed to, and item amended.

13. Pins manufactured from wire of any metal, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*..... 30 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. The Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech, explained this matter. At present brass pins are 30 per cent.; steel pins, 20 per cent., and iron, of which there are but few, 25 per cent. The object is to secure uniformity, and to encourage this industry, of which there is an establishment at Galt.

Progress reported, Committee to sit again.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:45 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 7th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), from the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the *Debates* of this House during the present Session, presented the second report of the said Committee, recommending that Messrs. Bouchard and LaSalle be appointed as additional translators of the official report of the *Debates* of this House, for the work of the present Session remaining to be done, and that they be paid *pro rata* at the rate of \$800.

## LAW OF EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Mr. Speaker, I find, on a reference to the Order Paper of to-day, that Bill (No. 3) to further amend the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases, has disappeared from the Notice Paper. I propose submitting a motion to the House to restore it to the Order Paper again. The Bill has had extraordinary vicissitudes so far in the House. When I moved the second reading of the Bill a motion was made that it be read in six months, but a majority of 47 voted in favour of the second reading. The Bill was read the second time and referred to a Select Committee, with the approval of the First Minister. The Select Committee examined the Bill and reported it to the House without amendment. In due course I moved that you leave the Chair and that the Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole. A motion was made that you do not leave the Chair then, but that you do so in six months. That motion was defeated by a majority of five. The Bill was referred to Committee of the Whole and the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again. On a subsequent day the Bill was referred to Committee of the Whole without discussion, and the first clause was passed while we were in Committee of the Whole. The first clause was the important clause, and affirms the principle that the accused in certain cases shall be competent to testify in his own behalf. After the clause was adopted by the Committee a motion was made by the hon. member for Quebec Center (Mr. Bossé) that the Committee do rise, and that motion was carried by a majority of seven. Now, as I do not believe that that was a fair expression of the views of the members of this House, I propose asking that the Bill be restored to the Order Paper. I have no objection of course to a fair, open, and manly opposition to the Bill. If the principle of the Bill does not commend itself to the judgment of this House then the House should throw it out upon the motion for the second reading. But I object very strongly to the kind of political assassination that has found its way into Parliament within the last five years by which a Bill, though it has had its second reading, been approved by a Select Committee, and gone into Committee of the Whole, has been assassinated in Committee of the Whole, in the dark, without any person being responsible for the assassination, and without the public knowing who the assassins really are. Now I propose that the Bill be restored to its proper place on the Order Paper. I do not desire to reopen the discussion on this Bill. I would not make any observations now, after those I have made, were it not for the course taken some nights ago by the Secretary of State. I am ready to admit that the Secretary of State led the only argument that can properly be called an argument against the Bill. I would have answered him there and then, but the Secretary of State, for reasons best known to himself, took care not to oppose it until I had made my reply, and according to the rules of the House I could not speak again.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend will allow me to tell him that I was absent when he replied, and did not know that the debate was over. I came in and made my remarks after I had returned from the corridor where some parties wished to see me; and I apologised to the hon. member for doing so.

Mr. CAMERON. Whatever the reason the effect of it was that I was prevented from replying to the Secretary of State there and then, because he spoke after I had made my reply. Now in the Secretary of State's remarks upon that occasion he prided himself upon being an admirer of the English system of jurisprudence in respect to Criminal Law; and he said it was a system that had worked well, that it could not well be improved, and that so far as he was concerned he desired to adhere to it. In reply to that statement

of the hon. gentleman all I have to say is this: The hon. gentleman must well know that the Criminal Law in England has undergone many and important changes during the last fifty years. He must know that there is hardly a Session of the Imperial Parliament in which changes, improvements, and modifications of the Criminal Law, are not made. Changes have been made of an important character since the time that it was a capital felony to commit the offence of sheep stealing; when it was a capital felony to commit the crime of larceny; when it was a capital felony to forge a £5 note; and when a very able and eminent English Judge stated that to repeal the law making forgery a capital felony would strike a fatal blow at the commercial and business prosperity of the country. Now I very much fear that the Secretary of State's turn of mind in somewhat like that of the eminent Judge to which I have referred. The hon. gentleman must know quite well that changes in the law of England have been made on this very subject within the last ten years, and that changes are now contemplated further than I propose to go in this Bill. He must know that in England, as well as in Canada, the principle of the Bill has been recognized over and over again, and I do not propose to adopt any new principle in the legislation with respect to our Criminal Laws. The Secretary of State must know that under the Plimsoll Act in England, by which certain acts on the part of owners of vessels are made criminal, the accused is a competent witness in his own behalf. He must know that, according to our laws in Canada, in cases of assault the accused is a competent witness, and under the Election Law both in England and Canada the accused is a competent witness in his own behalf. The hon. gentleman must know perfectly well that England in this respect has been marching on during the last ten or fifteen years, and just as experience matures and ripens the judgment of thoughtful men, especially law reformers, that experience is crystalized into Acts of Parliament, and the law has been changed from time to time in criminal matters just as circumstances require. The hon. gentleman must know that in 1873 at the instance of the Imperial Government a commission was appointed, composed of some of the most able members of the Long Robe, to examine and investigate into the whole question of the criminal code in England. He must know that that Commission, after a thorough and exhaustive enquiry into the whole question made a voluminous report, and in that report among other things the Commissioners recommended that the distinction between misdemeanor and felony be abolished altogether and that the accused in every case, whether in the nature of a felony or of a misdemeanor, be made a competent witness in his own behalf, and in addition that his wife be made a competent witness to confirm his story. The accused was made liable to examination and cross-examination as any other witness with the sole exception that the cross-examination should not go to the credibility of the witness. The hon. gentleman must know that, based upon that report, the Attorney-General of England in 1873 introduced into the Imperial Parliament a Bill, one clause of which enabled the accused party to give evidence in his own behalf. It was introduced on the responsibility of the Imperial Government by the Attorney-General. It received the second reading in the House of Commons and the principle was affirmed. It was referred to a Select Committee but no further steps were taken with respect to it that Session on account of the large amount of public business on hand. It was again introduced by the Attorney-General in 1880 and met with the same fate; and I find by the public press that during the present Session of the Imperial Parliament, the Attorney-General has again introduced the Bill. To show the hon. gentleman that public opinion in England in this respect is marching onward, while the hon. gentleman is disposed to stand still, I propose to trouble the

House by reading an extract from the *London Globe* with regard to that Bill. That newspaper says:

"A Bill of which the Attorney-General gave notice yesterday will, if passed, overturn one of the most fundamental principles of our Criminal Law. This is the proposal that prisoners on their trial shall be permitted to give evidence as if they were defendants in a civil action—a proposal that has constantly been made throughout an entire generation of lawyers, and as constantly opposed. It cannot be said, therefore, that the question has not been fully before the country, and that ample opportunity has not been afforded for the adequate formation of opinion. That the law of evidence with regard to this matter is in an unsatisfactory state is sufficiently certain. The recent attempt made by eminent counsel to bring a prisoner's story indirectly, and without liability to cross-examination, before a jury, at any rate reduced the existing rule to a state of logical absurdity. Either the aid of counsel must be regarded as being often a positive disadvantage to an innocent prisoner by closing his mouth, or else such aid must be a no less positive advantage to a guilty one, by enabling his story to be brought forward by an expert, and without such sanctions as an oath or affirmation implies. Of course the principal objection taken to the examination and cross-examination of a prisoner on oath is founded on the indefensible scenes with which the French criminal reports have made us familiar. But to this it may be safely answered that such scenes are the result of far other circumstances—of an inferior class of judges and magistrates, and of the practice, absolutely foreign to English ideas, of assuming the guilt of a prisoner unless he can prove his innocence in the teeth of every test capable of application. There is absolutely no fear that in this country the innocent would be put at a disadvantage by the liberty of being able to tell their own stories on oath in their own way. The principal danger of our system is that suffered by the public—the escape of the guilty, who too often get off by the simple expedient of holding their tongues. Whatever may be the details of the Attorney-General's bill, which may or may not be worthy of approval, its principle is certainly gaining ground among those who are familiar with the working of our Criminal Law.

There is an extract from the *London Globe* with respect to the Bill of the Attorney-General of England, on this subject, which is clearly in point, and is a strong expression of public opinion in favour of the Bill. The *Herald of Montreal*, commenting on this extract, says:

"It will be noticed that the proposal emanates from the Government, the Bill being a Government measure. If, under this system, the criminal be unduly favoured, the fault will lie with the jury. It seems to be only reasonable and fair that a prisoner's lips should not be sealed while all the world can be called as witnesses for or against him. If he wishes to testify let him testify. With the Judge, the Crown lawyers and the jurors to test the truth of his statements, there is but a slight chance for him to impose false evidence upon the Court; while, as regards the public, who will read his evidence, he will have in that quarter thousands of Judges and jurors more critical and severe than those who will try him according to the rules of evidence. The principle of Mr. Cameron's Bill, now before our Parliament, is already recognized in assault cases in our Courts, and it may be extended with satisfactory results to the cause of justice."

I will say no more on that point to which the hon. gentleman referred, and expressing his strong admiration of the English system of jurisprudence in criminal cases; I have said sufficient to satisfy any reasonable man that the statement made by the hon. gentleman, although sound in one sense, is not true in fact, and that there have been gigantic strides made in England in the last few years and that a movement to go still further than I propose to go has been initiated under the responsibility of the Imperial Government. The hon. gentleman opposed the Bill on another ground. He said our laws worked satisfactory, that no one had petitioned in favour of the change proposed, and on that ground he would hesitate to favour changes in the direction proposed. If that were true, it is no argument against the principle of a Bill. Parliament does not wait until the public at large present petitions to the House and ask for certain legislation. It is our duty as members of a free Parliament, if we think the public interests would be better served by making a change in either our criminal or civil law, to do so. And I say as a matter of fact it is not true. I say that since the Bill was introduced a large number of the public journals of the country have pronounced unmistakably in favour of the Bill. I say that since the introduction of the Bill the first or second day of this Session, I have received communications from a number of those who are engaged in the administration of the criminal laws of the land all pointing

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.)

in one direction and that is in favour of the principle of the Bill. I will mention the names of some of the gentlemen who have corresponded with me this year and last year, with reference to this measure. I had a communication from Judge Davis of Middlesex, from Judge Sinclair of Hamilton, and from Judge Toms of Huron, and I say to the hon. gentleman that there are no County Court Judges in the whole of Ontario, perhaps, who are, in my opinion, better capable of forming an opinion upon this subject than the Judges to whom I have referred. I have had a communication from the County Attorney of Toronto, pressing strongly that this Bill should become law. Further, I had a communication the other day from one of the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, a Judge, who, when he was at the bar, occupied a pre-eminent position—as an able criminal lawyer—I refer to the present Judge Armour, who wrote me a few days ago to the following effect:

"I have perused your Bill to permit accused parties to give evidence in their own behalf. I am entirely in favour of all accused parties being entitled to give evidence in their own behalf, just as in civil actions."

Now, I think I have shown that in that respect the ground upon which the hon. gentleman bases his opposition to the Bill is wholly without foundation. Further, he will find in a newspaper, published in the town of Cornwall, since the discussion in the House some weeks ago, an article which it would be well for the Secretary of State to peruse. I will read an extract or two from that article in order to direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the subject, and as a practical illustration of the advisability of passing this Bill. A man's practical experience in a matter of that kind is worth much more than any amount of theorizing:

"Two young men, both pretty drunk, quarrelled coming home from a party. They had a scuffle in which they both fell and lost their caps. One of the lads picked up a cap and ran off with it. After a while he came back to the scene of the row bareheaded, and proceeded to search for his cap. On being asked what he had done with the cap he had taken away, he declared that he knew nothing about it. The owner of the lost cap had his antagonist arrested for felony, and he was tried and found guilty. During the whole trial his mouth was closed. The jury had not the opportunity of hearing his version of the case.

"Now if the man who had lost his cap had sued the other for trover—which was under the circumstances the proper course to take—the defendant, to save himself from paying a few dollars, could have gone into the witness box and told his own story; but when his liberty, his character and his prospects in life were at stake, his mouth was cruelly closed by the law. We are quite certain that if the jury had been afforded the opportunity of hearing from his own lips and in his own way what he had to say, they would never have dreamt of finding him guilty of intent to steal.

"This is one case among many which shows the anomalous condition of the law which permits a man that he may escape the payment of, it may be a just debt, to give evidence in his own behalf, but which permits a prisoner, innocent of the crime of which he stands accused, from testifying to circumstances and facts of which, in the very nature of the case, he alone can have any knowledge."

Now, Sir, that appears to me to be a very strong case in favour of my position. I will now give the hon. gentleman the opinion of the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench of Ontario upon this point. The hon. gentleman knows that under the provisions of 32 and 33 Victoria, a man can be indicted for not providing his family with necessary food. Under the provisions of that statute about a year ago, a man by the name of Bissell was indicted at Toronto for not providing his wife with necessary food. The prosecutrix, the wife, entered the witness box and established a case to prove that her husband had neglected to provide her with sufficient food. Her evidence was objected to, but it was received by the presiding Judge and upon her evidence the husband was found guilty. The case was reserved for the consideration of the Superior Court, and the sole point in the appeal was whether the conviction could be sustained, as the prosecutrix gave evidence in her own behalf and against her husband. The Court gave an exhaustive judgment, and decided that the wife was not a competent witness in her own behalf, because the law did not make her so, unless in

cases of assault. Chief Justice Hagarty stated in delivering judgment :

" I am unable to satisfy myself that any of these authorities were not warranted by holding this case to fall within the exceptions to the general rule. As a matter of opinion it might be wiser to allow the evidence. But as Lord Blackburn said on this same point, that is a matter for the Legislature and not for us."

That case is reported in vol. 1, Ontario reports, page 514, and at 521. The result was that the conviction was quashed, and the husband though he was found guilty by the jury, escaped the punishment he deserved. The hon. gentleman says this is my Bill; but it is no more my Bill than it is the Bill of a number of other hon. members of the House. I say to the Secretary of State that the first lawyers on his own side of the House, the first lawyers at the criminal bar, have pronounced in favour of the Bill. It was referred to a Select Committee last Session and upon that Committee were the names of Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Davies, Mr. Robertson of Hamilton, Mr. Weldon and Mr. Cameron of Victoria, Mr. Girouard, Mr. Casgrain and Mr. Amyot. The report of the Committee was unanimous, and the present Bill is the exact Bill which was reported by that Committee. The hon. gentleman goes further, and he objects to the Bill because, he says it is opening up the road to the introduction of the French system of criminal jurisprudence, that is, to the examination of the accused. If the hon. gentleman had read the Bill presented by me, and given it the slightest consideration, he would have found that there is not the least similarity between the principle of the Bill which I submitted to the House, and the rule which prevails in the administration of criminal justice in France. Under this Bill no man is compellable to give evidence. He is competent as a witness, and if he finds that his interest will be served by his giving evidence, he can go into the witness box, and he can call his wife to confirm his story. In France the rule is entirely different, for there they go upon the assumption that every accused person is guilty until he himself establishes his innocence. A prisoner is examined and cross-examined and brow beaten in order to elicit such facts as will enable the public prosecutor to submit a bill of indictment. The object is not so much to ascertain whether a man is guilty, but to ascertain whether or not they can squeeze out of a man's own mouth such facts as would justify the prosecutor in submitting a bill to the Courts. I will read on that subject what the *Law Journal* of England says :

" The writer in the *Law Journal* hardly seems to appreciate this when he remarks that ' as to French criminal procedure we observe that the interrogation of the prisoner is only a part of it, and that part might be adopted without adopting the whole.' It is, however, just this part of the French criminal procedure which excites the most repugnance in England, and that for the reason that, as applied in France, its aim seems to be less the discovery of the truth than the conviction of the prisoner. We do not hold it as by any means an indisputable proposition that an innocent man ought to prefer, or would be likely to prefer, telling his whole story to a French Judge, to having his mouth closed as in an English criminal court. Before a Judge who starts apparently from an assumption of a prisoner's guilt, and continually interrupts his examination to utter ejaculations of horror over the enormity of his crime, or to exhort him feelingly to make a confession of it, the vindication of innocence is not by any means a necessity. Truth may, as it is said, resemble a torch which shines the brighter the more it is shaken, but then the shaking must be done fairly, and this is exactly the essential condition which French tribunals appear to neglect.

Now, Sir, that is the opinion of the editor of the *Law Journal* on the French system. It a most unfair system that a man must be assumed to be guilty until he can establish his innocence, and that he should be liable to be cross-examined and re-examined and brow-beaten by a Judge without the aid of counsel to assist him before he is put on his trial. That is not the principle of my Bill at all. Under it the prisoner will be at liberty to go into the witness box and tell his story, or to remain out and keep his mouth closed. The hon. Secretary of State is entirely mistaken as to the principle I have introduced into my Bill. The *Law*

*Journal* further says with respect to the general question of the admissibility of the evidence of an accused party :

" The primary object of a criminal prosecution is to elicit the whole truth about a crime. If a prisoner is innocent it can do him no harm to be examined: it cannot diminish his chances of escape; and, if guilty, it is good that those chances should be diminished."

On the same subject the *Pall Mall Gazette* observes :

" Innocence, as a rule, has more to gain than to lose, as guilt has certainly more to lose than to gain, by telling its own story, and having that story sifted by direct interrogation; and the cause of truth would undoubtedly gain by allowing in both cases the story to be told."

Now, I have answered the objection raised by the hon. gentleman, and I think I have answered it successfully. He admits that it is quite proper in assault cases to allow the accused party to be examined. He says :

" Two men meet; a few angry words pass, and a blow is struck; why not allow the parties who came face to face, with the result that an assault is committed, to come and let each tell his own story."

That is exactly what I say. The only difference between the hon. gentleman and myself is that I say so and support the Bill; he says so and opposes the Bill. I say that if his argument is good in reference to assault cases, it cannot be bad in reference to other misdemeanors, unless he can show a distinction in principle between the different classes of misdemeanors tried in our courts. I will ask him if he can point out why a prisoner in assault, which may be serious, is competent to give evidence, and not in other misdemeanors, such as libel, obstructing the Queen's highway, not repairing the Queen's highway, a public nuisance, or a man not providing for his family. These are all cases which may be tried in our Criminal Courts, although of a *quasi* civil character; and yet in every one of these cases, under the law as it now stands, the man who perhaps knows most about the transaction under trial is obliged to keep his mouth closed, and the hon. Secretary of State wants to keep it closed. Now, I say that this Bill ought to become law. Hon. gentlemen may vote it down; but mark my words, this Bill will become law before the hon. gentleman is two years older, and I should not wonder if he himself should be found voting for that Bill. If he does not do so now, he will before long. I move

That the House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Monday next to consider further Bill No. 3, to provide for the further amendment of the Law of Evidence in Criminal cases.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not propose to follow my hon. friend in the discussion which he has gone into upon this question. But if I heard him rightly, he said that this Bill was in the exact words of a Bill reported by a Committee of which I was a member. I recollect being on a Committee to which a Bill of my hon. friend, and one or two other Criminal Law amendment Bills, were referred, but I certainly never, either in the Committee or in the House, supported the principle of this particular Bill. For myself, from my experience in such matters, I am opposed to this Bill. I think it would do infinitely more harm than good. I merely wish to put myself right by showing that I am not in a position of inconsistency.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend has taken me to task for the argument I used in opposition to this Bill when it was before the House; and I do not think he is any more accurate in his remarks at this time than he was then. I do not intend to repeat the arguments which I advanced when the discussion of this Bill came up at its proper time. I think they were good then, and I think they are good still. I only want to say to my hon. friend that if I do not, as he says, know a great deal, I happen to know something about this question. When the hon. gentleman mixed up my argument as to the practice pursued in France, and tried to find my argument at fault, he was mistaken. The hon. gentleman does not know what is done in France. Since the Bill was disposed of the other day in the Committee of the Whole, he has read an article which I have read also; but the conclu-

sions which my hon. friend has drawn against me are not drawn in that article. I said that this Bill went further than the procedure before the French tribunal; I say the same thing still, and I am right, I said that it went further than the French practice, because in France there is no examination of a prisoner under oath—there is not the danger of false swearing. The hon. gentleman has given the House to understand that in France the prisoner's evidence is taken on a preliminary examination for finding out whether an indictment should be laid against him. Such is not the case. The accused in France does not give evidence. He is questioned, not only on the preliminary examination, but also in open court, with this difference, as I have just said, that he is not a witness under oath. If there is one thing that perhaps would assist the administration of criminal justice in this connection, it would be the examination, in a restricted manner, of the accused. It would be to ask a statement from the accused the moment he appears before the magistrate, before he has seen counsel and before he has prepared his line of defence. Then he could be asked to state the truth as to the occurrence, to explain what he did with himself or with the articles found in his possession, or any other point bearing upon the accusation laid against him. I would be in favour of having him thus questioned before a magistrate in open court, but not in secret, as in France. The English procedure forbids this. I would not go so far as to say I would introduce such legislation myself, but if there is one occasion in which a statement of the accused could assist in the administration of criminal justice, it would be when for the first time he was brought before the magistrate. He might then be questioned, not by a constable, nor in secret, not in any way that might be abused, but by the magistrate in open court. If this Bill should pass, notwithstanding the opinions expressed and read by my hon. friend, you will be sowing nothing but temptation for perjury, and you will reap a crop of perjury such as will astonish the world. The hon. gentleman said it was the same as in the case of assault. But I maintain that a man would not be likely to perjure himself in the case of a petty assault, whereas the temptation might be irresistible in cases involving a long and infamous punishment; moreover, in cases of assault very often there are only two parties, the man who strikes another and the one who is assaulted. Then the two are brought before the Police Magistrate and both make their statement. It was only the hon. member for Quebec West who went so far as to say that, to be logical, he would like to see this Bill applied to all cases of felony as well as misdemeanor. This at least is logical. But the hon. promoter of the Bill does not want to go so far. He maintains that, having only reference to cases of misdemeanor, this Bill would not have great importance, that it would be just a step beyond that taken in simple cases of assault and battery. This is a statement from which I entirely dissent. The list of misdemeanors comprises some of the most important offences. It comprises commercial frauds, the obtaining of money under false pretences, and quite a number of others equally great, many of which are punished more severely than some felonies are; and in England, it is in fact proposed to take away this line of demarcation between felonies and misdemeanors, because really the boundary line between misdemeanors and felonies is hardly to be found. There are some felonies which are much less grave in character than misdemeanors. The hon. gentleman's allusion from the French system is not correct. It has been said and often repeated in controversies between English jurists and those who contend that the French system is the best, that the accused under the French system is presumed to be guilty until he is proved to be innocent, whereas in England he is supposed to be innocent until found guilty. This statement is not

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

correct. The same principle holds in France as in England, and the same object is sought to find out whether the charge is true. In both countries the charge made upon oath by the complainant is presumed to be true; the only difference is that in France the accused is asked to repel the charge by his own statement, whereas in England the prisoner is protected against compromising declaration extracted through intimidation or ignorance. I hold firmly to the old rules of evidence which I have read in the old books of criminal legislation. We ought to have respect for those authorities founded on a wise and deep study of human nature. But we ought not, because we are in a new century, to believe that all the legislation made before counts for nothing, and that progress necessarily means we should change what has the sanction of ages. I hold also that Parliament has not been sufficiently informed on this matter, either by the authority of grand juries or that of Judges. There has not yet been a sufficient expression of public opinion from those who have the right to guide public opinion in these matters, to warrant our passing this measure. I do not object to the hon. gentleman bringing the Bill before the House, because by so doing it is bound to be ventilated. It will go before the country when the Judges and the grand jurors who have the administration of justice in their hands, and the public press which is always open to discussion in cases of this kind, will ventilate this question thoroughly, and after public opinion has had time to be formed concerning it Parliament may take action if necessary.

Motion negatived on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,	De St. Georges,	Mackintosh,
Allison (Hants),	Fairbank,	McCraney,
Allison (Lennox),	Fisher,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	McIsaac,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Mills,
Baker (Victoria),	Goffrion,	Mnlock,
Bécharé,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gordon,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Ray,
Brecken,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burnham,	Homer,	Springer,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Thompson,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Trow,
Cartwright,	King,	Vail,
Casey,	Kinney,	Watson,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Weldon,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Wheler,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Wilson,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Woodworth,
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Yeo.—63.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dugas,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Orton,
Beaty,	Fortin,	Oulmet,
Belleau,	Foster,	Paixt,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Reid,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hastings),
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Royal,
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Scott,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Haggart,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Smyth,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Tassé,
Chapleau,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Colby,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Coatgan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Tipper (Pictou),
Coursol,	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Outhbert,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Oardwell),

Daoust,  
Dawson,  
Desjardins,  
Dickinson,  
Dodd,

McCallum,  
McDougald,  
McLellan,  
Méthot,  
Mitchell,

White (Hastings),  
Wigle,  
Williams,  
Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (West'land).—87.

#### PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION BILL.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to call attention to the fact that, in the division on Bill No. 6, my name has been omitted, inadvertently I presume, from the division. I voted for the Bill, known as Mr. Charlton's Bill, and my name does not appear either in the Votes and Proceedings or in *Hansard*. I wish to have my name recorded as voting for the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid that, if this were allowed at this period of time, it would lead to very great difficulties. I can vouch for the statement of the hon. member, as I observed that he rose to vote, and I also noticed that his name had not been called by the Assistant Clerk, so his statement is correct within the knowledge of the House; but it is a very serious question, after an interval of time, to alter a division list.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is the reason why, if any doubt exist as to whether a member's name has been recorded or not, it is asked that the division list be read at the time, and I believe it is not the practice to alter it afterwards on any consideration. Now that the explanation is made, it will be recorded in *Hansard*.

#### REPORT OF THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to ask—I see the Minister of Agriculture is not in his place, but perhaps an answer might be given in the course of the day—when the report, which is important this year, of the Minister of Agriculture and Immigration will be brought down, and when we are to get that volume of the Census which is missing?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture is not well, and perhaps will not be here to-day.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to address a few remarks to you; and I trust that the House will not consider that the debate upon the statement made by my hon. friend the Finance Minister has been unduly prolonged. Such is not the case. The debate is much shorter than is usual, up to this stage, and I do not suppose it will be continued very much longer. I desire to speak very briefly to-day, and I presume there will be but few who will desire to follow in discussing the question now before the House. I noticed, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance made his Financial Statement this season, that he was much less confident in his tone than upon former occasions. He had the air of a man who was fighting with difficulties and swimming against the stream, and certainly the circumstances under which that statement was made were less favourable and less assuring to that gentleman and to his supporters than had been the case for a number of years previous. He met the country with the fact that his surplus, that had been boasted of so much, was being rapidly reduced. He met the country unable to deny that a considerable degree of depression existed. He met the country also with the prospect staring him in the face that the public debt of Canada, already unduly large, was soon to be largely increased by a measure that had but a few days before passed this Chamber. The hon. gentleman attempted at first to deny that a period of depression

existed; and, after having proceeded to prove that no depression existed in the country, he then proceeded to claim that, in any event, the depression that did exist was not as severe as the depression existing in the country in the year 1878. Well, I should hope that the depression was not as severe. Certainly, if a depression as severe as that of 1878 existed at this time, it would be a matter for marvel. The depression existing from 1874 to 1878 was due to causes more intense, more widespread, than any depression that may exist to-day. The character of that depression I shall take the liberty briefly to allude to. I will take liberty to call your attention to the fact that the depression from 1874 to 1878—a depression more widely spread, a depression more intense, than any commercial depression that has afflicted any country in this century—was caused by circumstances entirely beyond the control or the influence of the Government of Canada. That depression was due primarily to the great civil war that devastated the United States, that prostrated its industries, and was followed by a period of wild and reckless speculation, a period when the circulating medium of that country was a debased one, and was constantly fluctuating in value, a period characterized by railway inflation and followed by a collapse more general and more severe than any commercial collapse of this century. In consequence of that depression the finances and the business of Canada were depressed. Any depression existing in the United States must react upon this country, whose commercial relations are so intimate with the country to the south of us, and, in addition to the effect produced by the depression in the United States which reacted upon us, we had unfortunately during that period of years a succession of short harvests. We had one harvest, the harvest of 1876, that was a disastrous one, a harvest when we failed for almost the first time in the history of the country to raise the bread we used ourselves and were under the necessity of importing to the amount of several millions of dollars of bread stuffs. In consequence of this long continued depression in the United States, in consequence of short harvests—and I will show you presently how short they were—there was a severe period of depression in Canada; and I would be willing to admit that the claim made by the hon. gentleman, that the depression existing in this country now was less severe than that which existed in 1878, was true, because the depression, if it do exist at this moment, is due not to a protracted series of commercial calamities, but to a partial failure of one crop, and that partial failure following four years of good harvests. That being the case, the check to our commercial prosperity, if check has been received at all, ought to have been a very slight one indeed.

Now, with regard to the causes of the prosperity that have been enjoyed by the country for the three or four years preceding the present year, I wish to have a few words to say. And I will call your attention to the fact that prosperity was returning, that the return of prosperity was rendered certain by a measure not adopted in this country, was rendered certain not by the passing of the Tariff Bill of March, 1879, but was rendered certain by the return of the United States to specie payment on the 1st day of January, 1879, an event that preceded by some months the adoption of the National Policy. The effect, Sir, of the resumption of specie payment in the United States was very marked. That country has laboured, as I said a moment ago, under the evils of a depreciated currency for many years. From 1862 to 1878, for a period of seventeen years, the currency of the United States had been a depreciated one, and that depreciation, taking the mean highest and lowest premiums of each month of the year during seventeen years, averaged 36½ per cent. Now, in consequence of that depreciation the finances were deranged; in consequence of that depreciation business partook largely the nature of gambling; in conse-

quence of that depreciation of the currency nameless evils that it is unnecessary for me to mention, befell the commercial classes in the United States, and the return to specie payment on the 1st of January, 1879. I assert again, marked the return of prosperity to the United States, a return of prosperity in which we were sure to share, and this return of prosperity, let me reiterate again, had already commenced before the Government of the day had placed the present Tariff upon the Statute-Book. It was contemporary with the inauguration of the National Policy.

It has been claimed that it was necessary to increase the taxation of this country; it has been claimed that a necessity rested upon my hon. friend the Finance Minister to advance the rate of duty. Now, I hold that the views entertained by my hon. friend at my right, the Finance Minister under the previous Administration, were perfectly correct; I hold, Sir, that he was quite correct in maintaining that during that period of temporary depression it was unnecessary to advance the duties and to increase the taxation of this country. His assertion that upon the return of better times the revenue under the Tariff of 1878 would prove to be ample, I think was well founded and warranted by the facts. I find strong corroboration of this view in the financial history of the United States. I find that that country without a change in a singular particular of its Tariff, had a revenue which increased in two years, from 1873 to 1880, by the sum of \$56,000,000, or 43 per cent.; and I find that the revenue of that country increased in four years, from 1878 to 1882, by the sum of \$90,000,000, or 77 per cent. Now, Sir, if the revival of business in the United States led to an increase in the revenue of that country of 43 per cent. in two years, it is fair to presume that a corresponding revival of business in Canada would also lead to an increase in the revenue of this country, amply sufficient to meet the wants of an economical Government such as that of the predecessors of the gentlemen now in power. Credit has been taken by those gentlemen for the large amount of revenue they have derived from the Tariff; credit has been taken by them for the fact that, though the expenditure has been upon an extravagant scale, we have still had a surplus. Well, Sir, a large revenue pre-supposes large importations, and large importations can only be had as a result of increased exports. Unless we have large exports we cannot have large imports, and unless we have large imports we will not have a superabundant revenue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a Tariff is nothing more or less than a schedule of taxes. It may increase and it may diminish incidental taxation, according to the character of the measure, but incidental taxation under any Tariff must, to a greater or less extent exist. A Tariff may be so devised, also, as to enrich a few individuals, it may enrich a few manufacturing corporations, and it may benefit a few interests, but the revenue derived by a Tariff from the people must be paid by the masses, and that revenue, whether it is great or small, simply amounts to taxation; it is nothing more or less, and the millions contributed, the millions that swell the coffers of the Government, represent the contribution of the people in the shape of taxes; and the benefits derived by the imposition of that Tariff, if there are any benefits, are derived by the arrangement of the measure in such a way as to benefit certain interests at the expense of the great mass of the people. That, Sir, is the character of any Tariff. A Tariff is a schedule of taxes, whether it is designed for revenue purposes or whether it is designed for protection—in any event and in all cases, it simply means the taxation of the people.

I have alluded to the fact that prosperity had returned to the United States, which prosperity was reacting upon us when the hon. gentlemen now in power came into office. But, Sir, there is another and a more potent reason for the prosperity the country has enjoyed, and

Mr. CHARLTON.

that is the fact that for a series of years the products of the soil have been remarkably abundant. We have been blessed with a series of abundant harvests; and I wish, Mr. Speaker, to invite your careful consideration to a comparison of the exports of this country for two periods, each of five years in length, the first from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, and the second from 1879 to 1883. A careful comparison of the exports of the country for these two periods will show most clearly what is the reason the country has enjoyed an exceptional prosperity in the last four or five years. Before entering upon this, however, I desire to call the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to this point. I desire to remark that that hon. gentleman, in comparing the exports of foreign produce from Canada for the years 1876 to 1879 and from the latter period to 1883, whether conscious of the fact or not, would lead those who were listening to him, and were taking his statements unhesitatingly, into a misconception and into an error. It will be borne in mind that the importations of grain in Canada before the imposition of duties, were invariably made as entries for consumption. If grain was imported to this country, millions of bushels of it, designed for transmission through our canals to Europe, that grain was entered as for consumption; it appeared upon the Custom house books as grain entered for consumption. But, when the law was altered and duties were imposed upon grain, then only that grain was entered for consumption that was actually intended for consumption and paid duties, while that not intended for consumption was entered, as in transit, and passed through the country, consequently, any comparison between the importations during those two periods, must be an utterly fallacious one, because the mode of entry in the one case represented all as entered for consumption, while the mode of entry in the other case represents only that—and a very small fraction of the whole—which was really intended for consumption; consequently, the hon. gentleman's comparison, in that respect, is one that requires explanation, in order to be understood by the country.

I would ask the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to these figures I am about to give. I am about to give a carefully prepared statement and comparison of the exports of this country for a period of five years from 1874 to 1878, and another period of five years from 1879 to 1883. I wish to make that comparison, Sir, first, with grain, flour and meal; next, with butter and cheese; next, with animals and their produce, excepting butter and cheese; next, with malt, hay, green fruits, and potatoes; and next, with the products of our fisheries. In order to arrive at the actual exportation of grains I have not been governed by the statements made in the Trade and Navigation Returns of the exports of the produce of Canada, but I have been at the pains to take the total imports into the country and deduct them from the total exports, and the balance gives accurately the actual net export of these articles. I have done this with grain only; in the matter of butter and cheese, and animals and their produce, the tables are more accurate, and it was not necessary to take this trouble. I find that the net exports of cereals from 1874 to 1878 was \$49,592,000. The net export from 1879 to 1883 was \$82,267,000. The gross excess of the second period over the first period was \$32,665,000. The annual average of first period was \$9,918,000. Annual average of second period, \$16,455,400. Annual average, excess of second period over first, \$6,537,400. Annual percentage of increase, second period over first, 65 per cent. If the exports of the country in the most important line increased 65 per cent. during a period of five years over a corresponding period of five years preceding, that certainly would warrant the statement that great prosperity ought to have attended such a state of things. But this is the result with respect to grain, flour and meal alone. Let

us take butter and cheese. The exports from 1874 to 1878, the first period, amounted to \$31,852,413; from 1879 to 1883, the second period, \$38,520,687. The gross excess of the second period over the first was \$6,668,274. The annual average excess was \$1,336,091. I now come to consider animals and their produce, the produce of Canada, and I find in making up the statement that the tables for the year 1874-75 and 76 give the total exports only, and in making up the statement the difference between the entire import and the import entered for consumption, amounting in the three years to \$2,689,575 is deducted from the exports. The exports from 1874 to 1878, excluding butter and cheese, amounted to \$34,535,112; from 1879 to 1883, \$55,286,655. The gross excess of the second period over the first was \$20,691,544. The annual average excess was \$4,132,500. In malt, hay, hops, potatoes, and green fruit there was a very remarkable increase. The exports of those articles for the first period, 1874 to 1878, were of the value of \$5,248,000; for the second period, 1879 to 1883, \$16,695,236. The gross increase of the second period over the first was \$11,347,000. The annual average was \$2,219,000. We will next take the fisheries' exports. From 1874 to 1878 the value was \$26,671,000; from 1879 to 1883, \$37,397,000. The gross increase of the second period over the first was \$10,726,000. The average annual increase was \$2,165,000. Summarizing these statements we have the following:—

*Exports 1874 to 1878.*

Cereals net.....	\$ 49,592,000
Butter and cheese .....	31,852,000
Animals and their produce, excluding butter and cheese .....	34,595,000
Malt, hay, hops, green, fruits and potatoes.....	5,248,000
Fisheries.....	26,671,000
	\$147,958,000

*Exports 1879 to 1883.*

Cereals net.....	\$82,217,000
Butter and cheese .....	38,520,000
Animals and their produce, excluding butter and cheese .....	55,286,000
Malt, hay, hops, green fruits and potatoes...	16,695,000
Fisheries.....	37,397,000
	\$230,165,000

Gross Excess 2nd period over first period, \$82,217,000, or 55 per cent.  
Annual increase \$16,441,000, or \$4 *per capita*.

With a statement such as this, with the fact shown that the exports of these articles of Canadian produce exceeded by \$82,000,000, exceeded by 55 per cent., the exports for the first years, do we need to search further for the cause of prosperity in this country? Do we need to ascertain whether the National Policy has created it; or whether prosperity in some other country has created it? In those facts which I have adduced I have indicated a sufficient and simple cause for any degree of prosperity which may have existed in this country. And that degree of prosperity, so far from having been created by the National Policy, so far from having been increased by the National Policy, has been reduced by the National Policy. It has been reduced to the extent of the unnecessary taxation imposed by that measure upon this country. If that measure drew from the pockets of the people of Canada \$20,000,000 more than was sufficient to meet the wants of the Government, then the prosperity which the country enjoyed during the period from 1879 to 1883 was reduced by the National Policy the exact amount of unnecessary taxation imposed on the people.

The Finance Minister in the course of his speech expressed himself as unable to comprehend the statement made by the leader of the Opposition that \$20,000,000 additional taxation from Customs meant \$30,000,000 imposed on the people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At least.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will endeavour to enlighten the hon. Minister on this point, and I think I may be able to show him that the leader of the Opposition in making that statement was quite within the mark. A duty imposed upon an article enhances its cost. An article costing \$1, placed in the hands of a wholesale merchant will be sold, if his profits are 20 per cent., for \$1.20. It next goes into the hands of the retail dealer; if his profits are 25 per cent., the article when it reaches the consumer will cost \$1.50. Upon this basis a taxation of \$20,000,000 in the shape of Customs duties adds that amount to the cost of the goods in the wholesale dealers hands. A profit of 20 per cent. places the goods in the hands of the retail merchant at a cost of \$24,000,000. If his profit is 25 per cent., the goods reach the consumer at a cost of \$30,000,000, thus a 20 per cent. taxation by Customs duty represents an increased cost amounting to 30 per cent. to the consumer, 25 per cent. duty represents 37½ per cent. cost added to the consumer, and 30 per cent. duty represents 45 per cent. added cost to the people. It is for this reason that the present mode of raising taxation is so wasteful. Direct taxation takes from the pockets of the consumers what the Government actually receives; but this mode takes from the consumer \$1.50 in order that the Government may secure \$1. And for this reason the heavier the taxation imposed by the Tariff, beyond the absolute and bare necessities of the country, the greater the outrage perpetrated on the country, because for every additional dollar of unnecessary taxation imposed the taxpayer pays a dollar and a half. But that is not all. In addition to the taxes paid by the taxpayer directly, there is the incidental taxation. Upon every article upon which the Government imposes a duty, and that is manufactured to any extent in the country, the domestic production is enhanced in value, and while the consumer is paying with one hand into the Treasury, he is paying with the other hand into the pockets of the manufacturers, who in consequence of the duty may or may not ask more than the article is worth, but who certainly ask more than it could be bought for in the open market, with open competition.

It is claimed by my hon. friend the hon. Finance Minister that goods are cheaper now, than in 1878. Well, Sir, I suppose the hon. gentleman is sufficiently familiar with the history of manufactures to be aware, that the constant tendency is to cheapen the cost of production. That progress has been a very rapid one. It is said that 100 operatives to-day will produce more goods, working sixty hours a week, than 300 would have produced twenty years ago working seventy-two hours a week, and by perfecting machinery and introducing improvements in the mode of manipulating the raw staples, the cost of producing the goods continues to diminish. But the question is not whether goods are absolutely cheaper than they were in 1878, but whether they are relatively cheaper. The question is whether the goods are made dearer by this policy, than they would be at this moment, under a seventeen and a-half per cent. tariff.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, we stand on that ground.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman gave his whole case away when he tells us, that when wages go down in the United States or Great Britain, our employers must reduce their wages to stand competition. Why? If they have a wide margin between their prices, the price of the article brought in with the duty added, if they can produce goods as cheap as they are sold in the United States, weighed down as they are by the amount of the duty, why is the competition so keen that they must reduce their wages when there is a reduction in England or the United States? If goods are produced in Canada as cheaply as in the United States, if the duty is 20 per cent., the manufacturer is selling that 20 per cent. less than the imported article.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is the competition at home.

Mr. CHARLTON. The testimony of importers is, that except in rare cases where there is a glut of the market, the prices of goods is barely below the cost of the articles abroad and the duty added. Reason and common sense show that this would be the case; and in the whole history of protection in this country, or the United States or in any other country, that rule will be found to work invariably, except in the exceptional cases where a temporary glut of the market, may force manufacturers to put their goods on the market at less than ordinary prices. Then the hon. gentleman claims that his Tariff has been the means of increasing the production of textile fabrics in Canada to the extent of \$20,000,000 per annum; that it has added 15,000 to the operative class of this country. Well, Sir, I think his estimate is too high. I think his estimate as to the position and the increase in the manufacture of textile fabrics since 1878 is too high, and I shall examine later on, whether the National Policy is to be credited with any considerable portion of the actual increase in that manufacture.

Let us now examine some statistics with reference to the manufacture of cotton. The largest increase in textiles has been in the article of cotton—I presume the hon. gentleman will himself admit that more than one-half the increase has been in that line. It is the only industry which has been so far fostered by the Tariff as to be overdone—as to have reached what is sometimes called the second stage of protection. I have here a statement from Mr. Stevenson, of the firm of D. Morrice & Co., who, I believe, furnished the hon. gentleman with his statistics with reference to cotton. By this statement the increase of hands engaged in the manufacture of cotton is claimed to be about 7,900, and the increase of goods manufactured about \$7,800,000. Well, if that is true, there has been no such increase as an addition of 15,000 to the operatives in Canada engaged in the production of textiles, and no such increase as \$20,000,000 in the production of these articles. This gentleman in his first statement informed us that the average wages of operatives in the cotton mills was \$108 per annum. In his second statement made a few days later, which I suppose we are bound to go by, he gives us the following figures: Capital invested in cotton mills of Canada, \$3,850,000; yards produced in 1883, 115,000,000; hands employed, 10,200; expenditure, \$3,560,000. Part of that expenditure consists of a charge of \$1,200,000 for raw cotton; \$225,000 for supplies; the same amount for chemicals, etc.; \$215,000 for fuel; \$125,000 for wear and tear; \$50,000 for insurance; \$600,000 for interest on capital; \$1,960,000 for wages, \$100,000 for salaries of managers, clerks, &c.; \$250,000 for the loss between the payments of cash and the sale of productions on time. The profits amounted to \$1,810,000, a rate equal to 22 per cent. on the capital invested, besides \$600,000 allowed for interest, which is 7 per cent more, making 29 per cent. as the dividends and earnings of these mills for 1883. But if we examine this statement we shall find that the charge for raw cotton is too high. The amount is \$4,200,000, while the Custom returns give the amount imported as \$2,912,000 worth, or 27,451,349 pounds. This perhaps will be claimed as the cost of the articles at the point where it was purchased. If that is the case it would be fair to add freight, and if we add \$1.50 per hundred pounds—which is an enormous rate—to the cost as given by the returns, we have a total cost of raw cotton for those mills amounting to \$5,384,537, leaving an overcharge of \$875,463. Adding that to the admitted earnings, and the charge for interest on capital of \$500,000, and we have by this statement of Mr. Stevenson, a result of 37.4-10 per cent., as the dividends of the cotton mills of Canada in 1883. And we have another statement—a statement that the wages of the

Mr. CHARLTON.

operatives in 1879, were \$245 per annum, while this item for the year 1883 was \$194, showing that under the operation of this Tariff, while the cotton manufacturers have made 37 per cent. dividends in that year, and that upon a statement allowing an enormous amount for the wages of overseers, &c., operatives' wages have been reduced \$51 per annum. This shows that while the manufacturers have derived large profits by the operation of the Tariff, the operatives have not been benefited.

Now, if it be true, as my hon. friend claims, that the increased production of textile fabrics under the operation of the Tariff, is \$20,000,000 per year, and that the result of the tariff has been to employ 15,000 more operatives, if the goods produced by these 15,000 operatives have been enhanced in price by 20 per cent., which is undoubtedly too low an estimate, it follows that these goods have cost \$4,000,000 more to the consumers of Canada than they would have cost if they had been imported free of duty; while the operatives have received a total amount of wages of \$3,000,000; showing that the people of this country have paid for the increased production of textile fabrics in 1883, \$1,000,000 more than the total sum received in wages by the people employed in producing those goods. I have in my hands a very interesting table compiled by Mr. William M. Springer, in Washington, treating of this same subject. This statement is designed to show the incidental taxation imposed on the people of the United States in consequence of the increased cost of home products by reason of the tariff. In this statement Mr. Springer includes chemical products, earthenware and glassware, iron, steel, and all metal manufactured goods, wood and woodenware, sugar and molasses, tobacco, cotton and cotton goods, hemp, jute, and flax goods, wool and woollens, silk and silk goods, books, papers, &c. He shows that the value of the total imports of these articles in the year 1882 was \$433,173,335 under their high protective tariff.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They do not seem disposed to reduce it.

Mr. CHARLTON. They have a Bill introduced for reducing it, which is a great step in the right direction. Mr. Springer shows that the duty paid on these imports was \$194,464,758, that the domestic production was \$2,440,502,649; that the number of hands employed was 1,327,881; that the wages paid to those hands amounted to \$163,606,049; and that the increased cost of the goods produced by these operatives in consequence of the high tariff was \$556,933,637; in other words, while \$163,600,000 was paid in wages to the operatives, the consumers of the United States were called upon to pay an increased cost of \$556,900,000 for the goods produced by them, thereby incurring a waste, if you count the wages of the operatives as clear gain, of about \$100,000,000 per annum. We are doing the same thing in this country only on a smaller scale.

My hon. friend, in the course of his speech, seemed to be apprehensive upon the subject of the surplus. He told us that the importations were reduced in consequence of the increased manufactures; he told us that they were likely to be further reduced, and he led us to believe that he feared a further reduction of the revenue—that he feared, in fact, that his surplus would be entirely obliterated, and that he might, before many months, be called upon to actually face a deficit.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Who said it?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the hon. Finance Minister told us—I took down his words—that the importations were reduced in consequence of increased manufactures.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Exactly.

Mr. CHARLTON. And that in consequence of reduced importations there would be a reduced revenue.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That was entirely with reference to this year and next year—I did not go further.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman may not have seen the full effect of his plausible argument; but if his policy works according to his expectations, this will be exactly the result—that reduced importations, in consequence of increased manufactures, will increase the needs of the Government and the danger of a deficit. At all events, the hon. gentleman's surplus is shrinking, and is likely to disappear. But I wish to call his attention now to some other figures, to show that he is mistaken as to the fact, and that the importations of cottons, woollens, iron and steel—all goods susceptible of manufacture in Canada—are increasing, and are very much larger to-day than they were when his policy was inaugurated in 1879. Under the operation of the Tariff of my hon. friend from South Huron, a Tariff of 17½ per cent., the manufactures of this country were rapidly reducing the importations. The importations of cotton goods sunk from \$11,341,000 in 1874 to \$7,104,900 in 1878, a decrease of \$4,237,000, or 37 per cent. The importations of woollens in 1874 were \$11,160,000, and they fell to \$8,855,000 in 1878, a decrease of \$2,305,000, or 20 per cent. This is the record with regard to those two articles under the Tariff policy of the hon. gentleman's predecessor. In 1879 the hon. gentleman brought down his Tariff, and the National Policy was adopted. Now, let us carefully enquire what has been the effect of that policy on our manufacturing interests. In 1879, we imported \$6,551,000 of cotton goods, and in 1883, \$10,044,000; in 1879 we imported \$7,063,000 of woollen goods, and in 1883 we imported \$10,004,000. The increase in the importations of woollens and cottons from 1879 to 1883 was \$6,434,000, an increase of 47 per cent. against a decrease almost as great during the period my hon. friend from South Huron occupied the position of Finance Minister. We find, also, that in 1879 the importations of iron and steel and manufactures of the same were \$3,147,000, and that they increased to \$12,209,000 in 1883, not including the importations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The importations of woollens, cotton, iron and steel, and the manufactures of the same during the period of the hon. gentleman's policy, have increased by \$10,500,000, or 48 per cent., and yet he tells the country that the importations of manufactured goods are decreasing. Now, the total importations of manufactured goods susceptible of manufacture in Canada amounted, in 1874, to \$68,959,000; in 1878 they had fallen to \$44,583,000, a diminution of \$24,376,000, or 35 per cent. That is the record of my hon. friend at my right. In 1879, the year in which the National Policy was inaugurated, the imports of manufactured goods susceptible of manufacture in Canada amounted to \$39,600,000, and in 1883 they amounted to \$71,250,000, an increase of \$31,650,000, or 79 per cent. That is the policy that is diminishing the importation of manufactured goods into this country. If we turn to the United States we shall find the same state of things existing in that country. In 1878 the United States importations of woollens, cottons, iron and steel, linen and flax, and silks, amounted to \$87,293,000, and in 1883 to \$189,374,000, or an increase, in five years, of \$102,081,000, or 116 per cent.; and the lowest rate of duty imposed on any of these articles was 33 per cent. and the highest, 61 per cent. In 1883, five years later, the United States imported of the same articles \$189,374,000, an increase of \$107,000,000 in five years, or 116 per cent., and that increase has taken place under a protective Tariff designed to exclude these goods from the country, designed to keep the United States markets for American manufacturers. The same experience we have undergone, though not to the same extent, as the increase in our importations has been 79 per

cent., instead of 116 per cent.; so that the hon. gentleman's assertion that his policy is diminishing importations into this country, has to be taken with a considerable quantity of salt. It has, in fact, to be completely rejected. His policy does not give us the entire control of our own markets, it does not exclude foreign goods from Canada, it does not give our manufacturers the control of the Canada markets, but it shows that under our former revenue Tariff of 17½ per cent., our manufacturing interests advanced much more rapidly towards securing the control of the markets of Canada than they are doing under the policy of my hon. friend.

Mr. Speaker, I would enquire whether the manufacturing industries of Canada are due to the National Policy? When hon. gentlemen opposite speak on this subject, they would almost lead people to believe that we had no manufactories in this country before the National Policy was inaugurated; that the entire manufacturing system of Canada is due to the inauguration of the National Policy. I presume the right hon. gentleman will not make that assertion. When the question is asked, he is discreetly silent on the subject. I must say that the manufactures of this country, under a 15 per cent. revenue Tariff, and afterwards under a 17½ per cent. revenue Tariff attained a very great degree of development. I assert that the progress of our manufacturing industries was both healthy and rapid, that they stood upon a firm and healthy basis in the year 1879 when the Tariff was changed, and that they did not require a change of Tariff but a revival of times. I assert that our manufacturing industries were sure to have made rapid progress and to have attained a great degree of development under the Tariff under which they grew up, under which they attained the proportion they did in 1879. The production of manufactures in Canada in 1871 was \$211,000,000, and despite the hard times that came after the commercial revulsion 1874, and continued to 1878, the manufacturing industries of Canada made progress and development. When the hon. gentleman opposite changed the fiscal policy, great fortunes had already been accumulated by manufacturers. J. & R. Molson had accumulated a fortune of \$1,000,000; J. G. Worts had amassed \$1,000,000; E. & C. Gurney, \$750,000; and these gentlemen had commenced without a dollar twenty-five years before. E. K. Green has made \$500,000 and A. H. Galt, \$500,000, and scores of other manufacturers who had started with little or nothing, had gained fortunes ranging from \$150,000 to \$200,000, besides those I have mentioned. We had the entire control of the boot and shoe business of the country; the importations in this line were but a mere bagatelle, consisting of a class of work, the demand for which was so light that our manufacturers would not be bothered supplying it. We had full control of the market for agricultural implements and of the foundry business, and our sewing machine manufacturers were so prosperous that they were anxious to have reciprocity with the United States, in order to be able to send their goods to the United States market. The cotton industry and the woollen industry were also established on a prosperous and firm basis. During the period from 1874 to 1878, the depression existing among the manufactures of the United States, where they enjoyed the full blessings of an ultra protective system, was much greater than that which existed among the manufactures in the Dominion of Canada. In 1877 a return was given of forty-eight manufacturing establishments of New England, with a capital of \$52,320,000. Of those, sixteen paid no dividends whatever; nine paid dividends of less than 6 per cent.; six paid dividends of 6 per cent.; and seven only paid dividends of 10 per cent., and upwards. If we contrast that with the condition of things in Canada, we will find that of twenty large concerns established in this Dominion, in various lines, but two reported no dividends, two reported satisfactory dividends, one reported

reduced dividend as compared with former years, six reported dividends of from 6 to 8 per cent., two reported dividends of 10 per cent., and six reported dividends of 20 per cent., and upwards. Now this shows a remarkable contrast between Canada and the New England States, in this respect, that sixteen establishments in New England out of forty-eight paid no dividends, while in Canada only two out of twenty paid none. The highest rate in New England was 10 per cent. and in Canada 20 per cent., and upwards, in the year 1877; and I assert that our manufacturing interest was in a most prosperous condition, was established on a firmer basis in Canada than in the United States, either in the year 1877 or any year following the commercial depression in 1874. We had a smaller proportion of men, women and children out of employment. It was estimated that 2,000,000 men in the United States were out of employment in that period, but there was nothing like that proportion out of employment in this country, and a fair comparison of the then manufacturing industries in the two countries will show any candid, dispassionate man that under a revenue Tariff, Canadian manufacturing industries were paying better dividends and stood on a better basis than those in the United States under a high protective Tariff. The Tariff introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite has actually injured many of our manufacturing interests; it has injured our agricultural implement manufactories. In my Riding, there is one of these manufactories, and the proprietor told me that the increased cost of producing mowers, in consequence of the increased duty on raw material is \$2 per machine, and another extensive manufacturer informs me that the increased cost of material is so great that in order to place his goods on the market at the price which ruled before the National Policy was adopted, he has to reduce the weight of castings in his goods, and really to reduce their worth and quality. Our foundries were well established before this policy came into operation, and this policy has been detrimental to their interests, by imposing a duty on iron and coal. The lumber interest has received no benefit from it whatever, and my hon. friend has inflicted, as he himself admits, an injury on the cotton trade. He tells us the cotton trade is overdone; that there are too many mills.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Did not the hon. gentleman say they were paying 30 per cent.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; last year, down to June 30th, 1883. I take the hon. gentleman's own statement that the cotton interest has been overdone and that no doubt hon. gentlemen would accuse him of having injured the cotton trade. It is undoubtedly overdone. The forcing process which enabled the manufacturers to pay large dividends has induced too many to go into the trade. The cotton industry would have been better off to-day had it gone on under the operation of a Tariff such as that which preceded this one, when dividends were made of from 10 to 15 per cent., when the inducements were not so great and there was no prospect of 50 per cent. dividends. The cotton industry of Canada to-day, and for years following, would be on a more healthy basis under the operation of that Tariff than under the forcing process of the right hon. gentleman. Well, Sir, it is a feature of the claims made on behalf of this National Policy, that it claims everything—it claims the credit for all prosperity that exists in the country, it claims credit for everything that would have naturally resulted from the return of good times. No man can suppose that the manufacturing interests of this country, that had grown up under a revenue Tariff, would have remained stationary after good times had returned. No man can suppose that, after 1879, when the harvests of this country improved, when the business of the United States improved, and we received higher prices for our lumber, and for our barley, and for

Mr. CHARLTON.

the productions which we sell to that country; no man can suppose that, when prosperity pervaded the whole commercial world, the manufacturing interests of Canada would have stood still, and would have made no progress. It is my humble belief that they would have made, on the whole, greater progress than they have made under this policy. I believe that our manufactures of agricultural implements, our foundry interests, our sewing machine manufactures, would have been much better off; I believe that the development of the cotton industry would have been as great as it should have been for the good of the country; and I believe that the progress of the woollen industry would have been equally great. I believe that this National Policy, while imposing great burdens upon the people, in the shape of unnecessary taxation, has resulted in harm to one great interest, and has left the others in no better condition, in my humble belief, than they would have been without it. It is not necessary to arrange for 37 per cent dividends. A state of things such as that is sure to result ultimately in injury to the interests which receive such undue protection. I have no doubt that our cotton manufacturers realize that already. No doubt those who have invested in this industry regret that so many have gone into the business and that the business has received that development which it has, and wish that its growth had been less rapid and more healthy than it has been. These results were reached in the United States in various interests. They were reached in the United States in the iron interest; they were reached in the United States in the paper interest; they were reached in the United States in the cotton interest. Those results were not reached in the United States as rapidly as in Canada, because it is a greater theatre, a greater field of operations. What was reached here in three or four years required a decade at least before it was reached there, but the result here has been the same as the result there, and has been attained more rapidly. To-day, \$100,000,000, invested in blast furnaces in the United States, is a useless investment; to-day, they have more paper mills than they need in the United States, and they have more cotton factories than are required; and this is the result of their having paid enormous dividends, so that people were induced to rush into those industries, in the expectation of suddenly making fortunes.

So much for the Tariff. I have but one more point on that question to allude to, and that will be my hon. friend's assertions with reference to agricultural protection, which I shall reach in a few moments. I wish, however, to allude to a few points made the other afternoon by my hon. friend, the hon. member for Cardwell. He told us that, under the operation of the National Policy, the tonnage of Montreal had increased. Now, the increase of the tonnage of Montreal simply proves this. It arises from two causes. It arises from the increased importation of manufactures, which the policy of my hon. friend was to prevent; it arises also from the increased exportation of the productions of the soil, which my hon. friend's policy was to prevent, because we were to have a home market for all that. So the increase of tonnage of Montreal only shows that his policy is inoperative in the respects in which he promised it should be operative. The hon. member for Cardwell also pointed to the fact that there had been an increase in the savings banks deposits in this country. As I have already shown, we have had unusually good crops, we have had an active trade, we have had an increase of \$80,000,000 in our exportations to counterbalance the \$20,000,000 of useless taxation, leaving a net gain to the country of \$60,000,000, showing that the hon. gentleman's policy has not succeeded in utterly depressing the advance of this country. Notwithstanding the burdens he has imposed, notwithstanding the incubus which his

Tariff creates, notwithstanding a faulty fiscal system, the country has progressed and become wealthier, and the savings banks deposits have increased, not as much as they would have increased under another policy, it is true, but, in spite of the hon. gentleman's policy, they have nevertheless increased fairly, and the country has made some progress, in consequence of the exceptionally favourable position it has been placed in with regard to abundant harvests. He next referred to the exodus question, and he introduced an argument in that connection which I could not see the application of. He laboured to show us that the migration from the older States of the American Union had been large. Undoubtedly it has. If it had been from the United States to our own North-West, then the two cases would have been parallel ones. What we are talking about is not an exodus from Canada to the Canadian North-West, and I repeat that the argument of the hon. gentleman was totally inapplicable, because the people moving from the older States to the newer States still continue to be citizens of the American Union—still contribute to its revenue, its greatness and its strength—while our exodus consists of people who leave this country, desert their native land, and go to the United States instead of going to our North-West. Consequently, the argument had no application whatever. The hon. gentleman said we were not ashamed to cite the figures of the American immigration agents. Well, Sir, our friends opposite were not ashamed to cite them once. They were not ashamed to cite the self-same returns which they characterize now as totally unreliable. They founded arguments upon those returns from 1874 to 1878. They accused my hon. friend, on these returns, of having introduced a policy which was ruining Canada, of being unable to retain in Canada the thousands upon thousands who were deserting this country. The statistics which my hon. friends opposite adopted and vouched for from 1874 to 1878, were made by the same man that the hon. member now denounces as being entirely unreliable. Why? Because they do not tell the story he would wish them to tell. Because they tell us that, though a hundred and thirty thousand people emigrated under the *régime* of my hon. friend from East York, over four hundred thousand have emigrated since. While referring to this exodus question, I may say that an attempt has been made to place my friend to the right in a false position, by speaking of him as having used these statistics when he did not use them at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not one.

Mr. CHARLTON. He took returns from various municipalities in Canada, and compared the population at one period with the population at another period; he took the census of the school population, he took the children attending schools, he took the population in the municipalities, and from the data supplied by these returns, he made his estimates, without any reference whatever to the statistics of the United States officials. The hon. member for Cardwell also stated that the Government, in every change it had made in the land regulations, had made a change for the better. I am willing to allow that there is a degree of truth in that, because the regulations at first were so utterly and villainously bad that they could not be made worse, and, when a clamour arose in the North-West and could be no longer resisted, the Government made some slight concession to public opinion; so the regulations have been slightly modified from time to time, and modified for the better. He told us that any company can now get a charter in the North-West for a railway in any direction, except across that belt of 15 miles. That is the very direction for which they want charters, the very part of the country over which they want to run; that is the wall which prevents their having communication with their neighbours in the south, and prevents their having railway connection and competition by

competing lines. So long as that 15-mile belt interposes itself between the people of the North-West and the American competing roads, so long the complete and entire monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway is maintained.

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

### After Recess.

### THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 56) to empower the bondholders of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company to vote at meetings of the Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was about to enter for a few moments into the consideration of the question of agricultural protection. The Finance Minister, last year, was very modest in his claims as to the amount of the benefit that had been derived by the farmers of this country from protection. He claimed, I think, that the grower of wheat at that time received an advantage of 2 cents per bushel in consequence of the duty on grain; and this, if my memory serves me, was the only direct advantage the hon. gentleman claimed as accruing to the agricultural population from the operation of the duty. I took occasion, very soon afterwards, to demonstrate that the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken as to any advantage that the farmers derived from the duty on grain. I demonstrated; that, so far from the farmers at that time receiving an advantage of 2 cents per bushel in the price of wheat, on the contrary, wheat in all American markets was higher at that moment than it was in corresponding Canadian markets. I showed that wheat, No. 2 Spring, in Chicago, was at that time as high as in Toronto. That oats, barley, peas and rye were higher in American than in corresponding Canadian markets, and that the same was true with regard to butter and cheese; in short, no advantage whatever accrued to the farmers of Canada at that time from the imposition of the duties upon grain. We have always admitted, Mr. Speaker, that a duty upon grain imported for consumption would affect the price of the article. We have always maintained, also, that on any grain of which we raised a surplus for exportation, the duty could not affect the price. This being true, it follows as a matter of course, that a duty imposed upon Indian corn affects the price of that article, because we imported largely in excess of exportation for consumption. But the interference of the Government, by levying a duty on Indian corn, is an interference that results in injury to the farmers. We import Indian corn simply because that grain is much cheaper than our coarse grains. Our farmers sell a corresponding quantity of barley, rye, oats and peas, at relatively higher prices than they pay for the corn, and the result is large profits to the farmers of the country. I estimated, in 1876, that the importation of 6,300,000 bushels of corn and its equivalent in corn meal, resulted in a gain to Canada of \$1,400,000. By the importation of that corn, at an average price of 51 cents per bushel we were able to sell our entire surplus of peas and oats and 1,700,000 bushels of barley, which would otherwise have been consumed in the country, in the place of 6,300,000 bushels of corn imported. We actually made, after making fair allowance for transportation charges on the corn coming in and the coarse grains going out, a profit of \$1,400,000. That is the reason, and the simple

reason, why this country imports Indian corn. We might feed with our own coarse grains, but that feed would be dearer than the corn, and it is of course better to feed with cheap grain if it answers the purpose just as well. We have always maintained that the duty on wheat could not affect the price, except during a year when we failed to raise an amount sufficient for our own consumption, and the whole course of quotations since this policy was inaugurated—and I have made it a study to follow them, so that at public meetings I could show the operations, or rather the want of operations of the grain duties—shows that the price of wheat and all other grains, except corn, has been higher in American than in relative Canadian markets. It is now asserted that we have a short crop, that we have not raised wheat enough during the past year for our own consumption. If that is the case, then the duty will operate to raise the price of wheat, if we import it for consumption. The hon. gentleman claims that the duty now affords our farmers an advantage of from 8 to 10 cents per bushel on wheat. Why does it not afford an advantage of 15 cents the amount of the duty? The hon. gentleman did not make that claim for an obvious reason. The duty on flour is 50 cents per barrel, equivalent to 10 cents per bushel on wheat. He has arranged the Tariff so as to discriminate against the miller, for while the Tariff pretends to give a protection of 15 cents, it affords a protection of but 10 cents. But the hon. gentleman is mistaken in his opinion, that the farmers are deriving an advantage of 8 or 10 cents per bushel on wheat in consequence of the duty. The truth is, the farmers are deriving no such advantage. I have compiled the quotations for March 5th, as contained in the newspapers, and I find the following result:

QUOTATIONS, 5th MARCH, 1884.

No. 1 Spring Wheat.

Toronto..... \$1.10. Buffalo, Duluth..... \$1.14

No. 2 Spring.

Toronto..... \$1.08. Buffalo..... \$1.11  
Chicago..... 92 cents each.

No. 2 Red Winter.

Toronto..... \$1.06. Toledo..... \$1.01  
Oswego white and red, \$1 to \$1.12.

Barley.

Toronto No. 1..... 67 cents. Oswego No 1..... 85 cents.

Rye.

Toronto..... 60 cents. Oswego..... 67 cents in bond.  
Chicago..... 58½ cents.

Oats.

Toronto..... 36 cts. per 34 lbs. Chicago, 32½ cts. per 32 lbs.  
Toledo..... 35½ cts. per 32 lbs. Oswego..... 43 cts. per 32 lbs.  
Buffalo..... 42 cts. per 32 lbs.

Peas.

Toronto No. 2..... 74 cts. Oswego..... 85 cts.

We find from these quotations that the difference in price for No. 2 spring wheat between Chicago and Toronto is 16 cts. That is very little, if any more, than the freight charges. So that at this moment, as between those two points, the Canadian farmer is not enjoying any advantage from higher prices at Toronto as compared with Chicago. The margin on No. 2 red, between Toledo and Toronto is 5 cents, which is less than the freight. The margin on wheat between Buffalo or Oswego and Toronto is the other way. The margin on barley is in favour of Oswego by 18 cents; rye by 7 cents in bond, oats by 7 cents, and peas by 21 cents. This shows conclusively that the farmers of this country are not at this moment receiving any appreciable advantage from the duty on grain. Wheat may be a fraction higher than it would be without the duty, but the price cannot be more than 2 or 3 cents higher than otherwise it would be. It may be that the difference will be greater. In spring it may be greater, when the stock is exhausted in the country, when the farmers' granaries are empty, when the wheat has all passed

Mr. CHARLTON.

into the hands of the millers, then it may be higher by the amount of the duty on flour. The increase in the price of wheat will then come just at the time when the farmers will not be benefited.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The last two or three months it has been so.

Mr. CHARLTON. The quotations shows that it has not been so. They show that the farmer is not deriving any appreciable benefit, and I say that he will not derive any appreciable benefit at the time when he has any wheat to sell. The quotations show that other grains are higher in American markets than here; they show that agricultural protection is one of the most transparent humbugs ever palmed off on a confiding public.

An hon. MEMBER. What did you think about it in 1878?

Mr. CHARLTON. I never advocated so palpable an absurdity as a duty on agricultural products, or asserted that the farmers could be benefited by protection on the grain they raise in this country.

So much for agricultural protection. I shall now refer briefly in conclusion to a few leading facts in connection with the financial policy of my hon. friend. Sir, I think I may reasonably assert that all the promises made by that hon. gentleman, with regard to the advantages afforded by agricultural protection, have been dissipated into thin air. So far as the duties are concerned, it cannot be shown, it never has been shown, that the farmers have derived the slightest advantage from his protective duties. Then I may remind the hon. gentleman that some few years ago, while my hon. friends at my right held portfolios, he asserted that \$23,000,000 was as much as should be expended annually by this country, and yet the hon. gentleman in the face of that declaration, has carried up the expenditure of Canada to \$31,000,000. The hon. gentleman promised to cure the evil of an adverse balance of trade, and in the face of that promise we have an adverse balance of trade last year of \$18,000,000, and this year of nearly double that amount. Last year he contracted for seven years' prosperity; he assured us that we were sure of seven years' good times, and yet the policy which was to secure that prosperity, when the slightest stress is placed upon it, shows signs of failure. He has succeeded, in four short years, by the legitimate operation of the protective policy, in overdoing one of the great industries of this country, so that it is in danger of disaster. He was to create a home market for the farmers, which was to absorb all the productions of the soil, and yet in the face of that promise we have an increased exportation of food, of grain, of flour and meal, by a sum of \$32,000,000, since the hon. gentleman came into office. We have increased it 55 per cent. in the face of the promise that he was to afford the farmers a home market for their productions. He was to exclude foreign goods by his policy, and yet, despite his promise, we have actually gone on increasing the importations of goods susceptible of manufacture in this country to the extent of 79 per cent., as compared with the importations of 1879. He was to raise wages, yet in the face of that pledge it was shown by the gentleman who furnished him statistics in regard to cotton manufacture, that the wages of cotton operatives have fallen from \$245 a year, in 1879, to \$194 in 1883. He was to give us good times. I remember well, when the hon. member assured us in this House, that good times had come to stay. Well, Sir, I think the hon. gentleman assumed rather more power than belonged to any mortal man in this matter. I think he arrogated to himself a degree of influence which no man in this House or out of it possesses. Yes, Sir; good times were come to stay. He looked abroad and saw the reparation of the waste of war, the settlement of commercial difficulties in the

United States, after a long period of depression, which affected them as well as us—he saw these damages repaired; he saw commerce and manufactures resuming their wonted course, and, looking complacently at us, he said: Behold the effect of the National Policy! He saw our fields waving with abundant harvests, our farmers gathering in crops larger than were known for years, and then, with the same degree of complacency, he pointed to the National Policy. In fact, the hon. gentleman arrogated to himself blessings which are dispensed by Providence alone, and I fear Providence may yet punish the hon. gentleman for his presumption, by showing him how weak and poor a creature man is at best, and how shortsighted are all his assumptions of wisdom and power. We have evidence of this in the fact that this vaunted policy cannot stand the slightest strain—that it can stand an infinitely less strain than did the policy of my hon. friends beside me, when they occupied the Treasury benches during the five years, from 1873 to 1878. It is a policy whose inherent weakness is that it increases waste by useless taxation, and by large incidental taxation. It taxes everyone directly more than is required, and indirectly its taxes are twice those which are taken from the people directly. And Sir, when a succession of good harvests is interrupted, when the \$40,000,000 which are to be added to the public debt of Canada, in consequence of the so called loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in consequence of the additional subsidy to be granted to that road, and when the necessity for heavier taxation arises, as it will inevitably arise, when the full proportions and the actual character of the monopolies which have been created by this Government have been made apparent to this country, then the people will remember, if they do not now remember, that the taxation of the people of Canada from Customs and Excise, in the last year of the late Administration, was only \$1.34 per head, while it is now \$6.65 per head, or an increase of more than 50 per cent. They will then remember that these hon. gentlemen managed the affairs of the country during a great commercial crisis, during a long period of severe depression, which existed over the whole world—they will remember that they managed the affairs of this country with prudence, that they strongly maintained that economy which should be maintained by every Government; that they went out of office having increased the expenditure but slightly since they came in, and they will remember their ingratitude in 1878, for having withheld their confidence from the only Government who managed the affairs of this country with honesty for a generation.

Mr. DUNDAS. I had not intended to make any remarks on this question, at this time, but for some of the statements of the last speaker. I thought, Sir, that every person who reads the newspapers, knew that the price of wheat in Canada has very materially been advanced by means of the protective duty which has been imposed. If the hon. gentleman who has just sat down had read the *Globe* to-day, and had taken its report of the price of wheat in Chicago and in Toronto, and had intelligently instituted a comparison, I think he would have seen that the statement which he made was incorrect—that the farmers derive no benefit from the imposition of the duty. The *Globe* of to-day states that the price of spring wheat No. 2, in Chicago, yesterday was 91½ cents, against \$1.08 in Toronto, for same grade, leaving a difference of about 16½ cents a bushel in favour of Toronto. Now, the freight from Chicago to Toronto, I think, is about 7 cents a bushel. This would leave the difference in favour of Toronto at about 9½ cents a bushel. If it were not for that duty, why would the price of wheat be higher in Toronto to-day than the price in Chicago, plus the freight from the latter place? It is entirely due to the duty which has been imposed. I

am not going to discuss the question at present whether it is better for the country that the price of wheat should be high or low. The farmers of Ontario who have wheat to sell, of course, desire to have the price as high as possible, while those who consume wheat desire to have it cheap. But I think I can establish, not by the isolated case of to-day, but by taking the price of wheat at those points for the last eight or nine years, and striking an average, that the price of wheat has been advanced in Canada by the protection which has been afforded since 1879. I have the figures in detail, showing the average price of wheat in Toronto and in Chicago, each alternate week for the last eight years. I shall not go into the details, but have struck an average, and will give the House the result. In 1875, the average price of No. 2 spring wheat was \$1.01½ in Toronto, and \$1.02½ in Chicago; in 1876, it was \$1.03½ in Toronto, and \$1.02½ in Chicago; in 1877, \$1.32 in Toronto, and \$1.22 in Chicago; in 1878, 96½ in Toronto, and 97 cents in Chicago, and in 1879, until the 15th of March, the date of the imposition of the duty, 84 cents in Toronto, and 87 cents in Chicago. Taking the average for those five years, we find that the average in Toronto was \$1.03½ and in Chicago \$1.02½, or 1 cent more in Toronto than in Chicago. Now let us see what the average was during the five years next succeeding the imposition of the duty. In 1879, that is, from the date of the imposition of the duty to the end of the year, the average price was \$1.02½ in Toronto, and \$1.02½ in Chicago; in 1880, it was \$1.17½ in Toronto, and \$1.05 in Chicago; in 1881, \$1.23 in Toronto, and \$1.14½ in Chicago; in 1882, \$1.20½ in Toronto, and \$1.15 in Chicago, and in 1883, \$1.08½ in Toronto, and \$1.01½ in Chicago. If I had gone over the first two months of this year, I could have shown that the difference during that time was still greater. Now, striking an average of those five years, we find that the average price was \$1.14½ in Toronto, against \$1.07½ in Chicago. Thus we find that during the five years next preceding the imposition of the duty, the difference was 1 cent a bushel in favour of Toronto, while during the five years next succeeding the imposition of the duty the difference was 7½ cents in favour of Toronto. Now, what makes this difference? It is nothing else than the duty which keeps American wheat out. But it may be asked, why is the difference not greater than 7½ cents when the duty on wheat is 15 cents a bushel? Simply for the reason that flour, upon which the duty is lower than on wheat, is imported instead. As I said before, I do not wish to argue the point as to whether a high or a low price of wheat is for the benefit of the country; but the point I want to make, and to emphasize, is, that but for the imposition of the duty on wheat, the average price of wheat in Toronto, for the last five years, would have been from 7 to 8 cents a bushel less than it has been. I do not think you will find a farmer in Ontario, no matter what his politics are, who desires to have the duty taken off wheat to-day, and when I say that, I know what I am saying; I believe that the grangers, a majority of whom support hon. gentlemen opposite, are every day sending petitions to this Parliament, praying that the duty may not be taken off wheat.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Until it is taken off flour also.

Mr. DUNDAS. I quite concede that it would be fairer for the millers as well as for the farmers if the duty on wheat and flour were equalized, by making the duty on flour proportional to the duty on wheat, which would be about 75 cents a barrel. But I would rather leave the Tariff as it is, than have the duty on wheat reduced. I have desired to make this statement to settle this question once for all, but more particularly because of a remark made by a paper which is supposed to be impartial in politics; I refer to the *Monetary Times*. I saw a statement in that paper a few weeks ago, to the effect that the imposition of the duty on

wheat could in no wise affect the price in Canada, inasmuch as that the price in Canada was regulated by the price in Liverpool. That would be the case, provided we had to look to that port for a market; but, as is known by every person in the trade, this year at least, we have a market at home for all and more than all the wheat that has been produced within the Dominion.

**Mr. MILLS.** According to the observations made by the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Cardwell, and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House, we on this side have been guilty of the atrocious offence of telling the truth in regard to the actual condition and circumstances of the country. There is no doubt that it is not always easy to interest the public in questions of trade and commerce, or in a discussion of the general principles of policy which ought to govern the country in questions of this kind. But the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, knew how advantageous it was to take advantage of the depressed condition of the country, in order to attack with success its fiscal policy, and it seems to me that at present we have a favourable condition of things for a consideration of the policy of the Administration upon its merits. While the great majority of our people are prosperous, while trade is healthy, while the profits of the farmers are good and the prices are fair, it is not easy to interest them in questions which are really of very considerable importance to them, and it is only when the affairs of the country are straitened, when trade is depressed, that they are able to fully appreciate, and are willing to consider the important questions such as those relating to the fiscal policy of the Administration. We know what arguments were addressed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, the present Prime Minister, many years ago, and by those who were associated with him in the discussion of this question. The hon. gentleman, in 1878, proposed a resolution, in which he declared there were thousands of people leaving Canada because of their inability to obtain employment here.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** The resolution did not say so.

**Mr. MILLS.** The resolution did say that there were thousands of people leaving Canada because of their inability to obtain employment nearer home, and the hon. gentleman proposed to increase the taxation of this country for the purpose of keeping out foreign products and for the purpose of enabling the people of Canada to engage in manufactures and find a home market for the products of those industrial establishments. We heard nothing then of the unpatriotic character of a course of this sort, nor did we complain. We contested the accuracy of those statements, we contest their accuracy still; but now, when the condition of the country has been changed, when the promises then made have not been fulfilled, when the predictions then made in reference to the effects of this policy have not been verified, we hear hon. gentlemen opposite complain of hon. gentlemen on this side who repeat, as to the present conditions of things, those very statements made by the hon. First Minister in the resolution he then proposed. He then stated that thousands of people were leaving Canada because of their inability to obtain employment. But to-day the number out of employment is at least three times as great as when the hon. gentleman declared, and we say incorrectly declared, this to be the condition that then existed. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite say that we are unpatriotic, that we are seeking to decry the country, that we are seeking to prevent capital coming here as an investment, and that we are seeking to keep away immigration from the country. Well, if we look at the present condition of things in the towns and cities of this country, I think no great damage would be done at the present time if a large number of immigrants did not come here, under the existing circum-

**Mr. DUNDAS.**

stances. I believe at present we have a very large number of people who are out of employment, who are perfectly willing to work, but the work is not to be had; and it does seem to me that, under these circumstances, even if the charge were true, and we were successful in keeping away labourers from Canada at present, we should do no great damage to the country. Now, the hon. Minister of Finance, in his Budget Speech this Session, repeated the same statements that he made when he introduced his policy in 1879. He then said, as his leader said before, that Canada was, in 1878, and under the Administration of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), made a sacrifice market; yet he tells us to-day that although Canada was then a sacrifice market to such an extent that the manufacturers in this country were unable to sell their products in competition with the products brought in from abroad, we are to-day in a much more prosperous condition and our people are supplied with the goods which they consume at a cheaper rate than ever before; in fact, the hon. gentleman has been all along saying that bad as the sacrifice market was, or that good as it was for the people of this country to get their goods at a low price, they get their goods to-day at still lower prices than they did then, when the prices were ruinous to the Canadian manufacturers. Those ruinous prices of that day have no such ruinous effect now, and although prices are lower now and wages are higher, those engaged in manufacturing pursuits are reaping handsome profits which they could not reap in a better market, and when their goods commanded higher prices. In the first place, I have never been able to understand the proposition which the Finance Minister and hon. gentlemen opposite put forward on that occasion, and have repeated from time to time ever since. I can understand how the people might be injured by getting less for a commodity than it is worth, but how they were injured by buying their goods at less than their actual value—by getting too much for their money, I cannot understand, nor has the hon. Finance Minister ever yet explained it to the country. If the American manufacturers sent their goods to Canada and sold them for less than they were worth, I can understand how the American manufacturers might be injured—I can understand how they might sustain a loss, but I have never been able to understand how the people of Canada were injured in consequence of that policy. Then we were told by these hon. gentlemen that the American manufacturers and others were sending their goods in here and making Canada a slaughter market. Well, if you will look back at the condition of the country at that time, you will find that the importations into Canada were nearly \$40,000,000 less than they were a few years before, and these gentlemen have never yet told us how it is, if the \$128,000,000 worth of foreign products coming into Canada do not displace the Canadian manufacturers, how these manufacturers could have injured them when the importations were less by \$40,000,000. They said the country was prosperous in 1873. Then we were importing \$128,000,000 worth of goods. The hon. Finance Minister told us that we had every reason to believe that the country would continue to prosper, year after year, not by the restriction of its trade, but by increased importations and increased exportations. In 1877 these hon. gentlemen told us, and they have repeated the same thing from time to time since, that we were to be helped by high taxation; that we were to impose high taxes for the purpose of making this country prosperous. Well, at that very time the United States had a system of high taxation, and Free Trade policy prevailed in England, as it does to-day, and yet, where there was a policy of Free Trade and where there was a policy of high taxation there was alike depression. And, when we find all over the civilized world the condition of

trade depressed, irrespective of the fiscal policy of the Government, I think we have in this condition of things a very good evidence that the depressed condition of commerce throughout the world in no degree arose from the fiscal policy of the Administration. At all events, it was the bounden duty of those gentlemen, before they adopted the change they proposed, to show us that a better condition of things would arise from the policy which they proposed. We asked them again and again, at that time, if Canada was to be helped by a policy of high taxes, how it was that a system of high taxation had not prevented depression in the United States. Those hon. gentlemen have never undertaken to show how that could be. They recommended this policy, but they did not show that it was a proper remedy for the condition of things that then existed. When we look at the circumstance of Canada, we have no difficulty in pointing out the causes of the depression which prevailed. We know that, in consequence of the depression in the United States and in England, we were unable to find a market for our lumber. The thousands of men who were employed in our lumber woods ceased to obtain employment. There was not the usual quantity of lumber cut; there was not the usual amount exported. The people of the United States who were engaged in manufacturing pursuits, who bought our lumber for the purpose of making new mills and cottages, for the purpose of extending their manufacturing establishments and giving shelter to their employes, discontinued their operations. Many of those manufacturing establishments were closed. These people were thrown out of employment. Those who were engaged as operatives in those establishments were obliged to leave the cities and migrate beyond the Mississippi River and engage in agricultural pursuits, so that we ceased to have a market for our lumber, and, in all those districts of Canada where the population were depending upon this particular branch of industry, we know that the trade of the country was depressed, and that a depressed condition of industry prevailed. But, in the western section of Ontario, where the population is largely dependent upon agriculture, where the crops were fairly good, and the markets were in their usual condition, the depression was not felt; and it is well known to almost every resident of the country west of Toronto that we felt no depression, except for a few months in the autumn, or the latter part of the year 1879. When the Finance Minister, the other day, asked us whether the trade of the country or the condition of the country was not more depressed in every part of the country in 1878 than it was at the present time, I said it was not. I know that that is the case. I know, at the present time, that the people of the western portion of Ontario feel the commercial depression, the industrial depression, during the present year to a larger extent than they have during the past twenty years; and I have no doubt whatever that the importations of the country and the amount of revenue collected during the remaining portion of this year, will show that that is the case. Now, when we know that depression existed everywhere, it is perfectly obvious that it was absurd to attribute that depression to the fiscal policy of the Administration. As I have already said, the lumber market in the valley of the Ottawa and other portions of Canada was depressed. Those who usually depended upon the cutting of lumber for employment were without employment, and those who supplied them with their goods did not find their usual market. Everyone in this city knows that Sussex street was during that period deserted, that those who furnished the lumbermen with their boots and shoes and their clothing were unable to sell those goods, and they were unable to sell them for the very reason that the lumbermen had ceased to employ those parties for the purpose of cutting their logs in the lumber woods. Well, this was precisely the condition of things in

other branches of industry. When we examined Mr. Frost and others who were engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements, and in supplying the farmers in the valley of the Ottawa, they told us that the farmers here were unable to pay them. They said: We have our hay and oats in our barns, but we have not our usual market; we sold those products to those who were engaged in the lumber trade, but the trade being dull, they are not required. Well, what was required to change this condition of things? Was it additional taxes upon the population? Not at all. It was revival of the trade, and when we called the lumbermen together and asked them what remedy they proposed to remove the condition of things of which they complained, they said they had no remedy; they proposed nothing; they wished for a revival of the lumber trade, and they were obliged to wait until times became prosperous again in the United States and the United Kingdom. Then those hon. gentlemen, although they told us of the depression that existed and the remedy they proposed, failed to look at the parties who were suffering and whose business was depressed. Now, we had at that time facilities for obtaining information which do not exist at the present time. The Insolvent Act was in operation; there were official assignees in every part of the country; when persons who engaged in business failed, we could apply to the official assignees to ascertain who they were, what their avocations were, and the amount for which they failed, and we obtained returns from every portion of Canada, from British Columbia to Halifax. What do those returns show? They show that those who were engaged in commercial business were those who were suffering; it was not the manufacturing class. The First Minister, in the resolution which he proposed to Parliament, declared that it was the manufacturing classes who were suffering, and that the policy proposed was a policy in their interest; that was necessary in order to revive trade, in order to get rid of the depression that then existed. But when we look at the facts, we find that was not the case. We find that very few manufacturers failed. Now, I have taken the trouble of going over the returns we then obtained, and I will read some of these figures to the House. I find that fourteen dealers in coal failed for \$317,000; sixteen commission merchants, for \$427,000; one engaged in the sale of crockery, for \$36,000; 125 engaged in the sale of dry goods, for \$4,800,000; twenty druggists, for \$80,000; twelve dealers in fancy dry goods, for \$167,000; 122 grocers, for \$1,500,000; thirty-two hardware merchants, for \$3,000,000; 327 general merchants, for \$2,200,000; forty merchant tailors, for \$536,000; twenty-eight jewellers for \$430,000; four leather merchants, for \$489,000; two paper merchants, for \$108,000; one sugar importer, for \$128,000; one general importer, for \$160,000, making 745 failures for \$15,000,000, in round numbers. Now, Sir, when we look at the class of manufacturers, we find that they were in a comparatively prosperous condition; that among the cotton manufacturers, one failed for \$7,000; that among the woolen manufacturers, three failed for \$30,000; that among the sewing machine manufacturers, one failed for \$99,000, and that those who failed for the largest amounts, the carriage makers, the foundrymen and the boot and shoe makers, were those who had little or no competition from abroad. Eleven foundrymen failed for \$324,000; thirty carriage makers, for \$210,000; sixty-five boot and shoe makers, for \$840,000, and of all the manufacturers of Canada together, in a single year, the failures amounted to less than one-twelfth the amount of failures of the mercantile classes. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Government proposes a remedy for the depressed condition of things, for what class should their remedy provide? Certainly for those who were suffering. Now, the fiscal policy of the hon. gentlemen, from 1878 until to-day, is a policy to provide for those who are comparatively prosperous. There was, perhaps, no class in

Canada that, during the period of depression, weathered the storm with more success than the manufacturing class. And why? Because their business had adjusted itself to the circumstances of the country, had grown out of the wants and interests of the population, and had received no artificial stimulus, or none to a perceptible extent. It had grown with sufficient rapidity to meet the wants of the country, and the result was, that when a period of depression came, it was enabled to live quite as well as any other branch of industry in which the population of this country was engaged. When we look at the circumstances of the country, we see why it was that the mercantile classes suffered during that period of depression. Their sales had largely fallen off. The population of the country consumed, of imported goods, during the years of prosperity, or of inflation, \$128,000,000, while in 1878 they consumed \$91,000,000 worth. The number of merchants had not diminished. Those who were engaged in carrying on the trade of the country and in distributing those products, were the same in number as before; but when the business of the country, including home products as well as imported goods, had fallen off more than 50 per cent., it is perfectly obvious that this would injuriously affect a very large class of the population. A man may fairly live on the profits of a trade of \$10,000 a year, but may be driven into bankruptcy if you take off 30 per cent. of his sales, and precisely so it was during this period of depression. The sales made by the merchants had largely fallen off, and the result was that a large number of them had not sufficient profits to enable them to continue in business. This being the case, what then was required in order to get rid of this condition of things? Clearly to lighten their burdens. But what did gentlemen opposite say? Why Sir, the Government came down with the proposition to impose additional burdens upon the mercantile class—those who were barely able to keep their heads above water. The more they suffered the greater the burdens the Government imposed upon them. The Government took from those who had not and gave to those who had in abundance. They proposed to help the class who did not suffer at the expense of those who felt, in a serious and marked degree, the depression which prevailed. Now, Sir, when a protective policy prevailed for many years in the United Kingdom, I do not remember a single instance—I say no such instance existed—where, during a period of depression, a Government proposed to relieve the mercantile class from that depression from which they were suffering by the imposition of additional taxes upon them. I say the proper remedy, under these circumstances, no matter what may be the views of this House or the country as to the fiscal policy that ought to be pursued, at other times—the proper remedy was to lighten the burdens of taxation, had this been possible, instead of imposing additional taxes upon the population. What do we find here as the result? Why, Sir, when the hon. gentleman, who is at present the Finance Minister, proposed additional burdens on the population of this country, we find that the number of failures during the first year of his policy was greater, and the amount the aggregate amount larger than in previous years. The amount in 1879 reached nearly \$30,000,000, a sum larger by several millions than in any other year during that depression.

Mr. HESSON. It was the wind up of your bad policy.

Mr. MILLS. I do not hear the hon. gentleman. Now, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen are telling the country that the manufacturing industries of Canada are due to the fiscal policy they adopted. Why, what are the facts? Take the case of the cotton industry. When my hon. friend for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came into office in 1873, we find that the number of pounds of raw cotton manufactured in Canada was 1,700,000; and when he retired from office, the number of pounds manufactured in Canada was 9,000,000, a

Mr. MILLS.

four-fold increase during five years. It seems to me that was a very rapid growth of a manufacturing industry; it was a growth quite rapid enough for a prosperous period, and any additional stimulus was, under the circumstances, a very hazardous experiment. Now, let us look at the condition of things which existed in Canada in 1878, with regard to manufactures. In the case of agricultural implements, we manufactured upwards of 95 per cent. of those that were purchased by the population of this country; of boots and shoes, 99.1 per cent.—almost the whole consumption of the country. The people of Canada purchased, *per capita*, \$4.63 worth of boots and shoes of domestic manufacture, and  $\frac{1}{10}$  of 1 cent *per capita* of those that were manufactured abroad. Well, Sir, it is not necessary to argue that the boot and shoe manufactures could not be helped by additional taxes. Then, in the case of cabinet ware—upwards of 99 per cent. was manufactured in Canada. In the case of carriages, 99 per cent.; in the manufactures of machinery, 93 per cent.; in the case of saddles and harness, 98 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.; in the case of woollen goods, 84 per cent.; in stone and marble cutting, 97 per cent.; in merchant tailoring, 95 per cent.; in the manufacture of paper, 82 per cent.; in the manufacture of brooms and brushes, 95 per cent.; in the manufacture of cheese, 93 per cent.; in the manufacture of ropes and twine, 94.1 per cent.; in the manufacture of rubber, 81 per cent. So we find that all those industries which I have mentioned were in a prosperous condition, and so far from being driven out of the Canadian market by goods brought in from abroad and slaughtered, they had nearly the entire Canadian market to themselves. If you look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, you find the difference between consumption and importation, in years of prosperity and depression, is about 30 per cent., so it is perfectly obvious that if we manufacture all the goods required during years of prosperity there would be a considerable industrial disturbance in years of depression, and it has never been of advantage to this country and never will be—unless we can find foreign markets for our surplus products—to press forward our manufactures more rapidly than they were being developed under the moderate Tariff which formerly existed. Hon. gentleman opposite told the country that if they came into power they would remedy the condition of things which prevailed. I have already pointed out the cause of the depression. It was the want of our usual foreign market. One country dealing with another is very like a merchant dealing with his customers, and his prosperity largely depends upon their good fortune and success. It is impossible, in these modern times, when exchanges of commodities are largely carried on between countries, that one country can remain prosperous while the industry of other countries is very greatly depressed. If Canada suffered from depression between 1874 and 1880, it was not due to any want of wisdom in the conduct of its public affairs; it was due entirely to circumstances over which the Government had no control, the condition of things which prevailed elsewhere, and so soon as trade abroad revived, so soon as we had a good foreign market for the products of our forests, soil and fisheries, the trade of this country revived, our industries revived, the products of labour were increased and the purchasing power of the country was correspondingly increased. The hon. Finance Minister told us, in 1879, as he has told us every year since, that one important object to be obtained by this policy was the exclusion of foreign products. I always supposed that it was an advantage to a community to purchase whatever they could obtain by the products of labour cheaper than they could produce it by that labour. If we can produce, with a smaller amount of capital and labour, certain goods elsewhere and obtain for them a larger amount of other commodities than a similar amount of labour and capital would produce here, it is an advantage to us to engage in the exchange. It is on that principle that the industries and trade of a country are promoted and

it is on that principle that trade is carried on between one country and another. If hon. gentlemen opposite were correct in the views they entertained, then the public works in which they engaged are certainly a very great calamity. The effect of railways and canals is to cheapen transportation and do away with the natural protection which exists between distant points. It seems a most extraordinary state of mind, first, to assume that those public works are of consequence and advantage to the community, and then to impose duties and place impediments in the way of their free use. That is what we are engaged in doing at this moment. Then, the hon. gentlemen told us, as they did in 1879, and have done every year since, that they were going to put an end to our foreign trade; they were going to destroy all those branches of industry or trade in articles which could be produced in this country. They were going to put an end to the importation of cottons, woollen goods, the cheaper kinds of porcelain; they were going to engage in the production of steel and iron—they were going to do all these things for the purpose of diminishing the imports, for they said our imports are far too large. In my opinion if we produced exports with which to pay for imports, we were as well employed as if we had obtained those particular branches of industry, and produced the articles imported. If we import more than we consume and cannot pay for the goods, it is a very bad business for those who trust us; but is not a bad thing for us, materially, whatever it may be morally. If we purchase several millions worth of goods abroad, while we do not produce anything to pay for them, it is perfectly obvious that those who trust us are not liable to trust us very long. I have never yet been able to understand how hon. gentlemen opposite believe we can carry on a prosperous trade and export millions more than we import. What do the Trade and Navigation Returns show? They show that the years of the greatest depression are the years in which the exports are relatively larger, and the years of the greatest prosperity are the years in which our imports are largely in excess of our exports. Why? Because they are years of our greatest profits. The merchant who ships 50,000 bushels of grain in Montreal, for \$50,000, and sends it to Liverpool and sells it at a profit in Liverpool, must bring back more than \$50,000 worth of goods. If he makes a profit of \$5,000, he will bring back \$55,000 worth of goods; if the ship founders at sea, he will have exported \$50,000 and imported nothing. According to the calculations of the Finance Minister, that would indicate a prosperous condition of the country. Again, what the Government promised has not been fulfilled. Better prices have not been obtained for our products. They vary from year to year, as they did before. The relative prices, as compared with the United States, are the same as they were before the duties were imposed. None of the promises in that respect have been fulfilled. Then we do not find that the people have a home market, as was promised them. Their products are sent abroad, as they were before. Wheat, cattle, sheep, horses, the products of the mine and of the fisheries are sent abroad now, as they were before this policy was adopted. We do not find towns turning into cities, villages into towns, and hamlets into villages. We do not find these manufacturing establishments within sight of every farmer in Canada, as these gentlemen promised we would find. None of these promises have been fulfilled. These hon. gentlemen told us that the late Government were responsible for the depression which existed, and that they were flies on the wheel because they could not remedy it. Yet we find, in spite of this National Policy, in spite of all the efforts these gentlemen put forward, that the condition of depression is again returning; that trade is stagnant, that labourers are out of employment; and we find what we did not find before, manufacturing establishments closed all over the country. The condition

of things is one not at all to be desired. They told us, too, that no man would have to leave Canada in order to obtain employment. At the present time thousands are obliged to leave to obtain employment. These gentlemen said, when, according to the American returns, only 23,000 were leaving Canada, that it was because they could not obtain employment. Put us in power, they said, and we will remedy these things. The present Minister of Railways told us that men were not fit to occupy the Treasury benches who could not produce such a condition of things as would prevent the young men of Canada leaving the country and expatriating themselves in the United States. What is the condition of things now? Why, Sir, the emigration has reached the enormous number of 117,000 in a single year. The number of people who leave Canada now is at least three times as great as during the period of the Administration of the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). During the whole period of the late Administration, there were 120,437 people left Canada, according to the returns of the Bureau of Statistics in Washington. During 1881, under hon. gentlemen opposite, there were 117,000 left Canada, or within 3,000 as many in a single year as during the whole five years of the late Administration, according to the same authority. And, Sir, I have no doubt that that authority is very nearly accurate. I know it has been questioned by the Minister of Agriculture, but I trust that before this Session ends we will have an opportunity of discussing that question, when I think it will be conclusively shown that the statistics given by the Bureau at Washington are very nearly accurate, and that the statistics put before the country by the Minister of Agriculture are altogether wrong and misleading. Now, if these gentlemen are capable of fulfilling the promises which they made in 1878, and which they have repeated yearly from that time to this, the time has come when it is important that those should be redeemed. We know, Sir, that they have not been redeemed. We know that the condition of prosperity which has prevailed in this country, so far as it has prevailed, has not been on account of the policy of the Administration, but in spite of it. Hon. gentlemen told us, that if they were in power they would put an end to emigration. It has increased threefold. They told us that they would secure constant employment for the labouring classes. We know that thousands are out of employment at this moment. They declared that they would secure to capital a profitable investment. We know that there are millions invested at this day which are yielding no return to the owners. They said they would assist the agricultural classes, by securing to them better prices than prevailed before. We find that the prices, as compared with those of the United States, are to-day no better, and in some respects worse, than they were before this policy was adopted. I say, then, that in every one of these particulars the policy of the Administration has failed. Pledges that were given have not been redeemed, and the promises of economy which they gave have been wholly departed from. Why, Sir, when you look at the amount of money now required to carry on the Government of the country, and compare it with that which was required before, you see that many millions more are required at the present time to conduct the Government than was required in 1878. In every one of these particulars these hon. gentlemen have failed to fulfil the pledges which they have given to the country. They have failed to prevent that depression which they said could be prevented. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs called the members of the late Administration flies on the wheel. They said they were helpless—that they could do nothing to relieve the depressed condition of the industries of the country. They themselves are admitting, day by day, since this House has met, that they are flies on the wheel. They admit that they

cannot help the manufacturing classes. They admit that they cannot help the labouring classes. They admit that they can do nothing to give to the agriculturalists better prices for their products than they had before. They cannot do one of those things which they promised they would accomplish, if permitted to obtain control of the affairs of this country. Now, it seems to me, in looking at our financial circumstances, that we are in a very critical condition at this moment. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches have largely increased the burdens of the people. They have largely increased the annual expenditure of the Government, and prosperous times have favoured them with large amounts of revenue. We have every prospect, at this moment, of serious commercial depression. We have every prospect of a large falling off in the revenue of the country, and we have now threatening us a deficit which these hon. gentlemen declared ought not to occur under a Government, if the affairs of the country were efficiently administered. In my opinion, Sir, the taxation of the country ought to be imposed wholly with reference to the public interest and the public necessities. I have never said that a 15 per cent. Tariff was too small, or that a 20 per cent Tariff was too large. I say that the amount of Customs and Excise duties which we impose, should depend wholly on the necessities of the Government. If a 15 per cent. revenue is sufficient, no more taxation should be imposed; if 25 per cent. is required to conduct the affairs of the country and meet the obligations of the Government, when its affairs are economically administered, I am quite ready to impose a 25 per cent. Tariff. Whatever taxation is required to meet the public necessities, I am free to admit, the Government ought to impose. But beyond that they should not go. The present Administration, as its extravagant expenditures show, and as its large surplus shows, imposed burthens on the people altogether beyond the requirements of the State. These are not the only burthens the people have to bear. The Government have imposed taxes with special reference to taking out of the pockets of the people of this country a large amount that finds its way into the public Treasury. My hon. friend from South Huron has pointed that out very clearly. Why, Sir, foreign goods could not come in here at all, were it not that the people are paying an amount of taxes far beyond the amount that finds its way into the public Treasury. Look at the millions of cotton and woollen goods imported into this country; how do they find a market? By a corresponding increase in the price of the home article; otherwise, they could not be sold here at all, unless, indeed, they were sold at a loss. The revenue which the Government has derived during the last five years has been wholly dependent upon a corresponding increase in the price of the goods produced in this country; so that the people of Canada have paid taxes to the extent of many millions beyond those which are represented in the Public Accounts as finding their way into the public Treasury. In my opinion, Sir, the Government ought to impose the taxes in such a way as to make them press as lightly upon the trade and commerce of the country as possible. They should impose them in such a way as to distribute them over the country, so that each will pay, as nearly as may be, in proportion to his wealth, and that the people of the different Provinces will bear their fair proportions of the public burdens. We know that this is not done. We know that some portions of the population are paying taxes from which other portions are exempt. What is meant by the tax on breadstuffs? Is that not a tax on one section of this country that is not borne by another section? Are not the people of the Maritime Provinces subjected to a tax that the people in other parts of the Dominion are not called on to bear? What has been the statement of an hon. gentleman to-night? That the people of Canada, this year, have produced less breadstuffs than they require, and that the duties imposed by the Government have increased the price; so that

Mr. MILLS,

the people who are obliged to buy their bread have to pay, not merely the ordinary market price, but also a tax to the Government, from which other portions of the Dominion are exempt. I say that this is a grossly unjust method of taxation. Our whole fiscal system ought to be revised; and it seems to me, looking at the present condition of the country, that the time has come when we, on this side of the House, may fairly discuss this question with the hope that the public will seriously consider the character of our fiscal policy, and the mischievous consequences which flow from that policy upon the entire country.

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with attention to the speeches delivered by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, and by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who spoke this afternoon. I have listened to both of those hon. gentlemen with attention, yet with disappointment. I did expect that we should have had some variety, at least, in their speeches—that we should not have had the same old stories that have been repeated hereout year after year, ever since this National Policy has been debated on the floors of Parliament. I did expect that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), whose voice we have not heard here for some months, would have given us something new. I did expect that the hon. member for North Norfolk, who, in 1876 or 1877, delivered the most eloquent protectionist speech that has been delivered in Parliament, and who ever since has been delivering long and elaborate Free Trade arguments, and has to-night pronounced a protective policy to be a transparent humbug—I did suppose that a gentleman with such varied accomplishments would have given us something new. But neither hon. gentlemen has offered us anything but the same old stories which have been so often repeated. I have little to complain of in the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk; but in the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell, I have this to complain of—and I think the country will complain of it—that not once, but a number of times during his comparatively short speech, he has announced to the world that people are crowding out of this country for the want of employment. Sir, let me just say one word in respect to that. He tells us that he took his figures from the same authority from which they were taken for the years from 1874 to 1878, and that he finds that five times as many have gone out during the time the present Government have occupied the Treasury Benches as went out during the period of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS. No, no.

Mr. McLELAN. Well, it was three times as many, which is a sufficiently bad announcement to have made to the world. He should have explained that that same authority which he quotes gives ten times as many people from Canada as passing westward now as passed westward during the time his friends occupied the Treasury benches. We have opened up communication with our North-West, and there is a continual tide of immigrants passing through the American territory to and from that country, and that same authority places a large percentage of them as emigrants leaving the country. And yet the hon. gentleman does not fail to stand up here and announce, with all the weight and responsibility which his position gives him, that three times as many people are crowding out of the country as crowded out of it in 1878.

Mr. MILLS. It is true, nevertheless.

Mr. HESSON. It is not so.

Mr. McLELAN. I think, Sir, that the reason I have given—that there is a great intercourse going on between

old Canada and the North-West, and that we have to travel 1,100 miles through United States territory to reach that country—is the reason why Americans have an opportunity of misrepresenting the number of emigrants that pass out of the country. The hon. member for Bothwell compliments his Government upon having been able to ascertain the condition of the country by means of a bankrupt law, and states that they could ascertain, through the official assignee, from day to day, how many people failed. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues failed to lift a hand to remedy the evils which they found spreading over the country. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman would have us to believe at one moment that the country was in the greatest state of prosperity, and that very few of the manufacturers were failing. It was only the merchants that were going, day after day, failing for millions. The merchants were all in bankruptcy and ruin. And why? Because, he said, they had no customers. I would ask why were there no customers, why were there no people to buy from the merchants, if the country was in a prosperous condition and if the people were not going out of it in large numbers. Either one or two things must be true: either the customers were not in the country or the people were too poor to give their custom to the merchants. The hon. gentleman can take which ever horn of the dilemma he chooses. Either the people were not in the country to give their custom to the merchants, or they were so impoverished by idleness that they could not purchase, and the merchants therefore had to go into bankruptcy. I believe the latter to be the true reason. The hon. gentleman talks of taxation. Why, if you take the great mass of the labouring people and keep them idle week after week, month after month, year after year, as they were during the Administration of hon. gentleman opposite, they are more heavily taxed than they can be by any fiscal policy. No heavier taxation can be imposed on any people than enforced idleness, and that idleness resulted in such poverty that the people at large were unable to purchase goods and the merchants had to go into bankruptcy. Then the system of official assignees came into existence and they gave their returns to hon. gentlemen opposite, who did not lift a finger to remedy the evil. The hon. member for Norfolk pretends to account for everything in the past and everything in the present, and attempts to forecast the future. Both hon. gentlemen indulge in forecasts and they predict a future of ruin and depression throughout the country. I say such a course is unfair to this country, which is so prosperous. I care not what the hon. gentleman may say as to the depression they pretend is existing. They may proclaim ruin from day to day, as they have been doing; but I know that the voice that will come up from the country at large is that the country is in a healthy and sound condition. The hon. member for Norfolk has told us that the depression of 1878—and you will note that hon. gentlemen opposite do not agree altogether amongst themselves—the hon. member for Norfolk says there was depression up to 1878, very severe depression, but the hon. member for Bothwell, on the other hand, would have us believe that the manufacturers of everything were then in a flourishing condition, and there was not much depression, except that a multitude of merchants were failing for want of customers. The hon. member for Norfolk says the depression was brought upon us by the condition of things existing in the United States; that that condition of things acted upon the trade and manufactures of Canada, and produced that state of depression which he acknowledges did exist, and which the whole country deplored in 1879. The war no doubt had something to do with it. During the war, the prices of various manufactured goods in the United States were so high that they were not imported into the Dominion to any very large extent. After the war,

and when the multitude of people there had returned, under a high protective policy, to the manufacturing of goods, they overdid it, and finding that they had large surplus stocks on hands, they made of Canada the slaughter market to which the hon. member for Bothwell has referred, and flooded this country with their goods. First, under the protective policy, there was a great demand for labour in the United States; a large number of our young men were drawn to the United States and employed in the various factories, and when those factories over-produced, their over-production was sent into the Dominion, and the consequence was that many of our manufacturers had to suspend, or their establishments were entirely destroyed. But the hon. member for North Norfolk says that prosperity was returning to us in 1878 when the late Government went out of office. If we go back to the *Hansard* of 1879-80, we find it on record that those hon. gentlemen, even up to 1879-80, claimed that the country was in no better condition than in 1878. Hon. members of this House, who were then present, will recollect that in the strongest and most positive manner they denied, up to 1831, that there was any change, for improvement, in the condition of the country at large. The improved condition, however, became so manifest, that in 1831-82, they took other lines of argument, and admitted the general prosperity of the country. But the hon. member for North Norfolk undertakes to account for that prosperity by the exports, in consequence of our having an increased export during the last four years. Now, admitting that we had an increased export during the four years, admitting that, from 1879 up to the present time, there has been a larger export than from 1874 to 1878, still, you will find, if you will go back to the condition of things under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, who then occupied the Treasury benches, that the imports largely exceeded the exports; you will find that all the money coming from the exports of the country, during those four years, was spent in purchasing manufactured goods abroad, and that the imports largely exceeded the exports, from 1874 to 1878. Now, the honourable member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), in some of his speeches, when he was sitting on this side of the House, and conducting the financial affairs of the country, told us, that you will always find the imports of Canada exceeding the imports by a certain proportion. Well, now, if we had an increased export from 1879 to 1883, our imports under his policy would have just so much greater exceeded that export, and what would have been the advantage to the manufacturers of this country, if all the money that came to us, all the money value of our exports, had been expended in Great Britain and in the United States in the purchase of manufactured goods, brought into the Dominion of Canada? The working people of this country, the manufacturers of this country, the labourers of this country, who are dependent upon the manufacture of goods for their daily subsistence, would have been in no better position if all that money had been expended in the United States and Great Britain. The excess of exports would not have benefitted, to any appreciable extent, the labouring classes of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, take the position given by the hon. the ex-Finance Minister, that our imports under his Administration will always exceed the exports in a certain ratio, and make a comparison of four years—the four years that the hon. gentleman administered under his policy, and four years under the National Policy, and see the result. The hon. gentleman complains of the Finance Minister taking averages, and tells us that he is great upon averages. Now, I ask the House to take the aggregate—to take the aggregate of four years of exports of 1874 to 1878, and I find that we exported in those four years—

Mr. DAVIES. Which four years does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. McLELAN. The four years from 1874 to 1878. We exported in that period, in round numbers, \$314,000,000, and we imported \$402,000,000. In the four years, from 1880 to 1883, inclusive, we exported \$386,500,000. If we had imported at the same rate as they did, we should have imported \$490,000,000, but we only imported \$399,000,000 in that period. For the sake of comparison, and to make the comparison fair, you should deduct the imports into Manitoba and the North-West Territories. During the period that the hon. gentlemen occupied the Treasury benches, there was very little comparatively imported into Manitoba and the North-West Territories, but, since the opening up of that country, under the present Administration, the importations have been very large into Manitoba and into the North-West Territories. Taking for four years, it amounts to nearly \$20,000,000. Deduct the four years previous, and you have \$18,000,000. Take that from the imports of \$399,000,000, for comparison, and you have net \$381,000,000 of imports into the old Provinces of Canada. As compared with what we should have imported, if we imported at the same rate as they did, we have a saving of \$109,000,000. That is, that, if we take our exports as the basis, and had imported at the same rate they did, from 1874 to 1878, we should have imported \$109,000,000 more than we have imported. And so we would; but we are not to suppose that the people of this country have used less goods than they did from 1874 to 1878. We are not to suppose that there have been fewer customers to merchants. Fewer merchants have failed, and therefore the inference is that there have been more customers to sustain those merchants, and more people to consume the goods; and if it is not to be supposed that we have consumed \$109,000,000 worth of goods less in proportion, than we did in the period from 1874 to 1878. The goods under this policy have been manufactured in the country, and the \$109,000,000, as shown by this result, have given employment to the labouring class of this country, and that employment has sustained the merchants and prevented the bankruptcies to which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has referred. I ought to make a reference to the passing blow which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) gave to a certain class of the manufactures of Canada. He referred to agricultural implements, and he could not pass by the subject without asserting that the manufacturers of agricultural implements are manufacturing an inferior article to what they did previous to this policy. Did he not say that they had to put less of valuable material into the construction of it? He announced to the world that the manufacturers of agricultural implements had to put less of costly and necessary material into the construction of their goods, in order to compete with the United States. The hon. member for Bothwell, as well as the hon. member for North Norfolk, has referred to the taxation of the country, and I notice that both hon. gentlemen, when they speak of the taxation, and when they approach financial matters, always refer to and quote, with all due and becoming and party respect, the words of the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). And, listening to them, I was led to think that the words of the member for South Huron have now a peculiar significance in this House and to the country. Ordinarily, a man comes into the House, and we find him among a particular party, we give no more than individual weight to his utterances in that party; but, when we find a party gathering together and selecting a leader, we give attention to the utterances of that leader; when we find a party going out into the country and seeking a man, and saying to the world that that man is necessary to the existence of our party in the House of Parliament, as the exponent of our views and as our mouth-piece in that party, we give to his utterances all the weight and responsibility of being the policy of that party. Therefore we should give weight to the utterances of the hon.

Mr. McLELAN.

member for South Huron as being the sought-after and the accepted mouth-piece of the party. I suppose some may be curious to know why, with the great abilities of the hon. member for West Durham, and with the financial abilities of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), it was necessary to sacrifice the very-able and worthy man who last year represented the constituency of South Huron, in order to obtain the presence of this gentleman in this House. I think I have found the reason. A few evenings ago, it will be remembered, the hon. member for King's, N.S., (Mr. Woodworth) was speaking and the hon. member for West Durham, in reply, was asked to repeat something the hon. member for King's had said, and the hon. member for West Durham said: "I cannot utter the words, I cannot foul my mouth with them." And so, Mr. Speaker, it just occurred to me that the Opposition wanted a mouth-piece in this House who could give vent to all the pent-up feelings of the party, and they knew no one who could do that better than the hon. member for South Huron. They could look over the record of his speeches here, and see how he had poured out the vials of his wrath upon the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches. They knew from the speeches he had delivered, how he could assail the manufacturers of this country, how he could denounce them as "legalized robbers," and therefore, as they were warring against the manufactures of this country, they could get no better mouth-piece than that hon. gentleman. They remembered how he could insult whole races of people, how he could refer to the Scotchmen as inheriting the instincts of cattle-stealing; and when they wanted to insult a whole race, they could not find a better man. They knew, too, how he had insulted the whole country in declaring that it was through want of intelligence in the people that the present Government had been returned to power in 1878.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Certainly, and I stick to it.

Mr. McLELAN. They knew that he was capable of uttering language which has become somewhat historic, language which has been reported even in England and has become known to the Liberal party there—though perhaps they do not appreciate it. Sir, I hold in my hand a newspaper, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, containing an article with reference to the hon. gentleman; and the House will understand that this paper is edited by a great English Liberal leader who, of course, follows the history of the Liberal leaders upon this side of the water. And what does he say of this hon. gentleman? I will read, for the information of the House, what the Liberal paper mentioned has culled out of a few, only, of the speeches delivered by that hon. gentleman in Canada:

"The following compact vocabulary of descriptive epithets has been compiled from the speeches made by Sir Richard Cartwright during the electoral campaign of 1878 in Canada:

"Rascal, thief, blackguard, villain, abandoned man, slanderer, infamous person, liar, scoundrel, public criminal, creature, cheat, robber of Canada—"

I suppose this is applied to the manufacturers.

"squanderer, burglar, fool, fraud, putrid, infamous, infernal, diabolical, devilish, dastardly, cunning, empty-headed, foolhardy, suicidal, abominable, wretched, thievish, fraudulent, lying, mercenary, foolish."

"These adjectives and substantives, applied to his political opponents by a Canadian Minister of the Crown, should give our statesmen pause before they complain of the violence of the abuse to which they are subjected by the Irish and Conservative Opposition of our day."

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knew what they were securing, and the gentleman who represented South Huron last year had to be sacrificed in order that the present member might find a place here. I listened to him, in his reply to the Budget Speech, with a good deal of curiosity, to see how he would fulfil the expectations of his party. I must say that for the first half of his speech he proceeded in the

customary tone in which debates are conducted in this House, and I thought to myself, as I looked on the other side, that there would be disappointment, that the hon. gentleman would not come up to the expectations which had been entertained of him. But I saw, by the countenances of those who were sitting around him, that they had perfect confidence in his ability. I observed that as the hon. gentleman warmed to his work, as he began to denounce the people of this country, and as he attempted to account for the change of Government in 1878, by saying that it was due to the betrayal of the then leader of the Government by his countrymen, in whose honesty and intelligence he had trusted—when, I say, he warmed to his work and poured out the vials of his wrath upon the members of the Government and their supporters, I saw that there was no change in him, and that Richard was himself again. An hon. gentleman beside me quoted "The Ethiopian cannot change his skin, nor the tiger his stripes;" and, as the hon. gentleman emptied, one after another, the vials of his wrath on the Government and the country, I, too, felt like quoting the words of a more modern writer, applying them entirely in a political sense:

"Tell me, screaming scold, who was it cursed thee with such humours and ill-luck?"

"Was it some sullen bear dry-nursed thee, or she-dragon gave thee suck?"

But I am satisfied that the party felt they had the worth of their money before he sat down. It was like the story of the old Quaker who employed the boy. There was an old Quaker who was a little tender-mouthed, and who feared to foul his mouth with any kind of abuse. In a controversy with a man, he wanted to give expression to his feelings and desired to find an instrument. In the wide range of human characters there is no difficulty in finding a man for anything you want done. The scale runs so high there is no deed to be done for kin, humanity or country, however daring and noble, but there is a man ready to execute it; and it descends so low that there is no act, however mean and contemptible, and no crime against people or country, however damnable, but there can be found some-one to do it. So the Quaker was not at a loss. He selected a boy, who seemed to be an outcast, and, going up to him he said: "Art thee a profane lad?" The boy said: "What?" "Cans't thou say bad words; cans't thou slander and swear?" The lad said: "Give me a chance, and you will find I am some on the swear." So the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) had his chance to abuse the Government, and hon. gentlemen opposite thought he gave them the worth of their money, as the old Quaker did as regards the lad. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman is profane. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman is "some on the swear," or that he would violate any of the Commandments, but the people of the country whom he has denounced as degenerate, that race of people represented by the hon. member for East York, whom he accused of want of honesty and faithfulness, will say that he has been guilty, in a political sense, at least, of violating the Commandment: "Thou shall not bear false witness." But the hon. gentleman says that we have been unfaithful, because we have increased the expenditure, and he goes back to 1867. I have never yet heard the hon. gentleman make a financial speech but he has gone back to 1867, and pointed out that the expenditure which was then \$13,000,000 has ran up to \$23,000,000, \$25,000,000 and \$30,000,000. Is it a crime that the country grows and prospers and requires more expenditure, and that we are able to meet it without inordinate taxation? Why, the hon. gentleman would have the country warped and standing still, with an expenditure of \$13,000,000. If the hon. gentleman had been born in China he would have been famous as a gardener, as a cultivator of dwarfed

vegetables and trees. He would not have this country grow. To use an Americanism, if the hon. gentleman had been born a polywog, he would have become a frog, except for the satisfaction of being better able to croak over the ills and misfortunes of other people. I need not elaborate this question of the expenditure of the country. If the hon. gentleman will come down to particulars, if he will point out to the House, wherein large unnecessary expenditure have been made, then it will be in place to discuss the subject. But with the growing prosperity of this country, with the improvements that have been made, with the demands that have been made on the public Treasury, in consequence of the undertakings entered into during the hon. gentleman's administration, we have also the fact that the country has been prosperous, and that all these expenditures have been met from the increased revenue, without taxing inordinately the people. Before I pass away from this, let me refer to just one point. The hon. gentleman wanted to alarm the country by saying we were taxed nearly double per head as compared with the people of the United States. The hon. gentleman did not stop to explain that in the gross amount which is taken as the taxation of this country there was included all the revenues from Public Works, Railways and Canals, while in the United States there are no such items entering into the taxation. Moreover, the hon. gentleman forgot to tell the House, and we suppose it was entire forgetfulness on his part, that the taxation in the United States with which he made the comparison does not include the State taxation, while the taxation here in Canada includes the Provincial taxation, all the Provincial revenues coming from the Federal Government and being a part of that taxation. In the United States, every State, to a large extent, produces its own revenues and taxes its own people for those revenues. The total State taxation in the United States, independent of the Federal taxation, the large sum collected through Customs and Excise is \$52,019,959 for State; for county purposes, \$69,606,571; and for divisions less than counties, \$180,740,000, or a total of \$302,200,694, or \$6 per head; while the indebtedness of the States is proportionately large. So that, if the hon. gentleman had wished to make a correct comparison he would have omitted from the Canadian taxation the several sums I have named, and added to that of the United States the taxation that was devoted to State purposes. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) attempted to elaborate the argument that the farmers do not benefit under this National Policy; that the farmers have not been benefitted by the introduction of this policy. The hon. gentleman who replied to the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I think, gave a pretty conclusive answer in that respect. Take all the men who are employed in the manufactures of this country, in the mining operations, both in the east and the west, add them all together, and you will have a large population that, during the last four years, received employment under the National Policy and because of the National Policy. I estimate, Sir, that that number from 25,000 to 35,000 people, and if you take those who are dependent upon the earnings of these men you have a population approaching 150,000 or 200,000 who are supported and kept in this country because of the National Policy, and the additional employment which is given to the people under that policy. Now, Sir, how can that great body of people be kept here and employed without the farmers being benefitted? These hon. gentlemen have been desiring for years that we should have reciprocity with the United States, and the only reason they have for it or can have for it, is that our farmers shall be able to supply and feed the people who are manufacturing in the Eastern States. Now, Sir, we have a large number of these people at home, and if you take up American statistics and find how much of agricultural produce it takes

to sustain a man a year you will be astonished at the result. I will give some of the figures taken from the statistical tables of the Bureau of statistics of Massachusetts :

Quantities of Farm Produce that would be consumed annually by 200,000 persons, manufacturers and their families.

BY EACH PERSON.		TOTALS.
214 lbs. Flour and Meal,	barrels,	218,000
19 3-10 lbs. Butter,	pounds,	3,860,000
5 9-10 lbs. Cheese,	"	1,180,000
12 9-10 lbs. Lard,	"	2,440,000
7 1-10 qts. Beans,	bushels,	44,375
3 9-10 bush. Potatoes,	"	780,000
51 qts. Milk,	gallons,	2,530,000
5 doz. Eggs,	dozens,	1,000,000
6 3-10 lbs. Poultry,	pounds,	1,240,000
58 8-10 lbs. Beef, fresh and salt,	{ pounds or barrels }	11,760,000
7 lbs. Veal,	"	1,400,000
10 lbs. Mutton,	"	2,000,000
or on an average of 50 lbs. per, head Sheep and Lambs,		40,000
38 3-10 lbs. Pork, fresh, salt and Ham.....		7,666

These figures give some of the agricultural products consumed by a manufacturing population of 200,000, the dependents and those who are actually employed in manufactures. With this large body of people to be maintained [and supported by the farmers, it cannot possibly be but that the agricultural population are benefited by the employment of mechanics and artisans. Hon. gentlemen say that people are going out of the country, but if you do not employ them in manufacturing in the country, how are you going to retain the great body of the people who do not take to agriculture or the professions. The member for North Norfolk referred to the cotton industry, and in fact all who speak on that side of the House seem to bend their energies and direct all their powers against the cotton industry. The growth of that industry has been very great in this country, and if they could persuade the people of this country that it is in an unsound condition, or that the manufactures are charging increased prices, they think they have accomplished what suits their party purposes. I remember a year or two ago the leader of the Opposition paid us a visit down in Nova Scotia. He came down there to arouse the people of that Province against the National Policy. I remember that his whole political baggage was an old woman's cotton gown, and a poor man's shirt, and that shirt had seven yards in it. And the way that he held up that old woman's gown and flaunted that shirt was such that if there had been any argument with it, a cotton riot would have been created. But there was no cotton riot. He did not persuade those poor men and women that they were taxed and ground to death, because of the increased duty on the cotton which went into that shirt and into that gown. The hon. gentleman repeated his argument on that cotton shirt so often that every boy in all the villages he visited took to parodying the song of the shirt :

"The hon. member taking the stand and talking of taxes of gusset and seam and band ;

"Taxes on gusset and band and tail, making a sad and doleful wail."

But with all his ability, the hon. gentleman did not succeed in creating a cotton riot or in persuading the Government to reduce the duty on cotton. The manufacturers were protected, they had confidence in the Government which stood behind them, they invested more largely of their capital and they are now able to manufacture cotton goods as cheaply, more cheaply than they can be imported. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk gave away the whole case. In fact it generally happens that these hon. gentlemen drop something which has the effect of destroying their whole case. The hon. member stated that the tendency of manufacturers was to cheapen goods, because, he says, of the perfection to which machinery has come. Well, our manufacturers knowing that the Government would stand behind them, and warrant them in investing a large amount of capital in the most perfect machinery, went forward and made

Mr. McLELAN.

that investment and succeeded in their investment, But, you may get the most perfect possible machinery, but until you have acquired some experience and ability to manage it, you must run it at a loss. The most perfect machinery requires protection for a time. The machinery of human life is as perfect in an infant as in a full grown man, but the infant must have protection and care until he has acquired experience and development. And so these manufacturers, even though they have the most perfect machinery, must have some protection and care until they have acquired that ability and knowledge necessary to manage that machinery. But they have had that protection and have acquired that skill that enables them now to manufacture cotton at the lowest possible price. Now I come to the question, if you do not encourage these manufactures, if you do not give employment to your own people in this country, how are you going to keep them from going abroad? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we are driving the people abroad by the heavy load of taxation that we are placing upon them. But if you place the greater load of idleness upon them, if you have no employment for them, there is ten times the inducement for them to leave the country that there is when there is employment and remunerative wages to be had. Now, it is claimed that a reduction of wages has taken place in this country. I find, from some returns that have been made to the Department of Agriculture, with reference to the cotton manufactures, that there has not been a reduction, but an increase—that the average wages of men, women and children employed in a number of the cotton manufactories of the country, in 1883, was \$30 a head more than the average wages paid in 1881, and within \$20 of the average wages of the cotton operatives in the United States; and I say that, if we are able to maintain that condition of affairs, we shall not only keep our own people at home, but attract back from the United States some of our people who have gone there. The hon. gentleman stated that the people were all leaving and going to the United States. If you take up the Census of the United States for 1880, before the operation of the National Policy could have any effect on this country, you find that nearly one-half of the cotton operatives of the United States were Canadians—that out of 78,000 cotton operatives in the United States, 36,000 were born in Canada; and I say that if so many people left us previous to the inauguration of this policy to seek employment, there is hope that, by giving employment in our own country, we shall not only be able to retain our own young men, but induce some of those to return. Now, the United States Census Commissioners, in attempting to account for the large foreign immigration, say :

"In those States where the foreign element is large, the general causes are apparent. In the north-eastern States, the moving cause is the manufactures of various kinds, and the mining of iron and coal. The immigrants are mainly Irish, German and French Canadians, with some Welsh."

So that, the moving cause of Canadians leaving the country for the United States has been the manufactures, which have been fostered and have grown up under their protective policy. Another reason has been the opening of the prairie lands in the west. Now, however, when we have a policy which will give employment to our young men and young women in our own country, and when we have the North-West opened up—and I believe that in two years more we shall have speedy communication with that country through our territory, in consequence of the Bill that was passed here the other day, and was so stoutly opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite—our own people will be retained in Canada. The hon. member for South Huron told us that he believed that 100,000 people had gone into the North-West and settled there. Well, but for the opening up of that country and the wonderful progress that has been made in constructing railways across the prairies, I think it

is safe to say that 50,000 of those people would have gone to the United States, and would have been lost to this country; and if we have been able, by almost any sacrifice of money, to save that number of people to the Dominion of Canada, to contribute to its stability and progress, I say we have accomplished a wonderful advantage to the public at large. The hon. gentleman has announced to the world that 700,000 Canadians are living in the United States; he says that the Census of 1880 shows it. Well, if that is true, these people must have left before the inauguration of this policy. But did the hon. gentleman turn to our own Census? Did he tell the House and the country that there is a larger percentage of American-born people living in Canada than the percentage of Canadians living in the United States, according to the population? With this policy, I believe, we shall be able, not only to hold our own people, but to offer such attractions to the people of the United States besides, that we may reasonably expect a large increase to our population from that country. In referring to the North-West, let me call the attention of the House, for a moment, to the enormous quantity of goods that are imported into that country, from the United States—and why? There, communication is easy and direct with the United States, and the distance is so great between the manufacturing centres of Canada and that district, that it is almost impossible for them to trade with us; but when the Pacific Railway will be opened in two years, it will have an influence upon the manufactures of this country which it is impossible for any man to estimate, not only in the money it will bring us, but in the very fact that when these people are trading with us, when they are passing over this railway running through our own country, on our own soil, they will come to realize and feel they are a part and parcel of the Dominion of Canada, which they cannot now. To get to that North-West, you have to travel 1,100 miles through a foreign country. A man from the North-West, coming down to Canada, travelling through the United States, feels, when he reaches here, that he is in almost a foreign country. I know how it was with us in the Maritime Provinces, before we had direct communication with this part of Canada, in the winter. I know that when we came up here to attend Parliament we had to go first to New York or Boston, and there take the railways to get here, and when we came we felt almost that we were in a foreign country. Not until the Intercolonial Railway was opened, and we had direct communication with the western part of Canada by that railway, did we begin to feel that we were one with this great Canadian people. Having that means of communication, under this policy there has been, as the hon. member for Digby represented, an enormous and growing trade between the people of the Maritime Provinces and the people of old Canada. In 1866, before we were Confederated, we did a large portion of our trade with the United States, and we then, when we were not more than two-thirds of the population that we now are, imported from the United States, under a very low tariff, about double the quantity of goods we import now, with our increased population. With all the facilities that we have for trading with the United States, surrounded by water, with the facility of getting our produce carried from almost every port weekly to the United States, we do not import as much from the United States as we export to them. Notwithstanding that the hon. leader of the Opposition went down to the Maritime Provinces and counselled us to trade with the Americans—I say counselled us, but I do not use that possessory phrase—that phrase so suggestive of entire ownership—I do not say “our counsel” told us to trade with the United States, because we did not accept his advice and did not take his counsel. We found it more to our interest to trade with the people of the west; and I say that, with the increasing population that we have, the imports from the United States during the past year were only \$2,974,936,

while the imports of the comparatively handful of people in Manitoba and the North-West Territories from the United States amounted to \$8,592,112 and their exports to the United States only amounted to \$102,000, while from Nova Scotia we exported to the United States to the value of \$3,814,223. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that those people feel a lack of interest with the people of Canada, such as they would have if they had more direct means of communication and better facilities of trading with them. I believe that if we are ever to be bound together, as one people, it will not be by a political chord alone, but there must be also bonds of commercial and industrial union, which will hold the people of this Confederation together. If you take up a war map of the United States, in 1862, you will find that the people who were bound together by a natural means of communication or by great lines of railway held together, you will find that the cleavage between the different States thus connected in that great contest, was just where the commercial and industrial interests of the people were closely united. So, I say, that if the people of Canada are to be held together, they must tighten the bonds of trade and industry. The immediate prospects of the North-West being opened to us, unfolds a future of which any man may be hopeful and proud. The hon. Minister of Agriculture referred to the large immigration during the past year and the year preceding, and to the prospect of immigration this year, and we know there is employment for all the immigrants, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite may say. Look to the future the great North-West is opening to us. Our young men will find farms there ready and better than those in the United States, and others employment in our factories, and lying alongside 50,000,000 of people that must, in their migration, run over and lap into our country; there is a future before us of which we may be hopeful and proud. The generation is now born that will see in this Dominion more than 20,000,000 of Canadians, the most contented, happy and prosperous of any people the sun shall then shine on or the British flag wave over.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot say that I listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, but if the rest of his statistics are as accurate as the statement he was good enough to make to the House, respecting certain epithets read by him and alleged by him to have been used by me with reference to the members of the present Ministry and their supporters, all I can say is, that his friends may be proud of their champion.

Mr. McLELAN. I quoted from a Liberal paper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some few years ago I had occasion to order a list to be prepared of the various names, epithets, adjectives and substantives that had been used against me by the hon. gentleman's colleagues and the hon. gentleman's press. The hon. gentleman, Sir, has only made one mistake—some people might think it one of some little importance—he has alleged that I used to those hon. gentlemen the epithets which they used to me. That is all the difference. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has given you a partial list; and, as I like accuracy, I will supply the remainder of the list. Mr. Speaker, in the three months preceding the 21st January, 1878, the organs of that hon. gentleman, and the colleagues of that hon. gentleman, were good enough to describe me in the following fashion—as a man who was unjust, unfair, ungenerous, unprincipled, unkind, ungrateful, ill-tempered, ill-mannered, vindictive, reckless, implacable, indecent, foul-mouthed, brawling, discourteous, cowardly, obstinate, self-willed, conceited, brazen-faced, sophisticated, deceitful, cunning, pedantic, slanderous, artful, outrageous, churlish, silly, weak, changeable, vacillating, insolent, impertinent, brutal, braggart, despicable, revolting, idiotic, malevolent, ignorant, contemptible, cruel, cantankerous, presuming,

crafty, pharisaical, flippant, affected, vulgar and base. They further compared me, as the hon. gentleman likes accuracy, to Nero, to Caligula, and to Mr. Micawber; to Herod, to Pontius Pilate, to Judas Iscariot, and to Lagree; to Belial, to Beelzebub, to Jonah, and to General Starvation; to Moloch, to Machiavelli, to Junius, to Wilkes, to Judge Jeffreys, and to a mastodon; to a bangman, a jail-bird, an ostrich, a misanthrope, and a pre-Adamite Tory; also to a fossil Tory, a demagogue, a champion bully, and Benedict Arnold; to a hypocrite, a felon, a malefactor, and Janus; to an apostate, a traitor, a bungler, and a rotten stick; to Timon, to Caliban, to Shylock, to a doctrinaire, to a sloth, an irredeemable ruffian, a scavenger, an aristocrat and a lunatic. And, within the same few months, it was recommended that, when I next addressed a public meeting, I should be received with a few brickbats, I should be tarred and feathered, I should be tossed in a blanket, and made to run the gauntlet. Now, the hon. gentleman, next time that he wishes to make a list, not of epithets used by me, but of epithets used to me, can add to the list those, and he will have a tolerably correct account. And, if the hon. gentleman wants to know who used them, some dozen of them were supplied by the Premier of this Dominion, and a pretty large proportion of the remainder by their illustrious colleague in the Upper House, the hon. Mr. Macpherson. The remainder were supplied from the resources of the *Mail* newspaper; and, thinking that it might save these gentlemen a lot of trouble when I re-entered public life, I kindly made them a list, in order that in future they may have their vocabulary ready at their hands. Now, it gave me great pleasure to hear the Minister of Marine express the natural, the proper, the very righteous indignation that he felt at the thought that it was possible that I, or any other man, could use such language to political opponents. Sir, the hon. Minister knew whereof he spoke. Did he ever hear of words like these:

"But the picture, dark as it is, has something blacker still. I see there, standing in the background, the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia privately handing over to this same engineer a contract for the whole work. I see him shroud it in darkness and bury it for months in the grave of secrecy. And now the Provincial Secretary comes forward and tells us it was so hidden to serve the public interest; to enable Sandford Fleming—"

Did he ever hear of Sandford Fleming, I wonder?

"to enable Sandford Fleming, after he had taken the contract, to make better terms with the old contractors; to grind a few more dollars out of them. Public interest, indeed! Mr. Sandford Fleming's interest alone. Sir, I know not what term to apply to such conduct in a Government. I know not what to call it—I shall not venture an opinion; but in private life it is called extorting money under false pretences, and our laws make it indictable knavery."

Did the hon. gentleman ever hear that sentence before, or the following?

"They have heard of men riding in public conveyances with a loose mantle about them and a pair of false hands folded in front to full suspicion, while the real hands were finding their way into their fellow-travellers' pockets, and they now think that, when the hon. gentleman put on the mantle of Herbert Huntingdon and the old Reformers, the hands he put to the plough were not real—that the real hands were hidden, that they might the better get deep to the armpits in the public chest, and they wait, they long for the opportunity to sweep him from his position. Therefore, Sir, there was no necessity to bring this case here to excite public opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, if having brought it here for investigation in the discharge of a public duty, what if the people should, on an examination of it, decide that the public interests have been bartered away and betrayed—that the man whom they once believed in as the apostle of retrenchment has become the great high priest of jobbery and corruption? Who then shall restrain limits to their just indignation as they take him, loaded down though he may be with the share of the offerings that fall to the priest, and impale him upon the horns of the altar at which he ministers."

Did the hon. gentleman ever hear those eloquent words? Did he ever utter those eloquent words? Is it or is it not the truth that he applied those words to the present Minister of Railways, his present colleague and former opponent? I put that question to him once before, two or three years

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

ago. I am sorry to say that the hon. gentleman waited a long time to reply, but he did not deny, and I do not think he apologized to the Minister of Railways, either, for having used them. Probably the hon. gentleman had very good reason for using them, and I am perfectly willing to believe that he then, at any rate, was more accurate in his description and in his estimate, and in the terms he used about the hon. gentleman, than in any of the statistics or other remarks that he has made to-night. And, although I am not quite so sure of the fact, I am informed that the hon. gentleman, when contesting Colchester, when Mr. Jones, of Halifax, and Mr. Longley, were opposing him, put what I may call a final climax to the language I have just been reading to you, by describing Mr. Jones and Mr. Longley as two unbaptized, buttonless vagabonds from Halifax.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

11 Soap powders, a specific duty of 3 cents per pound..... 3 cts. per pound.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister of Customs last night promised some further explanation of that item.

Mr. BOWELL. The explanation is simply this: The question was asked why soap powder was made 3 cents per pound, while soap itself was only 1½ cents. The reason is, that soap powder is worth about double the amount of soap per pound, so that it equalizes them in that particular.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman give us an idea of what the equivalent *ad valorem* is?

Mr. BOWELL. It is between 25 and 30 per cent.—perhaps a medium, 27½ per cent.

15. Steel, ingots, bars, sheets under three-sixteenths of an inch thick, whole or cut to shape, but not further manufactured, and \$3 per ton of rolled round wire rods in coils, not elsewhere specified, three dollars per ton of 2,000 lbs. and 10 per cent. 2,000 pounds, and ten per cent. *ad valorem*. cent.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Last Session Parliament imposed a duty of \$5 a ton upon these articles. Steel, ingots, bars, and sheets under three sixteenths of an inch, are as at present. This large rate that was imposed last year varied from 3 to 13 per cent. upon various qualities of steel imported, and it was found by parties engaged in the manufacture of steel that they were three or four different kinds of pig iron, and one especially, with a large quantity of manganese pays a duty of \$2 per ton. Therefore parties manufacturing it have very little margin left except upon certain qualities of it, and in order to give them something like the duty that is collected on iron, this amendment was proposed of 10 per cent., and \$3 per ton. This gives an average of from 13 to 18 per cent. That is about the scale. It varies under these propositions. There are now two manufactories of steel, one in New Glasgow, N.S., and the other in London, Ont.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At what do you estimate the value of steel, roughly, per ton?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It varies from \$30 up to \$200 per ton. There is a great difference in the value of it. Therefore, by the specific duty it may be 3 per cent. upon the high quality of steel and 13 per cent. upon the lower quality. But this now makes an average of from 13 to 18 per cent., according to the quality of steel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it was \$5 before, was it not?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; that made the duties, as I say, on the lower grade of steel, 13 per cent., and on

the higher, 3 per cent., and the parties paying \$2 per ton on the iron they manufacture had very little margin left. Therefore, this will place it much upon the same principle as iron. Iron pays a duty of 12½ per cent., in a certain form, and up to 17½ per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. I observed a statement to-day that the price of some kinds of cast steel had been largely advanced. Does the hon. gentleman know anything of that?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; I have not heard.

Mr. BLAKE. Then does the hon. gentleman anticipate a reduction of revenue from this?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; it will be borne in mind that the importation of raw material gives \$2 a ton. We get something on that. It will go on, probably, to \$20,000. The hon. member will see that it depends largely upon the quantity manufactured. Parties say that if they have such encouragement as will enable them to extend their operations, they will manufacture largely in the Dominion of Canada. Some of it will be made from scrap iron, but steel is largely made from a particular description of iron, imported in the form of pigs, paying \$2 per ton.

Mr. BLAKE. What does the hon. gentleman expect the output to be?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will be very considerably increased by the imposition of this duty. The statistics of last year do not give it a fair basis of an estimate for the future, because the duty was only imposed in July, and there has been a very large importation since. But, in the previous year, we had 16,419 tons of this description imported, and it is expected, with this encouragement, that the manufacture will be largely increased. But there are certain descriptions of steel that they will not manufacture, and that we leave on the free list.

Mr. TUPPER. I may state that the capacity of the works in New Glasgow is about 7,500 tons.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I expect the whole will be about 8,000 tons, according to the views of the importers. At London they will manufacture what is called crucible steel, which is of a higher description and more valuable than that manufactured in New Glasgow. While the quality may not be as great in value, it will probably be quite equal to that of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLAKE. About what tonnage is expected in London?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The country this year is full of steel, and the demand will probably be less this year than it will the year following. The produce in Canada will probably be from 8,000 to 10,000 tons.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper just said there would be 7,500 tons in New Glasgow. How much does that leave for London?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not think there will be as much, according to the statement of the party who has charge of the industry there, because it is crucible iron, and they do not make as many tons.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of the expected London tonnage?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think we may reasonably expect one-half of the 8,000—a half in both.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Pictou has stated 7,500 tons for New Glasgow?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is their capacity; they will be able to produce that.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is not the output?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It cannot be the output next year, but that is the capacity. Our expectation, is 8,000 tons from both.

Mr. BLAKE. I am anxious to divide it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not allowing next year 7,000 tons for New Glasgow.

Mr. BLAKE. I was anxious to understand what the hon. gentleman was allowing, that is all.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We can only make an estimate from the information we have. The information given us is, that one-half of the quantity, within a year or two, will be produced in those two establishments; but as to the exact proportion between the two, I cannot give it. I estimate that a large amount will be produced at New Glasgow, because it is a different kind of steel.

Mr. BLAKE. The calculation is an easy one. The hon. gentleman has stated that there are two establishments in which this is to be produced. I quite agree with him that the matter is in some degree one of speculation, but we must have some information as to what will be the effect of the proposition, and what portion of the product will be produced at each establishment. He has told us that probably the year after this there will be produced 8,000 tons, or one-half the present importation, and that is from two establishments. What I desired to know was, how much he expected to be produced by one and how much by the other.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think it will be in the proportion of 5,000 to 3,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I correct in supposing that the hon. gentleman expects to get 8,000 tons manufactured here, from which he is now receiving, at \$5 per ton, \$40,000, and that 16,000 tons of iron will be brought in to be manufactured into steel, and that there will be a loss of \$24,000 to the revenue? That may possibly be made up from increased duty on the remainder—perhaps it will. That is a point which will depend entirely on the value of the steel imported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but *pro tanto* \$24,000 will be lost to the revenue under this change, if 8,000 tons of steel are manufactured in Canada.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. My statement was a comparison of the duty as at present. I do not expect a very large increase as the result of the change. If the manufacturers here increase the quantity, the revenue, of course, will not be increased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not dispute my proposition, that by the manufacture of 8,000 tons of steel, \$24,000 will necessarily be lost to the revenue. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman what number of people are likely to be employed in those two factories, producing 8,000 tons of steel?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know. I know that about forty are employed at New Glasgow at present; I do not know how many at the other establishment. The New Glasgow works have limited their operations, at present, as there is so much steel in the country; but I am not able to say how many people would be employed to manufacture 8,000 tons of steel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That, according to the hon. gentleman's theory, would be an important element, when we shall lose \$24,000 of revenue by the proposed change.

Mr. TUPPER. I understand that between forty and fifty men are now employed at New Glasgow, but the works are

not running up to their full capacity. When they are doing so, 160 men, I am informed, are required to produce 7,500 tons a year.

Mr. BLAKE. But the Minister does not expect more than two-thirds of the 8,000 tons to be produced at New Glasgow.

Mr. McDUGALD. I do not see that the proposed duty is open to much objection. In looking over the imports for the last two fiscal years, I find that of ingots, bars, sheets and coils imported into Canada, for the year ending 30th June, 1883, there were 18,385 tons, costing \$67.20 per ton; and for the year ending 30th June, 1882, there were 16,419 tons, costing \$54.56 per ton. A duty of 10 per cent. *ad valorem* and \$3 per ton specific, gives a protection of 14½ per cent. on the value for the last year, and 15½ per cent. for the former year; or an average, taking the two years, of 15 per cent. As to the form of the duty being mixed and *ad valorem*, I think it suits the interests of the industry fairly, from a protection standpoint. It provides protection for certain grades of steel manufactured, and in order to manufacture the higher grades we require more experience, and require a larger market, and there can be no objection to increasing the duty on those qualities. As to the quantity which can be produced in the establishment at New Glasgow, I took the opportunity, about two months ago, of visiting that establishment, which is very well equipped, and in which over \$200,000 capital are employed. At that time there were about forty hands at work, and I think at the present there are about sixty. They have turned out 500 tons of steel in pigs, and reduced 40 tons to a finished condition, to meet the various requirements of the trade. They are not producing a large quantity, because they want to ascertain the state of the market and know what is needed. Everyone acquainted with the trade is aware that steel deteriorates after it has been made for any length of time. As to the capacity of those works, they are equipped to turn out 25 tons per day, or over 7,500 tons a year, and in order to run to their full extent 300 men will have to be employed. These are the statements which I have from the manager of the works, and I believe they are correct.

16. Steel, rolled round wire rods, under half an inch in diameter, when imported by wire manufacturers, for use in their factories, five per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 5 per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This article, when imported at present, pays a duty of 10 per cent. Under this proposition, when it is imported for manufacturers of wire, the duty will be reduced to 5 per cent. The article of wire pays 15 per cent. duty. There are two modes by which the industry can be encouraged: either by increasing the duty on wire, or by reducing the duty on wire rods, which is the raw material. As wire fencing is coming into very general use all over the country, and especially in the North-West, and as wire is being introduced into many manufactures, it is considered desirable that the duty on wire should not be increased, and it is therefore proposed to give parties engaged in the industry a reduction in the duty on wire rods.

17. Steel, needles, viz:—Cylinder needles, hand frame needles and latch needles, thirty per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 30 per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is a new industry, established in Ontario, for the manufacture of cylinder needles, of which we have samples. They are flat needles, with an eye of a peculiar make. It is considered desirable to give this industry protection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the duty at present?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It comes in the unenumerated list, 30 per cent.

Mr. TUPPER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then 10 per cent. is added.

Mr. BLAKE. Where is the factory?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At Guelph, I believe.

Mr. BLAKE. About what is the production?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not a large item. With respect to the item on pins, which was passed last night, I may say that the machinery now in operation cost \$15,000. The manufactory is either at Brantford or Galt. I think this manufactory is in Paris.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says the importation is insignificant.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not much.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this factory a combination?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Mr. BLAKE. About how much is the importation?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot say. Of course this party expects to increase the production, if he gets the protection, and of course it not being enumerated, I cannot tell the value.

Mr. BLAKE. But I presume, when the hon. gentleman made a proposition in reference to alteration of this kind, for protective purposes, he would obtain some information as to the probable result. He says the manufacturer expects to increase the production, but the production may be beyond the demands of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to have added to this section the words "clock springs, corset steels, and shoe shackles." I have here a letter from a personal, though not a political friend of mine—a gentleman with whom, I think, the leader of the Opposition is acquainted, as he is the President of the Reform Association of our county, and opposed me at my election, and opposed the National Policy. He is a gentleman of means, who has been searching for an investment for the last two or three years. Here is his letter; and I am sure the Finance Minister will pay attention to it, and I hope, place his goods in the same position as those in the present list:

"GARRAQUE, Ont., March 3, 1884.

"Geo. Taylor, Esq., M. P., Ottawa:

"DEAR SIR,—Your kind favour of the 28th ultimo to hand. In reply, would say that we are in a position to more than supply the trade of the Dominion in the goods we make. That is one of our difficulties; for in the States, corset steels, clock springs, shoe shanks, metal skirt trimmings, each constitute a separate industry and forms, by itself, a large business. Here, in Canada, with our comparatively small population, the consumption would not warrant an investment in the necessary machinery and plant for making one or two of the above-named articles. And we have, therefore, to stand any chance of their paying, to combine several specialties. This we are doing, and shall have invested in the business, for this purpose, in the neighbourhood of \$12,000. A good deal of our special machinery and skill we have had to import from the States, as it could not be obtained here.

"Since writing you before, we see that, instead of a specific duty of \$5 per ton on the steel we use, there is now to be a specific duty of \$3 per ton, and an *ad valorem* duty of 10 per cent. This change would seriously embarrass us if applied to the steel we use.

"What we really need, and hope will be conceded, is, that the steel in sheets and coils that we use for manufacturing corset steels, shoe shanks and clock springs, be admitted free, and that the duty on the three manufactured articles named, be placed at 30 per cent. all around.

"We regret that we had not written you earlier on this matter, but we were under the impression, till a day or two before, that the Budget would not be brought down for a couple of weeks thereafter. The obtaining of these concessions, however, is of such vital importance to the successful conducting of our business, that we trust the Minister of Customs will see his way clear to grant us what we ask.

"Thanking you for the trouble you are taking on our account,

"We are, very truly yours,

"A. BRINDEN & GOWAN."

This establishment is now under way and they are manufacturing clock springs. It is the only industry of the kind

in Canada, and these goods now pay only a duty of 10 per cent. I hope the Finance Minister will give this industry the same chance as others of a similar kind.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman must appeal to the Government if he wants an addition to the duty, as he cannot move an addition of this description to the clause.

SUGARS, SYRUPS AND MOLASSES:—

- Sugar, when imported direct, without transshipment, from the country of growth and production, above number fourteen, Dutch standard, a specific duty of one cent per pound, and thirty-two and a half 1c. per lb. and per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 32½ per cent.
18. Equal to number nine, and not above number fourteen Dutch standard, a specific duty of three-fourths of a cent per pound, and twenty-seven and a half ¾c. per lb. and per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 27½ per cent.
- Below number nine Dutch standard, a specific duty of one-half cent per pound, and twenty-seven and one-half ¾c. per lb. and per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 27½ per cent.
19. Melado, and concentrated Melado, three-eighths of one cent per pound, and twenty-seven and one-half ¾c. per lb. & per cent. *ad valorem* ..... 27½ per cent.
- On all the above Sugars, Melado, and concentrated Melado, when not imported direct, without transshipment, from the country of growth and production:—
- Above number fourteen Dutch standard,—
- a specific duty of one cent per pound, 1 ct. per lb. and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem* ..... and 35 p. ct.
20. Equal to number nine, and not above number fourteen Dutch standard, a specific duty of three-fourths of one cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem* and 30 p. c.
- Below number nine Dutch standard, a specific duty of one-half cent per pound, ½ ct. per lb. and thirty per cent. *ad valorem* ..... and 30 p. ct.
21. Melado, and concentrated Melado, a specific duty of three-eighths of one cent per pound, ¾ ct. per lb. and thirty per cent. *ad valorem* ..... and 30 p. ct.
22. Concentrated Cane Juice, Concentrated Molasses, Concentrated Beet Root Juice, and Concrete, whether imported direct or not, a specific duty of three-eighths of a cent per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem* ..... and 30 p. ct.
23. Syrups, Cane Juice, Refined Syrup, Sugar House Syrup or Sugar House Molasses, Syrup of Sugar, Syrup of Molasses, or Sorghum, whether imported direct or not,—
- a specific duty of five-eighths of a cent ⅝ ct. per lb. per pound, and thirty per cent. *ad valorem* and 30 p. ct.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What are the changes here?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There are a good many resolutions here, that one principle is involved with reference to nearly all classes and descriptions of sugars. Under the present Tariff, sugar imported from the country of production, pays a duty of 30 per cent., not including the charges which are found to be, for the last year or two especially, very varied in their character. The result has been owing to the establishment of agencies in Canada, by the growers of sugar in the East Indies and China, and parties undertaking to deliver sugar to the refiners in Canada at a certain price, duty paid. Then the different Customs Departments make up a statement of charges, and these vary in the different ports and under different circumstances, from 6 to 23 per cent. This has caused a great deal of difficulty and dissatisfaction, and it has operated, in many respects, very unfairly, because it is difficult to ascertain at all ports where the entry is made, whether the charges are excessive or reasonable. The Customs Department have a great deal of difficulty in harmonizing these matters, and the Government, after being in conference with the parties on this subject, decided to make the dutiable value of the sugar free on board—to reduce the duty from 30 per cent. to 27 per cent., and this applies to all classes and descriptions of sugar. The fair, legitimate charges vary from 6 to 14 per cent., and taking the average charges at 10 per cent., it is supposed that 2½ per cent. reduction will yield about the same revenue. For instance, sugar is worth, say \$3 at present, and a 10 per

cent. reduction of the duty collected would be \$2.70 per 100 lbs. At 30 per cent., that would yield 81 cents per 100 lbs.; but if you take 27½ per cent., with the charges free on board, that would yield 82½ per cent. per 100 lbs., or 1½ per cent. more than the present Tariff gives, and so on with other prices of sugar: it will produce a little more revenue than under the present Tariff. The Government also propose that the duty on molasses, when imported from the country of production, shall be 15 per cent. for all purposes. At present it is 15 per cent. for domestic purposes, and 25 per cent. for refining purposes. This will, of course, be applicable to all parties engaged in refining sugar; but it gives additional employment to the refiners of the country, and increases our trade with the West Indies, which it is thought, in the interests of the country, that we should extend as far as possible. It is estimated that what we lose on molasses can be made up by the additional 1 cent or ½ cent a pound on sugar, and therefore the change will not affect the general revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman intend to take any other means of ascertaining the saccharine value than the Dutch standard?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not at present; as I say that is under the consideration of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that it was found in the United States, some years ago, when they allowed sugar to be imported on the Dutch standard, that grave frauds were perpetrated on the revenue by some high qualities of sugar being left dark for the express purpose of being brought in at the lower rate of duty. It seems to me that that danger exists in our own country as well as in the United States.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and that is the argument in favour of the polariscope. But as the duty in the United States was specific, and not specific and *ad valorem*, as ours is, the fraud may have occurred to a greater extent than it has in Canada. Of course there is the possibility of attempts being made, and sometimes successfully, to undervalue the sugar; but, as I stated a few nights ago, the Department of Customs appreciate the importance of having uniformity in that respect, and intended to have a thoroughly efficient staff organized for sugar alone. There are a good many arguments to be urged in favour of adopting the polariscope test, but I do not think the country will lose much by waiting a few months, until we can have the benefit of the experience of the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman will remember that last year he gave, as a reason why the duty on tobacco was reduced, that the reduction was forced upon us because the Americans had reduced the duty on tobacco. I understand that their sugar Tariff has also been materially reduced. How is it that we can maintain our high Tariff when they have reduced theirs so much in the article of sugar, and we could not do it in the article of tobacco?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. For this reason: that they reduced their duty on tobacco very far below our rate; and if we maintained more than 4 cents a pound, as at present, there would be a large amount of smuggling; but the duty we collect on sugar to-day is very much below the duty imposed in the United States, and there is no danger of smuggling.

Mr. PATERSON. That is precisely what I wanted to get the hon. Finance Minister to say. He has been claiming, all along, that our refiners have been receiving no undue advantages; but now we find that they have been bringing in their sugar at a rate much below the rate imposed in the United States. If that is true, what protection had our refiners over the Americans?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It did not make a bit of difference what protection they had, for the drawback was absolutely in excess of what was paid by them, and it gave them an advantage over our refiners.

Mr. PATERSON. It makes a difference, when you put a duty on the drawback.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. But not in English and Scotch sugars, in regard to which there is no exception.

Mr. PATERSON. I understood the hon. gentleman to say, the other day, that the Tariff has been raised only 5 per cent. above what it was under the old Tariff. If he looks at the table before us, I think he will find that the sugars above No. 14 are paying more than 5 per cent. above sugars of the refining grades. I think the difference is something like  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.; and the hon. Minister will observe that the Tariff is working in such a way that there is continually coming in large quantities of the lower grades of refined sugars and lessened quantities of sugars above No. 14. He will see that the import trade, with regard to sugars above No. 14, is about crushed out altogether. The comparative statement for 1882 and 1883 does not show this so much as a comparison between the six months ending December 31st, 1882, and the six months ending December 31st, 1883. During the former period, 1,950,000 lbs. were imported above No. 14, and during the latter only 1,297,000 lbs. Well, in the last six months of 1882, there was imported of sugar between No. 9 and No. 14, that paid  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a cent and 30 per cent., 35,000,000 lbs., while in the six months of this year we have only imported to the extent of 20,000,000 lbs. of this class. In the six months, ending 1883, all sugars below No. 9, paying  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent and 30 per cent. were imported to the extent of 37,000,000 lbs., while during the last six months the importation reached 60,000,000 lbs., so that the decreased importation of sugars between No. 9 and No. 14 was 15,000,000 lbs., and the class below No. 9 has increased in importation by 22,000,000 lbs., thus showing that the trade is running in that direction, that the refiners are getting their sugars in at lower prices than they did before. Whether they have found that they can use the lower grades to better advantage or not, I cannot say, but it must have an effect on the hon. gentleman's Tariff. If there is 22,000,000 lbs. more come in under the  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent per lb. and 15,000,000 less under the  $\frac{3}{4}$  cent per lb., it must make a very considerable difference in the revenue; and if, in addition, you take the importations that pay only  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a cent and 30 per cent. you will find the wonderful increase from 2,782,000 to 9,228,000 lbs. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he knows what proportion of the refined sugar can be turned out from these two different grades, as between Nos. 9 to 14 and below No. 9.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman has asked a good many questions and made a good many statements, some of which I shall feel called upon to reply to. In the first place, he speaks of the large and very considerable increase in the importation of sugar below No. 9, as compared with previous years. During the last year, the hon. gentleman will observe the increased imports of sugar from the West Indies was 10,000,000 lbs. over the average of the three previous years, but he will also observe that our trade with Brazil has also increased, and that Brazilian sugar, with some from the East Indies, and some from China, is a sugar below No. 9, because it has less saccharine value than the sugar from Cuba, Porto Rico and the British West Indies.

Mr. PATERSON. Is that a well established fact?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes. There is another thing, we have an increased number of refiners, and they find, no doubt, at present, we have as many refiners in Canada to day, if they worked the year round, as would refine all the sugar we require. Therefore, by importing a cheap class of sugar,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

it gives additional employment to the people, and it is in the interests of the refiners to do more of the work here, and therefore import their sugar at a lower saccharine value than they did a year or two ago. The hon. gentleman will understand that the melado sugar to which he has referred will be probably hit little, because in proportion to its value, the charges on melado are higher than on the better descriptions of sugar, but practically as far as refined sugar is concerned, all above No. 14 stand on the same basis as before.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman attributes the increase in the importation wholly to the low grades having less saccharine matter in them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Partly in some. If you import melado or a raw sugar, whose saccharine value is but 75 per cent., that will not produce the same quantity of refined as 95 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. Has the hon. Minister any means of determining how much of this increased import is due to increased consumption, and how much to loss in refining?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot say at present.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the average rate paid by the refiners, per pound, under our duty, and the average that the importer has to pay on sugar above No. 14?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The one above No. 14 is 1 cent per pound and 35 per cent., and the others pay  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  a cent and 30 per cent. The hon. gentleman can work that calculation out; it depends on the value of the sugar and the number.

Mr. PATERSON. I make it to be \$1.50 per 100 lbs. for the refining sugars and \$2.50 on the imported sugars.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That may be so. The imported sugars vary very much. If you take the whole imports of sugar—I am speaking from memory—I think about 150,000,000 lbs. of sugar is the import, and that is without counting melado. I think the whole revenue was \$2,400,000. If it was \$1.50 per hundred, it would be \$2,250,000.

Mr. PATERSON. I noticed to day, if I worked it out right, in working out the molasses entries at 25 per cent. for refining, that I reckoned the duty had amounted to 30 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Are there some extra charges on packages, or how would that come about?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. members must have taken—

Mr. PATERSON. Must have made a mistake?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY—molasses that are not imported direct.

Mr. PATERSON. When imported direct from the country of growth or production, they are 25 per cent. In working it out, I found there had been 30 per cent. collected, if my calculation was correct, and I did not know how it had come, or whether it was a mistake in my calculations or a mistake in the trade returns.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Last year, the quantity of molasses imported was 41,137 gallons, of which the value, according to the returns, was \$10,938, and the duty collected, \$3,303. That is over 25 per cent. When not imported direct, it is 30 per cent. When imported direct for refining purposes, it is 25 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. I have not got exactly the same figures as the hon. gentleman. I am speaking of molasses used for refining purposes, for the manufacture of sugar, when imported direct from the country of growth or production. There are 247,494 gallons, at a value of \$63,628, and the duty collected is \$19,299, which I make to be a little over 30 per cent., and it is put down as a 25 per cent. article. I did not know

how it came. And so, with regard to what is imported not direct, and subject to the 30 per cent. duty, the amount of duty figures out to 33 per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There must be some mistake about that.

Mr. BOWELL. A large quantity of this sugar has been imported and entered for consumption at 15 per cent.; afterwards, it has been disposed of to the refiners, and the extra 10 per cent. paid upon it, and, in making the entries in the returns that have been sent from the different ports, these were mixed up, so that I am not at all surprised that the hon. gentleman has been misled. As soon as my attention was called to it, instructions were given that in future these returns should be made, and the statistics given in such a way as not to be misleading. This is the cause of the difficulty.

Mr. VAIL. We know that a considerable portion of the sugar imported, especially from China and the East Indies, is imported in bags. Would not that add a great deal to the cost of the sugar imported on board, in addition to the sugar imported in wooden packages?

Mr. BOWELL. No; it has no effect on the present Tariff as it exists, because the package, no matter whether it is a bag or a hogshead or a barrel, is not dutiable, not being added to the value of the article for duty. The principal reason for changing the mode of collecting the revenue at the present moment arises from the fact that we had reason to believe, in fact we had the best evidence to show, that exporters had deducted from the value of the sugar and added to the value of the packages; so that, while the importer could make the declaration of the actual value to him of the cargo, the revenue lost, because under the Tariff, the packages were not dutiable, that is the principal reason why the change has been proposed in the mode of collecting the duty.

Mr. VAIL. Does not the Customs Act require the duty to be charged on the package?

Mr. BOWELL. If he refers to the Tariff, and not to the Customs Act, he will find that this is a special exemption.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. One of the difficulties the Department has experienced is this: A party purchasing a cargo of sugar in China, when entering it for duty, suppose it is contained in 10,000 bags, deducts from the invoice price the value of those bags. The difficulty has been for us, so far removed from China, to ascertain the real value of these bags, and they have made it appear double for the purpose of escaping the legitimate payment of duty. That is one of the reasons for the change, to obviate that, so that, if it is attempted in future, it shall not be successful.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has said that the anticipated slight increase of duty on sugars under these rates will about balance the anticipated reduction on molasses.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Does he anticipate that there will be a larger import of molasses to the displacement of a certain amount of raw sugar for refining purposes, to any considerable extent?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Take the year 1881-82; the values altogether, imported from the country of produce, and imported from the United States, were \$70,000, and \$44,301 of duty was collected. I think the probabilities are that that may be doubled, and therefore the duty that we will receive from the sugar that is produced from the molasses will not yield us quite as large a return as if that sugar had been imported in the raw state and refined; but the estimate is that what we lose on the one in that case, we shall have an equivalent for in the other.

Mr. BLAKE. That is to say, that the calculation that the increase on the sugar will balance the loss on the molasses includes an anticipated doubling of the quantity of molasses to the displacement of sugar.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. As to the statement of the Minister of Customs that the package is not included, I find at the bottom of Item 25, the following:—

“The value upon which the *ad valorem* duty shall be levied and collected shall be the value free on board, as provided by section 77 of the Customs Act.”

And section 77 of the Customs Act, provides that the value shall include the value of the packages, and so forth.

Mr. BOWELL. That is applicable to the Tariff as now proposed. The hon. gentleman asked me a question as to the bag—

Mr. VAIL. As to what you propose to do.

Mr. BOWELL. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, and he is quite right.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is intended that clause 77 shall apply, and that the value of the bags shall be included?

Mr. BOWELL. The bags and all other packages, including hogsheads, barrels, export duty, in short all other charges which the merchant pays for the sugar free on board, will be the value of the article for duty; hence the Finance Minister has proposed in these Resolutions to reduce the *ad valorem* duty from 30 to 27½, and from 35 to 32½, as the case may be. The specific duty remains as it was.

Mr. VAIL. Can the Minister of Customs tell me how many bags, to contain a ton of sugar, would cost, more than a cask that would contain a ton of sugar? My object is to learn what advantages the refiners are going to obtain by importing their sugar from China instead of from the West Indies. Of course, if the packages are cheaper from China, and the sugar is cheaper besides, by this *ad valorem* duty, it would be likely to result in favour of the refiner, and somewhat discriminate against the West India sugar, which is imported in casks.

Mr. BOWELL. Bags, hogsheads, and barrels are charged at such a variety of prices that the Government decided to make this change. Some of the bags are entered at a cost of 50 cents, holding about 200 lbs, while other bags of a larger kind are entered at 25 cents. Some hogsheads are entered at 9s. sterling, which, I believe, is about their proper value in the market; but, on examination of the invoices, we found some of them are charged as high as 16s., and even 18s. And just so with the bags. As I explained a moment ago, while the invoice of the consignment to the merchant shows the actual cost free on board, and that as he pays the full value to the shipper, yet the revenue is defrauded to the amount of the extra charge which is placed on the packages, and deducted from the value of the sugar.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman expects to find a considerable reduction in the price of barrels and hogsheads.

Mr. BOWELL. It will not make any difference as far as the revenue is concerned, what they charge under the present proposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Supposing the production of sugar from molasses should largely increase, how will your revenue stand?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will not make much difference. The hon. gentleman will see that there is a limit to the operations in molasses, because the very moment the residue of the syrup, after taking out the sugar, becomes

considerable, it will depreciate in value, and there will be no object for parties manufacturing from molasses, if beyond the limit at which they can sell the waste.

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose, under this clause, the specific duty will be levied on the shipping weight and not on the landing weight?

Mr. BOWELL. It must be on the landing weight. We can only charge on the weight which comes into the country. If the sugar was partially destroyed on the voyage, the Customs Act would make allowance for it.

- 24. Molasses, other, when imported direct, without transhipment, from the country of growth and production,—fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*, on the value thereof free on board ..... 15 per cent.
- 25. Molasses when not so imported, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*..... 20 per cent.

The value upon which the *ad valorem* duty shall be levied and collected upon all the above-named sugars, melado, syrups, molasses, &c., shall be the value thereof free on board, as provided by section 77 of the Customs Act, 1883.

Mr. TUPPER. I would like to ask where the different refining factories are, which will be benefitted by such a change?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The only boiling establishment we have at present is in Halifax. But it is open for every sugar refinery in the country to use molasses.

Mr. TUPPER. Are there any syrup factories besides the one in Halifax?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, the Redpaths and Drummonds have been refining from molasses this last year and the year before. These are the only two that have been doing anything up to the present time, but under this provision no doubt some others will take advantage of it.

M. BLAKE. I suppose any existing refiners can adapt their operations to the use of molasses as the raw material?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is open to all of them.

Mr. PATERSON. What proportion of refined sugar can be taken from molasses?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Some of the refiners simply boil the molasses and make a syrup. In 1882, there were 630,000 gallons of molasses used in the manufacture of sugar or syrups, and the duty collected was \$44,000.

Mr. PATERSON. The Finance Minister has evidently had the fact brought to his attention that molasses for refining purposes, whether because it is included in the Tariff or from some other cause, has almost ceased to be used. I presume he is now giving facilities to use molasses. I suppose the 25 per cent. duty that was on it before, made it more costly as a raw material for the refiner, than melados and sugars below No. 9. Now, it is about 15 per cent. I do not know whether he had some information that would give us some idea how the 15 per cent. would compare with the product of 50 per cent. upon melados.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is but a small percentage of sugar in molasses. Last year the refinery at Halifax had to close; the rate of duty that was imposed left no margin whatever. Upon a careful examination of the amount of duty that is collected on molasses in the United States, for the same purposes, and comparing it with the revenue of our sugar refiners, we came to the conclusion that they had not sufficient margin, and therefore it was considered but right and fair to place them in a position that they could carry on that industry with a small profit.

Mr. PATERSON. The proportion is about 15 to 50 per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is nothing like the value.

Mr. PATERSON. The calculation is that there is only 15 per cent., where there is 50 per cent. in the other.

Mr. MILLS. The observation of the Minister shows that he proposes to give some people an inferior quality of sugar under this Tariff to that which they have received before. The proposition is to manufacture sugar from molasses to a larger extent than heretofore, and the hon. gentleman knows that the lower grades of sugar and molasses contain a very much larger percentage of glucose or grape sugar than the richer grades. The hon. gentleman knows that sugar manufactured from the better classes of raw sugar contain a larger quantity of cane sugar than those refined from lower grades, and we know that difference amounts to as much as 20 per cent. and that there are some varieties of refined sugar which do not contain more than 80 per cent. of cane sugar, the balance being grape sugar and glucose, and the same tendency applies to sugars produced from molasses. If he will look at the report which Prof. Edwards made to the Department some years ago, the hon. gentleman will find that verified. Every time sugar is refined, a certain percentage of cane sugar is converted into grape sugar and into glucose; and what is now proposed will give the country an inferior grade of sugar to that which it received before.

Mr. STAIRS. I do not think the remarks of the hon. gentleman exactly apply. I do not think it follows that in sugar made from molasses there is an increased quantity of grape sugar in the product. The grape sugar will not crystallize to such an extent, and therefore most of it will go into syrup and be sold as such. The refinery at Halifax, which is principally affected by the change, is intended more to manufacture and refine manufactured syrups and sell them, than to manufacture crystallized sugar from the molasses which are imported. It was put up for that purpose originally, to import from the West Indies some grades of molasses not available for grocery purposes, being I presume, too dark and in some respects inferior, and convert them into a saleable syrup. They found they could not compete with molasses from the West Indies, which were imported at 15 per cent., whereas they paid 25 per cent. It may be that they may make a little crystallized sugar; but, even if they do, the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell do not apply entirely. He may be correct, that there is a larger proportion of grape sugar in sugar so manufactured, but this will not crystallize but will merge into the molasses and will be sold as such.

Mr. TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentleman does not object to the reduction.

- 26. Zinc, chloride, salts and sulphate of, five per cent. *ad valorem*..... 5 per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Dry zinc, at the present time, used for the manufacture of paints, pays 5 per cent., and those who are importing these articles wish to manufacture that very description of dry zinc. These are some of the color manufacturers. What they say is, and there is much force in it, that the raw material from which they would manufacture dry zinc pays a higher rate of duty than the manufactured article.

Mr. BLAKE. What does it pay?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is in the unenumerated list, and pays 20 per cent.

On Resolution 3 (page 653),

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to add the following words in the third line from the bottom of this Resolution: "and on dyed cottons, jeans, coutilles, cambrics, silicias and casbans." This is the repealing clause, and we found, on looking at the Tariff Act, that there might be a doubt as to whether that portion of the old Tariff would be repealed without adding

these words to the Resolution. The effect is to repeal that portion of the Tariff now in existence which exempts these articles from the 27½ per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see how the hon. gentleman will accomplish his object by this means. He has not dealt with cambrics, silicias or casbans at all. Jeans and coutilles are dealt with for particular purposes, and it will not do to repeal the existing Tariff, which will apply generally.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Under the original Tariff, coutilles, jeans and casbans, and those two or three other articles named were in the 20 per cent. list. We transferred the coutilles and jeans, leaving them at 20 per cent., except when imported for specific purposes; and in that regard it was necessary to introduce some amendment. Last year we passed Resolutions on this subject, and I am told they did not appear in the Tariff Act. They were to come into operation on 1st January, and therefore it is necessary to move the Resolution again. It is necessary to introduce this Resolution and place all the articles at 27½ per cent., except coutilles and jeans, for corset purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. The House initiated a measure for legislation. The Resolution was simply one to be embodied in Act of Parliament, and if the House did not go any further and the Session terminated, I apprehend there is no lawful authority to collect one dollar.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There has been very little collected.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say it was a very little one, but the offense is the same.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the effect of the change with regard to mill irons and mill cranks, and wrought forgings for mills and locomotives

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Great difficulty has arisen with regard to what is wrought forging and what is not, and many parties have entered as these forgings, articles which are really not of that description, in order that they might get them in at 20 per cent. By this change they are placed at 25 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How is it with regard to those jeans, coutilles, &c. Do they come in at 20 per cent. and the others at 27½?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They were calculated before at 20 per cent., without reference to the purposes for which they were to be used. Now, in order to come in at 20 per cent., they must be imported for these two specific purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. Why are they raised this Session?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Because they are manufactured largely in this country. The corset industry employs thousands of people to-day, and it became a question of whether we would subject what is the raw material to them to an additional duty of 7½ per cent., when the duty imposed on the manufactured article was 30 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the reason for the general principle on which the hon. gentleman proposes to relatively reduce the rate of duty for these corset makers, is that these articles are their raw material. But I did not understand, until just now, that it was really proposed to advance the duties on jeans and coutilles. Is that also in reference to the silicias and cambrics?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I had thought that what the hon. gentleman was doing was merely carrying out the Resolution of the House in favor of 27½ per cent., arrived at last Session.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, with reference to printed or dyed cottons. But in the list, last year, I think there was an exception of four or five articles.

Mr. BLAKE. In his Tariff proposition last year, the hon gentleman included these jeans, coutilles, cambrics, silicias and casbans, either expressly or by implication. A considerable deputation from the dry goods trade visited the hon. gentleman, and he made an alteration in his proposal and decided that he would not embrace these articles in the proposed increase of duty, but would embrace only the printed or dyed cottons. He now proposes, without any notice whatever, to reverse the policy of last Session and to raise the duty on these articles from 20 to 27½ per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The deputation came to me last year with reference to jeans and coutilles, not with reference to the other articles. But they were in the list, and I declined to remove them. At that time the manufacturers wished all these articles to be placed in the 27½ per cent. list. I gave the representatives from the corset makers an assurance that the duty would not be increased on jeans and coutilles, these being the only two articles in which they were interested. After we had gone into Committee, last year, I should have asked that the other three articles should be put into the 27½ per cent. list; but we allowed them to remain until this year, with this understanding, that jeans and coutilles should be admitted at 20 per cent. when imported for this purpose. But it was found that by placing these at 20 per cent., it would be necessary to insert these words, so that the trade would understand.

Mr. BLAKE. So that, when printed or dyed cottons is inserted, the trade will understand these other articles?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. What increased revenue from this change does the hon. gentleman expect?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No increase. If anything, there will be a loss, because there are, in the Valleyfield factory, some 200 looms at work.

Mr. BLAKE. This is an increase of taxation intended to effect a diminution of revenue?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is an increased tariff for the purpose of encouraging industries and getting the articles as cheap as before.

On Resolution 4 (page 653),

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. As I stated the other night, importers are subject to great loss if they cannot get in the whole of their invoices. For instance, if a man imports large plates of glass in a case which are included in one invoice, unless 75 per cent. is destroyed, he can get no allowance made. Therefore, it is proposed to change to 25 per cent. of the whole invoice.

Resolutions to be reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:50 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 10th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SOULANGES CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certified copy of the judgment and decision of the said Court in the election appeal relat-

ing to the Electoral District of Soulanges, Province of Quebec, in which appeal Georges Raoul Leontad Guichard Humbert Saveuse De Beaujeu was appellant, and Stanislas Filiatrault was respondent, by which the judgment of the Superior Court for Lower Canada voiding the election on the 27th October, 1832, for the said district, was confirmed and the appeal dismissed.

#### FERRIES.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) introduced Bill (No. 115) respecting ferries.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. PATTERSON. The object of the Bill is to take away from the Dominion Government and fix in the hands of the municipality directly interested in the ferry, the power now centralized in the Dominion Government.

Bill read the first time.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say that I observe a member in another place has made the statement or insinuation that I had some concern with, or knowledge of, an article which was published in a daily newspaper, headed "Is it a crisis?" I wish to give that statement or insinuation the most distinct and unqualified denial.

#### THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company.—(Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.)

Bill (No. 33) to empower the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, limited, to construct and work a line of railway between Medicine Hat and the Company's mines on the Belly River, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

#### THE SCOTT ACT IN CUMBERLAND COUNTY, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) enquired, The reason of the delay until February 6th, 1884, of the issue of the Proclamation bringing in force the Scott Act in the county of Cumberland, Nova Scotia?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There has been no delay in the Proclamation. The election was held on the 25th of October, 1883. The returning officer reported the result of the election on the 15th of November, 1883. The papers were submitted to the Privy Council according to law on the 24th January, 1884, and the Order in Council was passed on the 5th of February, and received in the Department on the 13th of February. Parties were informed on the 14th of February, and the Order in Council was published in the *Canada Gazette* on the 16th of February, 1884.

#### PUBLIC DEBT OF CANADA ON 1st JANUARY 1884.

Mr. CHARLTON enquired, The net amount of the public debt of Canada on 1st January, 1884?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The amount of the public debt on the date mentioned by the hon. member was \$106,578,402.

#### PIER AT CRANE ISLAND.

Mr. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether the Government awarded a contract, in or about December last, for the completion of the work on the wharf at Crane Island? Who  
Mr. SPEAKER.

are the other parties who tendered? And what are the amounts of the several tenders?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation). In answer to the hon. member, I must say that, in fact a contract has been given out, at about the time referred to in his question, to complete the works of the pier at Crane Island. The contractors are Messrs. T. E. Normand and Pierre Duclos, junior. The contract was given to them for the amount of \$8,250. The other tenders received are those of Mr. Wilfrid Vézina, Messrs Isidore Samson and Aubin Lachaine, Mr. Alexander Guérard, Mr. Etienne Dussault, Messrs. S. Aikman and W. Wardle, Messrs. Charlton and Gagnon and Mr. John S. Thorn. The amount of these various tenders are \$10,000, \$10,337.50, \$10,700, \$11,000, \$12,000, \$12,800 and \$14,800. The lowest tender that of Messrs. Normand and Duclos, for \$8,250 has been accepted.

#### IMMIGRATION AGENT AND QUARANTINE OFFICER IN VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria), enquired, What occasioned the delay in making the appointments of immigration agent and quarantine officer in Vancouver Island, after the Estimates were passed by Parliament, to take effect from 1st July, 1883?

Mr. BOWELL. The appointment was delayed until the return of the then Minister of Justice, who was in British Columbia. Immediately after his return the appointment was made.

#### STONE FOR THE NEW DEPARTMENTAL BUILDING

Mr. WELDON enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to use the stone from the Curryville Quarry in the county of Albert N.B.; in the construction of the new Departmental Building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A condition of the contract is that the stone in question may be used or other stone of equal quality. That matter has not yet been decided.

#### EASTERN EXTENSION—INTERCOLONIAL RY.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury), in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Government of New Brunswick, relating to a claim made by the latter Government for the balance they claim is due them on that portion of the Intercolonial Railway, known as the Eastern Extension, since May, 1876; also, all Minutes of Council passed since that date, said: This claim is a long standing one. It was brought before the last Parliament and the Parliament previous, on both of which occasions I stated the grounds upon which it was based, and it was hoped that long before this it would have been paid. However, nothing has been done in that direction, and as there is no provision made in the Estimates this year for it, I felt it my duty to bring the matter before Parliament once more. In doing so I shall briefly explain the origin and the equitable character of the claim. It will be remembered by some members of the House, no doubt, that prior to Confederation arrangements were being made between old Canada and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia for the building of the Intercolonial Railway, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick agreeing to pay three and a-half twelfths each and old Canada five-twelfths of the amount; and the British Government engaged to guarantee the interest on a loan of £3,000,000 sterling for the construction of that work. There was some difficulty, however, in carrying out those arrangements. I think the circumstance of the Government of Canada going out of power at that time prevented the execution of the arrangement being carried out. In the

meantime the Governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick made a contract with an English company to construct a work from what is known as the Shediac road to Truro, a portion of which was in New Brunswick and a portion in Nova Scotia. The portion in New Brunswick is about 37 miles in length, and is what is mentioned in this resolution as the Eastern Extension Railway. When negotiations were going on for the construction of this railway by a company called the International Company, who were to do the work through a contracting firm known as Clarke, Puncheon & Co., it was understood that this railway would become a portion of the Intercolonial Railway when it was constructed. That arrangement was made with the British Government, in proof of which I will just read one clause from a correspondence between the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies and E. W. Watkin, Esq., on behalf of the Company:

"I am directed by His Grace to inform you in reply, that if the Lower Provinces shall, at their own expense, commence the construction of a railway on a line approved by Her Majesty's Government between Truro and the Bend, and if subsequently the proposed loan of £3,000,000 shall be raised under the Imperial guarantee in virtue of the offer contained in the above memoranda, the railway between Truro and the Bend, and the works constructed thereupon by the Lower Provinces, shall (as far as Her Majesty's Government is concerned) be considered to form part of the railway on which the loan of £3,000,000 is to be expended, and that His Grace sees no reason for requiring any change in that part of the memoranda which declares that five-twelfths of the loan shall be chargeable against Canada, three and a-half twelfths against Nova Scotia, and three and a-half twelfths against New Brunswick."

This shows that arrangements had been made that this part of the road, known as the Eastern Extension, should form part of the Intercolonial Railway. However, these arrangements were not carried out, on account of the Confederation of the old Provinces being accomplished and an Intercolonial Railway agreed upon by them. The Canadian authorities did not, however, think proper to adopt this portion of the road as a portion of the Intercolonial Railway in the first instance. I presume it was considered by the Canadian Government that the price asked for this portion of the road—the thirty-seven miles passing through New Brunswick—was more than they could pay, basing their figures on the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, about \$24,000 per mile; and they made an offer to the New Brunswick Government that they would pay them \$894,000, which is \$24,000 a mile, the presumed cost of the Intercolonial Railway. But it afterwards turned out that the Intercolonial Railway cost a very much larger sum, which entirely changed the basis of the calculation. Now, to show that the Canadian Government refused to pay the amount demanded by the Government of New Brunswick, I will read from a report of the Privy Council of Canada, approved of by His Excellency on the 26th of April, 1869:

"The Committee of Council have given their attentive consideration to the memorial of certain Senators and members of the House of Commons from New Brunswick, praying that the General Government may assume the section of railway between the European and North American Railway in New Brunswick and the Nova Scotian border, generally known as the Eastern Extension, to form portion of the Intercolonial line.

"The Committee are of opinion, under all the circumstances connected with the construction of that line, that while the General Government are in no way bound to accept it as part of the Intercolonial road, yet as the construction of the latter road parallel to it, in a strip of country thinly populated and averaging about 20 miles wide, must necessarily, under the Eastern Extension, be almost valueless, and a source of loss and embarrassment to New Brunswick to the extent of their investment in it, it would be advisable to adopt the Eastern Extension as part of the Intercolonial Railway, on the following terms and conditions:—

"First, that the entire line from the European and North American Railway to the Nova Scotian border, including the western abutment of the bridge over the Missisquoi, to be finished to the satisfaction of the Intercolonial Railway Commissioners, and a perfect title given therefor, including the lands acquired and held for the purpose of the railway.

"Second, that the price to be paid for it be \$894,000, being at the rate of \$24,000 per mile.

"Third, that the Government of Canada be not held liable for any claim, whether from contractors or others, directly or indirectly connected with the said work or its contemplated extension to Truro.

"Fourth, that the offer of the above terms be accepted within sixty days from this date, and if not, that the Commissioners be authorized to proceed with the construction of the direct line, so as not to impede the construction of the whole road."

The fact is that the New Brunswick Government were told, in so many terms, that the Dominion Government would give them \$24,000 a mile for the road, which was the price it was estimated the Intercolonial would cost. The New Brunswick Government were informed that if within three months they would accept that offer, the matter would be closed, but if not the Dominion Government would build another road parallel to the Eastern Extension, which would destroy the value of their road. Under these circumstances the New Brunswick Government were, in a measure, compelled to accept the offer, and lost by the transaction \$150,000. They received from the Dominion Government \$894,000, but out of this they had to pay the contractors \$644,000, besides the \$100,000 already paid them, leaving a deficit of \$150,000, which the New Brunswick Government had to provide. Though compelled to accept this offer, they never ceased to agitate for an equitable adjustment of this affair. In 1874 this claim was formulated with several others, and a deputation was sent to Ottawa—I think two or three deputations, at different times, have been sent to Ottawa previously to have it adjusted. The hon. member for Kent, being a member of the Local Government, was, I think, on one or two of those deputations. Again, in 1878, a deputation consisting of the leader of the Local Government and one or two other members of the Government, were sent here during the Session of Parliament. They called together the Senators and Members from New Brunswick on both sides of politics and left them to deal with the Dominion Government. A Committee was named, and as one of that Committee, I brought the matter before the House—then led by Mr. Mackenzie—and asked for papers that the claim might be fairly formulated and all information be had on the subject. However, it was late in the Session, the papers were very voluminous, and they were not printed. The Elections came on next spring and the Liberal Government was defeated, and the claim was not adjusted. In the meantime, when the Attorney General returned to New Brunswick, he laid the matter before his Government, and in the Speech from the Throne, put these words in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor. They put forward their claims in these terms:

"I have caused renewed representations to be made to the Government at Ottawa, concerning the claim of the Province to the sum of \$150,000, in respect of the Eastern Extension Railway. This matter was brought under the consideration of the Dominion Government in the month of December, 1874, and no conclusion having been reached, I deemed it advisable to send members of my Government to Ottawa, early in the present Session of Parliament, to endeavour to obtain through the co-operation of the Senators and members of the House of Commons, respecting the Province, a settlement of this and other matters. I am glad to be able to say that, with few exceptions, the members representing the Province, cordially co-operated with the members of my Government. The Provincial investment in the Eastern Extension Railway was made for a work undertaken for the Province in 1863, as a part of the Intercolonial Railway, and in view of a previous assurance of the Imperial Government that New Brunswick should not be prejudiced by commencing that portion of the work in anticipation of a final arrangement for the construction of the whole line, and that the Imperial guarantee them, when given as it was subsequently by the Imperial Government and accepted by Canada, should cover this portion of the road. The road was subsequently adopted by the Imperial Government as a part of the Intercolonial Railway. But this Province has, thus far, received from Canada only \$250,000 out of the \$400,000 put into the road by the Province. There can be no doubt of the right of the Province to receive the sum of 150,000 on this account with interest."

This puts the case in a nutshell; I would almost be willing to rest the case upon that statement. However, the claim has not yet been settled nor is there any provision for it this year in the Estimates. What I wish to point out to the House is this: that the Province of New Brunswick paid \$150,000 for that portion of the Intercolonial more than she has received, that the basis upon

which that sum was arrived at was a basis of \$24,000 a mile which it was then expected would be the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, but the Intercolonial Railway has cost something like \$40,000 per mile. You will see that this road has cost the Dominion very much less than it would have cost had the Dominion built it to the extent of some \$500,000 or \$600,000. There is another consideration which I would urge upon the Government, and that is the fact that New Brunswick is a sparsely settled country, that we have a large amount of wilderness land, much of which would be good agricultural land if settled, and that we have to expend a large amount of money in roads and bridges, and in railroads. I hold in my hand a statement from the New Brunswick Government of the amount of money paid for railroads since we went into Confederation. That amount is already \$3,363,000 in round numbers. We also gave a company for building a road which will probably form part of the Intercolonial Railway, and should have been in the first instance, 1,617,772 acres of land. Reckoning this at \$1 an acre, which will be a very low value, the total that we have expended in building railways since Confederation amounts to \$1,981,000. Then there is a law upon our Statute-Book giving a bonus of \$3,000 a mile for 250 miles of railway. There are contracts let for the whole of this amount, which will add \$750,000 more, making \$5,731,000 in all, besides \$300,000 paid by municipalities. I think the Government should consider the fact that New Brunswick has already since Confederation paid about \$6,000,000 of money for railways to open up and develop the country, that two of these roads which have been subsidized by the Local Government are really Dominion roads, and will form a portion of the Dominion road; that three or four more are feeders of the Intercolonial, and important feeders, when they are built, which will add to the value of the Dominion road; we also should consider them in view of the facts that we have taken a new departure in regard to railways, and have been subsidizing local roads; we also have been reconsidering old claims of contractors on the Intercolonial Railway, which were previously denied and left to arbitration, and paid, of less merit than the one in question. I hope these considerations will induce the Government and the House to consider this claim favourably, and without any further delay pay New Brunswick this \$150,000 and interest to date.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The papers in this case have most of them, I understand, been already sent down.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the motion will be for those that have not been sent down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, those that have not been sent down. I am sorry the Minister of Railways is unfortunately confined to his room to-day from indisposition, so that I cannot say anything with regard to the question the hon. gentleman has raised. There is no objection to the motion.

Motion, amended by the insertion of the words "not already laid before the House," agreed to.

#### COMPLAINTS AGAINST MAJOR GENERAL LUARD.

Mr. MULOCK, in moving for copies of all letters of complaint respecting the conduct of Major-General Luard at Cobourg, or elsewhere, sent by Lieut.-Col. A. T. Williams, M.P., or any person or persons, to the Government or any member thereof, together with copies of all replies thereto, and of all documents and other correspondence in the possession of the Government relating to such matters, said: In making this motion, perhaps it will be right that I should state a few matters and circumstances which, I think, suggest to me, if they do not make it my duty, to call the attention of the House to the subject matter

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury.)

of this motion. As is known to all members of this House, at one time in the history of this country we depended largely upon the Imperial forces for our colonial defence. With Confederation a change of policy was adopted and we have seen the Imperial forces gradually withdrawn from Canada, and, in lieu thereof, we have endeavoured to build up a citizen soldiery of our own. As part of that system, the Act respecting the militia of Canada provided that the chief command of the active militia of Canada shall vest from time to time in an officer holding rank in Her Majesty's Regular Army, and whose position there is not lower than that of colonel. From time to time, we have had discharging that high office, men, to all appearance, and as far as their record went, thoroughly qualified to discharge those duties; and, without tracing the various changes which have taken place—for commanding officers have come, and commanding officers have gone—we at last had come to our shores a gentleman whose military record spoke for itself. However, when he arrived here, it appears that he found amongst the militia of Canada a man his superior in military knowledge, and, without wasting time in tracing his career in command of our forces here, I will come down to one eventful day which culminated in the correspondence taking place which is asked for by this motion. On the 20th September, 1883, the third military district was encamped at Cobourg. Major-General Luard, who was then commanding officer, was present in his official capacity to inspect the troops. The inspection took place, after which the officers met in mess as part of the military ceremonies, and at this mess Major-General Luard was present, by invitation. At that mess was present, also, a gentleman occupying a distinguished place in this House. He was there, according to the newspapers, in his official capacity as Lieut.-Colonel of the 46th Battalion—I refer to the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Williams). He had been present on parade as colonel, and was present at that mess, and it is said that the Major-General was guilty of offences during his official visit to the camp at Cobourg which justified a correspondence upon the subject being opened by the hon. member for East Durham, and which, in the opinion of the editor of the Port Hope Times, justified the removal of Major-General Luard from the high position he was filling. I do not propose to enter into a consideration of the facts, but simply to call attention to the procedure adopted. It is impossible on *ex parte* statements to determine whether one view or another may be correct, and it therefore appears to me unjust that criticisms adverse to any person should be indulged in on the strength of mere newspaper statements. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is said that on the 27th September a letter was sent from the town of Port Hope to the Secretary of State for Canada, written by the hon. member for East Durham—not written by him as colonel of the 46th Battalion, but written by him as a member of this House—and in that letter he endorsed certain statements which appeared in the Port Hope Times, of the 27th September, 1883. Without reading all the article I will read only those statements of fact in the article, which were endorsed by the letter of the hon. member for East Durham to the acting Secretary of State. The newspaper report proceeds as follows:—

"The inspection concluded, the Major-General assumed command of the brigade and put it through various field movements, in the course of which he displayed those peculiarities of temperament for which he is noted, showing plainly his inability to grasp or comprehend that spirit of patriotism and self-sacrifice which animates our citizen soldiers, and strongly impressing upon the minds of those with whom he came in contact the unfavourable opinion of him which prevails so universally throughout military circles in the Dominion. The conduct of the General, on the whole, during inspection, was unworthy of an officer occupying his position, and was in direct disobedience to the Queen's Regulations, which govern him as well as the humblest private in the ranks. He failed to show that thorough knowledge, which he evidently desired others to imagine he possessed, for he was frequently shown to be incorrect when attempting to reprimand officers commanding corps, and by his insulting and boisterous tone, he seemed to desire to weaken their authority,

and lessen their self-respect in the presence of their respective commands. Some of the officers to whom he used most unbecoming and profane language, were men who were quite as well up in the details of their drill, and the knowledge of their duties as he has shown himself to be. He also made an insulting assault upon some of the officers who had assembled behind his saluting flag after the inspection parade, his language being described by the crowd of civilians standing near as most indecent, and exhibiting on his part a want of that knowledge which a man occupying the position ought to possess."

And then passing over some criticisms on that subject, I come on to another alleged statement of fact :

"On the termination of the field movements Major-General Luard was tendered an invitation to luncheon by the commandant and the officers commanding corps, which he accepted, and he was entertained in the Brigade Officers' mess tent. Here, also, he exhibited himself at a decided disadvantage, sneering at and insulting the members of the House of Commons generally, and taking advantage of his being in uniform to make attacks which were unworthy of any one occupying a much more humble position, and which, we are glad to learn, were spiritedly resented. The greatest indignation was felt by the majority of those present, it having been thought that, while he was the guest of the officers, he would at least refrain from insulting them."

In the editorial columns of that same paper, on the same day, is an article referring to the news item I have just read, and which article contains this statement :

"If the militia of Canada is to be maintained, it is of paramount necessity that Major-General Luard shall be removed from his position in this country, and some other officer more cognizant of the genius of our people, and more abreast of the age, substituted for him. His usefulness is gone, and he should not be allowed to go to remain."

Then, after referring to reports in other papers, the same editor goes on to state—referring to the alleged occurrences at mess:—

"What really occurred was this: An officer at the table was speaking to Colonel Williams in a spirit of pleasant banter of the small value which had been placed upon the patriotic efforts of members of the House of Commons at the late meeting of the Dominion Rifle Association; and Colonel Williams replied, deprecating the remark which had then been made. General Luard then, in a loud tone of voice, and in a very offensive manner, made an attack on the members of the House of Commons, which Colonel Williams indignantly resented, and said that he was satisfied the members of the House of Commons would place even a smaller value upon the opinion of the highest military authority in the country on such a matter, and that it was to their constituents that they looked for appreciation of the value of their services. The conversation was joined in by others at the table, and the General continued his offensive manner of tone."

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I understand that the hon. member for East Durham, in his capacity as a member of this House, did on the 27th of September, the date of the issue of that paper, direct a communication to the Secretary of State for Canada, in which letter he made this statement :

"I have the honour, as a member of the House of Commons, to transmit to you a copy—"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is not in order. The hon. gentleman cannot quote a paper that is not before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. He is bringing it before the House.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well. I will speak from my information, and say that in the letter in question the hon. member for East Durham endorsed the statements contained in the report and editorial which I have just read, as being a correct statement of what occurred, and called the attention of the proper authorities to the matters complained of. I am told that the newspaper containing these vague statements was, on the 9th of October, sent to the Major-General for his remarks on the statements therein contained, and that on the same day he replied asking that if any charges were to be made against him they should be formulated specifically, that he might have an opportunity of replying. I understand no charges were formulated; and that about the 15th of October the Major-General again directed a communication to the Secretary of State, asking that the charges made should be formulated or withdrawn, and saying that it was unreasonable to expect him to defend himself against vague statements contained in the

newspapers made in the loose manner in which these were made—and I think every member of the House will admit that they were made in a loose manner. This was on the 15th of October. I am told that no reply was sent by any member of the Government to the letter of Major-General Luard demanding that the charges should be formulated, that months rolled by, and that these charges were held over that gentleman's head and were neither substantiated nor withdrawn. I am further told that during this period the Major-General was in expectation of, and had reasonable right to expect, promotion in the regular army. But the fact of those charges, vague as they were, hanging over him, to some extent prejudiced his claim to such promotion. He was exceedingly desirous of having those charges investigated or withdrawn in order that not only his character as a soldier might be cleared, but that he might have the proper reward of a soldier, if entitled to it, in the regular army. From 15th October to 15th January, three months, I am told he received no reply whatever to his application, although those charges were still hanging over him and his promotion was in doubt; and on 15th January, two days before the House assembled, he called the attention of the Government to the fact that Parliament was about to assemble, that in all probability charges would be made in Parliament, and it was only fair to him that he should have them formulated in a proper manner. He received no reply to that letter, and on the next day, 16th January, he directed another letter in similar language to the Government; still he received no reply; but worn out at last and failing in health, in consequence perhaps—I do not say it is a fact—but perhaps in consequence of the irritation, the anxiety, occasioned by the position in which he was held in spite of himself, negotiations were opened up to induce his withdrawal from the force entirely. Later on it was announced in the press that he had applied for leave of absence, and it is a fair inference to draw that that leave of absence was intended to be made permanent; on that point, however, I have no knowledge whatever. But I wish to direct the attention of the House, in the first place, to the position taken by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Williams) and the line he adopted. It may be that he has taken a proper course—I do not intend at this stage of the discussion to express an opinion on that point; but as he is at present in his seat he will no doubt be able to justify the course he has taken. He is a military man, he has served years in the force, he knows what discipline is, what duty is, and no doubt he will be able to explain how as a military man he can at the same time be a member of Parliament, and how he can assert his position as a member of Parliament in a way different from that which he would have to assert it as an officer. It would seem to me not in harmony with military rules that in reference to matters forming the ground work of a charge in a military court he, being a soldier and on duty, should be able to make a complaint, except in his capacity of an officer. It does appear to me that if an officer is on duty, if he is at mess, that mess being a part of the military service, it is irregular that he should take advantage of his position as an officer and, when mess is over and his uniform thrown off, should withdraw from his tent and become a reporter. I do not say that the hon. member for East Durham did report those matters, but I find in certain correspondence it is intimated that the hon. member for East Durham did give information to the editor of the *Port Hope Times*, which was subsequently incorporated into the report which I have read. I dwell upon this point, in order that, if it is not correct, the hon. member for East Durham may have full opportunity to contradict it. I do not suppose, I will not believe, that he so far forgot his duty as a soldier as to withdraw from mess and afterwards be guilty of what would seem to be a breach of discipline, by inspiring an article against his superior officer. I think too much of the

hon. member as a gentleman, to charge him with having done any such act; at the same time, as is well known, it is intimated in the correspondence to which I have referred, that he did adopt this course, I think it proper prominently to call attention to the matter, so that he may as prominently clear up his position on this point. There is, however, one point about which there is no doubt: that he did communicate, as a member of this House, claiming in his letter, the privileges of a member of the House, and laid the charges before a tribunal in a way that an officer of Her Majesty's active militia in Canada should not have done. It seems to me most important for the welfare of the militia force of Canada that this point should be established: We have in this House many members occupying high positions in the military force of Canada, and are they as members of the House to have different rights and privileges accorded them because they are members of the House from those which are enjoyed by other members of the force? Is our force to be demoralized, I may say, by the circumstance that men are serving in the ranks and yet not amenable to their superior officers? I find in the ordinary regulations applicable to complaints that where an officer has a complaint to lay against his superior officer there is a course prescribed, and that course is not the course pursued by the hon. member for East Durham. If an officer complains that his superior officer has been unjust to him or has done anything which would form the foundation for a military enquiry, he must proceed, as I read the Regulations, through his next immediate superior officer, and it is the duty of that officer to place the complaint in the hands of the proper authorities. Why was not that course pursued here? It does not follow, I think, that because General Luard happened to occupy the highest military position in Canada, that the course adopted by the hon. gentleman should have been pursued. It would rather appear that the hon. member for East Durham desired to take advantage of his position and his influence as a member of Parliament rather than to present his claim in the ordinary way that an officer, being a member of Parliament, I submit should have been bound to have followed. I do not propose at this stage to criticise what is said to have been done, because we have no state of facts admitted on all sides. I do not know if it will be regular for me to say what I have in my mind at this moment—that our military service does sustain frequently, I think, a good deal of injury and loss of efficiency by criticisms being made which are not founded on any admitted or proved state of facts; but I can fairly call the attention of the House, for the benefit of the service, to this proposition, whether a member of Parliament holding a commission in the active militia of Canada, has any privileges or rights other than those which he would have as an officer or private were he not such a member. With these remarks I beg to move the motion which I have read.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have the pleasure of seconding the motion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I, too, Sir, want some light on this mysterious subject. The hon. gentleman has read from a newspaper which I had intended to quote from, and I will proceed to read from the *Toronto Mail*:

"Major-General Luard is rapidly becoming an impossible man for the position he holds. He appears to be a survival of one of the very worst features of the military service of England—that which permitted in field officers a license of language and bearing quite intolerable among civilized society, on the ground, apparently, that a dash of profanity and the swagger of a freebooter added a valorous air to men who had few other qualities to command respect. The idea that men in subordinate positions can be governed readily by the free use of profanity and abuse is one not wholly departed from among us. It still prevails among the 'bosses' of gangs of railway navvies, and amongst some, at least, of the general officers of Her Majesty's service. We believe neither Her Majesty nor the military authorities are very kindly disposed to encourage the indulgence of bad temper towards troops; and possibly General Luard's valuable services may have been obtained all the more easily when his faults of temper were so well known.

Mr. MULOCK,

"We publish elsewhere, from the *Port Hope Times*, an account of the affair which took place at Cobourg. We have good grounds for believing that the account is correct, and was, if at all, on the side of moderation, in describing General Luard's language and manners, if the peculiar exhibition can be called manners at all. We may say here, that we have on previous occasions exhibited all possible friendliness to General Luard, in the belief, or the hope, that he was doing some good, in his way, in creating a stronger sense of the serious nature of militia duty. But recent occurrences, and the general tenor of his conduct put it out of the question that he can be defended. We go so far as to say that it is quite impossible that he should be much longer retained.

"It is very obvious that the Major-General does not know the country nor the people. It is clear he has no adequate understanding of his duties. It is certain that he lacks all sympathy with the sacrifices made by the militia service, officers and men, in keeping together as an organization. He is entirely wanting in tact and kindness. And we have left ourselves but one thing to say of him, and that we will not say because he wears Her Majesty's uniform, and is bound to be, by the traditions of the service, a gentleman. If the rules in this respect have been relaxed, they could hardly have had any effect on Major-General Luard, whose appointment dates from the previous generation.

"It is very obvious that General Luard and Canada must part company. We have no desire at all to dictate; but we mean just what we say. Public opinion and militia opinion, and parliamentary opinion, are all pretty much the same. The Minister of Militia, of course, occupies a delicate position in such a matter. If he does not take the matter in hand at once, it will be due to him and to the militia service that members of Parliament should next Session make action imperative. This is all we need say at present. We are expressing what we believe to be public and professional opinion. If it does not bring about, in the manner we have mentioned, the change we have named, then let us hear no more about it, and let General Luard rant and swagger as he will."

If this statement be correct, and I am assured by an officer and member of Parliament who was present, that it is substantially correct, it proves the existence of a strange condition of things in connection with our militia force, worthy of the attention of the military authorities of the House and the country. But there is in it an element of compensation which proves the truth of Emerson's theory. A great French writer tells us that there is something in the misfortunes of our dearest friends which is not displeasing to an ungenerous mind. I never realized so fully the profound philosophy and wonderful wisdom of the maxim of Rochefoucauld, as I do to-day. It will be within the recollection of many members of this House, that a few years ago, when I ventured to say, that in my opinion, an old colleague of ours and an old militia officer, one who had devoted much time and attention to the service, with that courage and zeal which, I am happy to say, animates the officers and men of the entire militia force of Canada—when I ventured to say that this old colleague, this gallant officer, and this kindly and genial gentleman, had been treated with unnecessary cruelty and harshness in being reprimanded in general orders, for an offence of which nearly every commanding officer who wishes to preserve the discipline of his company had been guilty, the House will recollect that the honourable and gallant Colonel, whose trials and tribulations form the subject matter of this motion, rebuked me for the course I pursued on that occasion. He pointed out the political and military ethics which governed the situation. He told me, in a very pleasant and patronizing manner, that while my votes were always right my speeches and opinions were often wrong, and that a closer and more logical connection between the two would be more conducive to political and military discipline. He pointed out that obedience was the very essence of the military system, a blind, unhesitating, unquestioning obedience, on the part of the inferior to the superior authority. I bowed with submission to this great military authority, waiting patiently for time, the avenger, to solve this problem. Well, the whirligig of time brought its revenge sooner than I expected, and the bitter cup of contumely and humiliation which was placed to the lips of Colonels Walter Ross and Campbell, has been drained to the dregs by the gallant Colonel. All the circumstances surrounding this case were of a very mysterious character, and I am not surprised at the curiosity manifested by the hon. member for West York. I, too, share in that feeling, and I should like to have more light thrown on the dark

subject. The gallant Colonel occupies an exceptional position in this House and in the country. He is popular with the members, with the people and with the soldiery. He was regarded as the Bayard of the militia force, and as being literally without fear or reproach. "We knew him but to love him, we named him but to praise." It was thought by many that in the event of so great a calamity overtaking the country as the loss of the Minister of Militia, that he would be his fitting successor. In the event of that great strategist going down in some great battle, some deadly conflict, in defence of his country, it was felt that the cause would not be wholly lost so long as the gallant Colonel survived. This it is which makes all the attendant circumstances so strange and mysterious. It had been ordained by fate and the hon. Minister of Militia, that great military movements should take place on the western frontier. Primarily these Fall manoeuvres were intended to promote the organization and increase the discipline of that region, and in the next place, to give our neighbours across the border an idea of our military strength and powers. The theatre was prepared in which this great military spectacle was to take place, and the camp was pitched in the vicinity of the pleasant town of Cobourg. We all know the great interest which such an event excites in a district. It would be a gala day throughout the entire region. All the beauty and the chivalry of the western counties would be gathered to witness this great military display. The pomp and pride and circumstances of glorious war would be increased by the presence of fair women and brave men. The strains of martial music would add to the enthusiasm. Mounted on his war steed, the gallant Colonel would watch the world with noble horsemanship. As he rode to and fro along that glittering line, we can fancy him singing that old soldier's song:

"There's not a trade a-going  
Worth knowing, or showing,  
Like that to glory going,  
Says the bould Soger Boy."

Popular with his soldiery, popular with his constituency, envied by the men and admired by the women, his cup of felicity seemed filled to overflowing. But all is vanity, says the preacher. Black care rides behind every horseman. Every arrangement had been accurately made, every military movement carefully considered. He had reckoned with his host, with his gallant regiment, but alas he had reckoned without the Major-General. That fierce old warrior had distinguished himself on many a battle field. When the forts of Canton were attacked, it is said he led the stormers. He was schooled in all the traditions of ancient and modern warfare. He was versed in all the modes of European slaughter! But gallant soldier as he certainly was, he had the weakness of our common humanity—he had not a soul above buttons! As he rode grimly and sternly along that glittering line he marked much that was amiss, and muttered many military maledictions. He saw not the cowed and craven glances of the scourged soldiery of Europe, but the bold looks and the dauntless bearing of the free men of the forest, and the form of the man who had made for themselves fair homes in the wilderness, who were ready to die at any moment for their Queen and country, and who would hold the land as bravely as they had won it. But the brave old soldier could not understand the difference between an irregular and a regular force, or between the volunteers and the regular troops, and so he clothed himself with curses, as with a garment. He swore at everything, in the heavens above, at the earth beneath, and at the water under the earth. He made an insulting assault upon an officer. He swore at all sorts and conditions of men. We have been told on good authority, that our army swore terribly in Flanders, but we thought that the sweetness and light, the culture and civilization of the nineteenth century, had produced their

legitimate results. We thought that a service which had given us such men as Havelock and Headly Vicars, men who combined the most earnest and fervent piety with the most dauntless daring, eliminated all such coarse and vulgar elements. When Mr. Bret Harte, the American humourist, visited this city, he told us a tale of the early settlement and gold fever in California. Among the adventurers who first visited the country was a western teamster. From the first he was considered a first-class swearer, but by dint of practice, he attained the position of boss blasphemer of the Pacific Coast. One day his team became entangled in a ravine, and he entered upon a protracted course of swearing. Like the Major-General, he swore at everything in the heavens above, the earth beneath, and the waters under the earth. An excellent clergyman who was passing, ventured to remonstrate with him on this horrid blasphemy. The teamster turned on him with surprise and indignation: "So you call that swearing, do you? I never thought you devil-dodgers had any practical ability. If you want to enjoy first-class swearing, you should hear me exhort my impenitent mule." I fear the feelings of the gallant Colonel must have been like those of the excellent clergyman. Now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to ask what would you have done under like circumstances—you Sir, who represent in the Chair which you so eminently adorn, all the ideas which preside over the development of the human intellect, the idea of industry in your commercial, of justice in your legal, of war in your military, of the mystic in your religious, and of the State in your representative capacity. What would you have done, if while the gallant regiment was drawn up under the bleak shades of that magnificent but gloomy pile where justice presents her malevolent rather than her benevolent aspects. Where the intelligent remnant, to borrow the expression of Mathew Arnold, are kept in durance vile by the malignant and mechanical majority. What would you have done, if while you were meditating some great military movement a military termagant was to tell you that your military manoeuvres were on a par with your commercial capacity, your legal attainments and your knowledge of constitutional customs and parliamentary practice? I venture to say that the blood of the descendant of him who slew the "Red Comyn" would have mounted to fever heat, and that "Maksicear" would have been the order of the day. The logical sequence of the battle is the banquet. When the cruel war is over the warriors rest upon their laurels, and pass the wine cup, after the fashion of the heroes of Homer. The Viking of Heaven was of all hollow where the heroes would drink perpetual mead out of skulls of their enemies. The sweetness and light of the modern culture has made the military mess of the modern Valhalli. That eminent writer on military subjects has given us many a pleasant picture of "Our Mess." The histories of Charles O'Malley, Jack Hinton, Harry Lorrequer, Con Cregan, Maurice Tierney, and Tom Burke of Ours, will last as long as the Commentaries of Cæsar and the works of Jomimi, without violating the miseries of the mess-table, that the gay young Canadian soldiers passed the wine cup and sang pleasant songs and told many a tale of love and war, as has been the fashion with warriors from the beginning. "Why soldiers, why should we be melancholy, boys, whose business 'tis to die." But, alas! there is a skeleton to every feast, and a grim and bony old skeleton was the Major-General. He broke out in a fresh place, he grumbled, and growled at everything. He laid his mailed hand on the ark of our constitutional covenant. Horrible to relate, he sneered at the members of Parliament and at the House of Commons. It appears there is nothing sacred to a Major-General. This is not the first time that great soldiers expressed their scorn and contempt for the institutions of a free people. Oliver Cromwell purged the English House of Commons. At the time of the *coup d'état* of Napoleon III. General Espeness drove out at the point of the bayonet the

members of the French Assembly. Murat, at the instance of Napoleon I., outraged the representation of the French people. And under the very shadow of our Parliament buildings, that great soldier and Polish patriot, Colonel Gzowski, at a military banquet, and surrounded by his warriors, expressed in language of superb disdain, his supreme and profound contempt for the representatives of the Canadian people. Allow me to ask what we have done to merit such maledictions? We have done our best to promote the efficiency of the militia service. We have always voted the Estimates; we have listened with pleasure and patience to long and eloquent speeches of the Minister of Militia; we have never smiled, more than was absolutely necessary, at anything which appeared supremely ridiculous; we have never insinuated that it was possible that the hide of the lion would cover the form of a more ignoble animal, and we have given the best and bravest, the flower of the House of Commons, to the service of our country. As Hasdrubal devoted, so we have consecrated you to the service of your native land. We have taken both your money and your life; we have doomed you to deadly dinner lugubrations, luncheons and ghastly dinner parties. In addition to this, we have staked all on the hazard of the deadly dice; we have given the hon. member for Argenteuil the power behind the Throne, to the dogs of war; we have given our best beloved, the hon. Minister of Customs, to the service of Velone; we have given our gayest cavalier, our most splendid horseman, the hon. member for Beauharnois, to the cavalry service; we offered up our best shot and most perfect marksman, the hon. member for West Elgin; we have given Cols. Ouimet, Bergin, O'Brien, Tyrwhitt, Coursol and Thompson, in fact all our best and bravest, the flower of the House, yet those cormorants are not satisfied. Like the daughter of the Horse Leech, they constantly cry: Give, give. It is manifest that a great breach of the privilege of the House has been committed, and that condign punishment should follow. When that most excellent City Father, Alderman Heney, animated by his zeal for the cause of temperance, which is only exceeded by that of the hon. Minister of Finance, and the hon. member for King's, when attempting to pluck a brand from the burning, not wisely, but too well, was brought to the Bar of the House and subjected to great torture. Other illustrious culprits have expiated their sins by suffering appropriate punishment. Now, what shall we do with the Major-General? Shall we demand him from the Imperial authorities? Shall we give him a soldier's death and shoot him in the great square as Rossel and the French Communist Generals were shot in Satoria; or shall we put him to death by parliamentary practice and cause him to be pierced by the short rapier of the Sergeant-at-Arms. The punishment would be too mild for the offence. I would cause him to be placed at the Bar of this House and force him to listen to a series of lectures on Canadian warfare as compared with that of the older civilizations, pointing out that the introduction of our system might prevent the difficulties and disasters which occurred in the movements and management of European armies. I fancy the punishment would be adequate to the offence. We can understand how the gallant Colonel made his moan to the Minister of Militia. You might remember an occurrence which took place in the reign of Louis XIV. A French Marshall, more distinguished for his courtly than his military achievements, took forcible possession of a box at the theatre belonging to a French gentleman. The gentleman made his complaint to the King—Sire, I do not complain of the Duke of Richelieu, who took Monarcier; I do not complain of the Marshall de Saxe, who won many battles for Your Majesty; I do not complain of the Duke de Luxemburg, who has captured many cities for his King, but I do complain of the Marshall de Villars, who took my box at the theatre, and who took nothing else.

Mr. WRIGHT.

We can fancy the gallant Colonel making his complaint to the Minister of Justice; I do not complain of Lord Dufferin or the Marquis of Lorne, who, by the admirable administration of the affairs of this country, won the respect and esteem of all classes in the community; I do not complain of Lord Wolseley, who led the expedition to the Red River and who always behaved, while in Canada, not only as a gallant soldier, but as a kindly and genial gentleman; I do not complain of Generals McDougall, Smith, and Ross, although strict disciplinarians have always been remembered as true friends of the Canadian soldiery, but I do complain of the Major-General commanding Her Majesty's Canadian Militia, who insulted me in my military and political capacity; who, while in Canada, only captured Major Scott's towel and never captured anything else. Last Session the hon. member for Quebec, animated with that love for art, and that regard for the good, the true, and the beautiful, which so eminently distinguishes him, made a very eloquent speech, in which he suggested that some great artist should be commissioned to paint an historical picture, which would hand down to posterity lineaments of the Fathers of Confederation. I would suggest that some Canadian artist or some or Horace Vernet should be requested to paint a companion picture—the first would mark the inauguration, and the second the military progress, of the Canadian people. The scene might be laid in the vicinity of the Parliament Buildings. A military mystery would be in process of elucidation. A hollow square would be formed, of the bronzed veterans and the household troops. The Minister of Militia, mounted on his white charger, surrounded by a brilliant staff, would gaze with the air of Von Moltke on the scene. Suddenly a banner would be seen approaching. Is it the starry flag, under which the boys in blue are marching? Is it the sunburst of O'Donovan Rossa? He charges fiercely on the foe and returns covered with glory. Voltaire tells us that Frederick the Great ran away from the battlefield and hid himself in a mill, and covered himself with glory and with flour. There is a military maxim that "to the victors belong the spoil." When in the plenitude of the military power of Rome great battles were won by the soldiers of the Republic, when the victors were awarded a triumph, they paraded their trophies, captives and treasures, through the streets of the Imperial city. This maxim may be true of the military, but it is not true of political warfare. When, a few years ago, we won the great political battle; when we stormed the Liberal intrenchments; when the dust and smoke of the great conflict had cleared away, we looked down on a very pleasant political picture—the broad expanse of the El Dorado of the new Jerusalem of the North-West greeted our vision; but, alas, it was like the banquet which was spread before the Governor of Barataria, but which his Excellency was forbidden to taste. It was like the glimpse which Plato gives us of the lost Island of Atlantis. Our bugles sung truce, and everything of power, patronage and advantage was transferred from the victors to the vanquished. It was the grandest act of self-abnegation and self-sacrifice in the history of constitutional government. And to-day, when we have removed that sacrifice, we are told, as Mirabeau was, of the great treason of the Conservative party. Everything of wealth and power has enured to the advantage of our political opponents. To them, the princely palaces; to us, the prospective poor-houses. To them, the sparkling wines and costly viands; to us, the Spartans' fare. We have the proud satisfaction of thinking that these sacrifices have been made in the interest of our common country, and that our motives have been of the purest and most exalted character. The hon. Minister of Militia has had his own troubles in connection with these military matters. When he entered upon the duties of his office, he succeeded many able strategists and great tacticians. The hon. member for Digby and other great warriors preceded him. But young men are

heroes of history, and he was forced to strike out a path for himself. He remembered that war was a conflict of ideas. On one side, he represented four millions of people, imbued with aristocratic and monarchical ideas; on the other side, fifty millions of the fiercest Democrats the world has ever seen. The odds were great, but he remembered that small nations, trained in warlike habits of military discipline often conquered large ones as illustrated the battles of Plataea and Arbela. He resolved to load the dice to make assurance doubly secure. He recollected the part which the order of Knighthood had taken in the past. The plutonic that stayed the progress of heathen Prussia, the Knights of St. John and the Templars, were the bulwarks of Christendom, and stemmed the tide of Mahometan invasion; so he determined to meet the democratic with the aristocratic idea. On the one side, the simple Knights of Labour, on the other the Knights of St. Michael and St. George. We can imagine the present and the past Minister of Finance. The Knight of St. John and Des de Chalon riding at the head of their men at arms, and the one presenting his brazen and the other his silver shield to the foe. In all seriousness, I would say that the hon. Minister of Militia has done much to improve the militia force. He has pitched great camps, he has founded military institutions, he has made most eloquent speeches, which, like the bugle-call that sounds the charge, has awakened every generous, noble and manly sentiment. He has done everything in his power to promote the best interests of the militia. I have a profound respect for the officers and men of the militia force in Canada. I think them to be as gallant gentlemen and as brave soldiers as the sun ever shone on. In my own county we have military organizations which are kept up under the most difficult and trying circumstances. They maintain discipline, however; their Rifle Association sends their men to Wimbledon, where they behave in a most creditable manner. Some time ago, I was asked to attend a military festival in one of the isolated townships. It was in the very heart of the forest. As we proceeded to the place of meeting, the night was dark and the mountain tops were aflame with the forest fires, where the rapid river ran like a stream of lava. It was like a scene in Milton's "Paradise Lost." I was much impressed, as the soldiery were trooping to the place of rendezvous; some had marched a distance of twenty miles; they were composed of the very flower of our county, and every man had his tale of difficulty and hardship to tell; but all were animated by a spirit of fervent loyalty to their Queen and undying love for the land beyond the sea. It is of such men the militia of Canada is composed. What is true of my own county is, I have no doubt, true, and to a greater extent, of the other counties. Treat these men well everywhere, and they will do anything; treat them like dogs, and they will turn and rend you.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, there is, perhaps, no question which will come before this House in which the people of Canada are more interested than one affecting the Militia of the country. If we are to maintain the country which our forefathers conquered, and which was preserved by them in several battles, at Chateaugay, Lundy's Lane, Queenston Heights, and Stoney Creek, we must see that the spirit that animated our forefathers is properly and scientifically directed. What to us is this immense country, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific; what are these lines of railroads which we are building, those immense prairies, if the spirit which animated our forefathers does not remain in the breasts of their undegenerate sons, and we are not willing to defend this country with our lives? As I know that spirit animates the whole population of the country, it is the duty of the representatives of our country, to see that that spirit, when the time comes, receives a scientific direction. In the light of this, this correspondence which has been moved for by my hon. friend from York

(Mr. Mulock) becomes of interest to us, and, perhaps, it will be expedient to give an account of this eventful day, the 20th September, in which the accusations have been hurled, some on one side and some on the other, some against the gallant General who commanded on that occasion, some against the Lieut.-Colonel who commanded the gallant regiment, and other officers on that day. My present intention is to show that the gallant General who commanded on that day, an officer loaned to us by the Imperial authorities, performed his duty, and solely his duty. His history in the past shows him to be a gallant soldier, and the experience which he has had in England shows that he, at least, ought to be well qualified for the situation. He is an officer who graduated from one of the best military institutions in Europe; he took his commission from Sandhurst. By gallant experience in the Crimea and in China, he showed that he was a soldier, and one of the right stuff; perhaps, as the accounts in the papers which I have had the opportunity of seeing show he was one of the most gallant soldiers amongst the most gallant troops in the world, because you will recollect that the troops in the Crimea were composed half of French and half of English, and he gallantly distinguished himself there. His experience in England shows that he ought to be particularly useful in the direction of a volunteer force in this country. He not only had this experience in the Crimea, and China, and India, and in several foreign countries, but he was Assistant Inspector-General of Militia in England, and when temporarily on half pay he was Adjutant of one of the militia regiments in England. No one that I ever heard of found any complaint with the gallant General when he was serving his Queen and country in all these different parts of the world. It is only when he comes to Canada that complaint is found against him, and particularly about his bearing on the 20th September last. What are the facts of the case? He goes to the camp at Cobourg, and finds troops which he had found two years ago to be pretty fair, but which had relaxed in discipline so that they were not what they had been two years before. He finds, too, that some of the companies consist of only four men, and one of the complaints made against the gallant officer is on account of his swaggering and bullying style. He rides up to this person who is marching forward with four men. He was astonished. He asked what it was. The officer replies: I am Captain so-and-so, and this is company so-and-so. Captain, he says, where is your company? He points past a Sergeant and Corporal, and shows one man to the right there. The General stops and views the company, looks at them and sees that the fire which, as my hon. friend says, animates the whole militia of the Province, is in that single company. He pays a great deal of attention to them, and, after reviewing them, he orders them to form fours right, and dismisses them. The company was formed into line and marched off. Then comes the wonderful display of bravery which occurred on that day, and which the General was found fault with for criticising too severely. There was a field day, and the gallant 46th, commanded by my friend, Lieut.-Colonel Williams, was one of the most distinguished regiments on the field. They had been ordered to attack the position of the enemy, as reported by the *Port Hope Times*, they were marching in *echelon* battalions, firing as they advanced. There was a gallant Colonel of the Cobourg Cavalry—I think it was—who was placed too far to the left, and the polish which was on the helmet and pipe clay of the halberd did not receive sufficient attention; he was too far from the admiring crowd surrounding the flag-staff, and he thought his cavalry was not showing off to the best advantage, so he galloped up between two lines for the purpose of getting near the flag-staff. It may have been some military stroke of genius which raised the Colonel, and certainly the genius

of the Lieut.-Colonel of the 46th came in there. He not only had been posted thoroughly in modern tactics, but had evidently been reading the description of ancient battles. He had been reading, likely, Aytoun's description of the battle of Killioranky, and the moment the troops came in front of him he took advantage of the position and ordered his men to cease firing and to fling themselves flat on the ground. After the Cobourg cavalry passed by, there was no troops to be seen. As I said, the genius of the officer came in there. Down they crouched, like the Highlanders on the hills at the battle of Killiecrankie—

"Down they crouched amidst the Bracken  
Till the Lowland troops drew near,  
Panting like the hounds in summer  
Till they scent the stately deer."

After the cavalry got passed, and when the enemy appeared in view, you ought to have seen these gentlemen start from their lair. Didn't they rush upon the enemy with a cry which the 18th Royal Irish might envy? And at the head of them was the Lieut.-Colonel, his sword flashing in the air. I will not go on describing the battle, as, perhaps, I would not be capable of describing it properly. Now, let us come to the luncheon of the evening. The General states that among the delinquencies of my hon. friend from East Durham (Lieut.-Colonel Williams) was the fact that he arrived late at lunch. That is an unpardonable offence for an officer. When his superior officer was at luncheon with him he ought, at least, to have arrived in time. Another unpardonable offence was that the conversation turned in the direction of the House of Commons, and, as my hon. friend from Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) has related, there was a gallant Colonel, an Aide-de-camp of the Queen, presiding over this distinguished company, who made some disparaging remarks against the House of Commons on military matters. We all know how that hon. gentleman comes to be an authority upon military matters. We have the military history of that gentleman—how he distinguished himself in several strategical manoeuvres along the Grand Trunk Railway here, and how, after a distinguished career in which, as an hon. gentleman suggests, he shed the blood of his sires, he finally arrived at a position to make him capable of performing the high and onerous duty of a responsible officer in the Canadian militia, and was at length advanced to the high position of Aide-de-camp to Her Majesty the Queen, an honour for which, I am sure, the whole Canadian militia, and the whole Canadian people, feel deeply grateful to Her Majesty. He had stated at this assembly that the opinion of the House of Commons—I do not know, but in fact on every other question as well as on military questions—was not worth ten cents. Thereupon Lieut.-Col. Williams disputed that Col. Gzowski was an authority, or if he made any such statement it should be taken without any criticism upon it. The gallant gentleman who commands the Forces of the country knows that the first duty of a soldier is obedience; he had been taught it, as the hon. member for Ottawa says, by the remarks of the gallant Minister of War, and by the gallant Colonel here in the former debate upon Col. Ross. He said political questions should be laid aside, and that the hon. members of this House should remember that the first duty of every soldier is obedience. This was a great breach of discipline on Col. Williams' part, who dared to defy this high authority, the Aide-de-camp to the Queen, who dared to take the part of the House of Commons upon the question. The Major-General being an old soldier, and knowing nothing about politics, followed his line of duty; his business was to see that the opinions of an Aide-de-camp to the Queen were respected, and he very properly corrected Col. Williams, and said to him that as Col. Gzowski had expressed an opinion upon that subject, that was sufficient for him, and that no political discussion should take place at the mess; that the very fact of Col. Gzowski having expressed

Mr. HAGGART.

an opinion was enough for him and ought to be enough for Col. Williams. Col. Williams took advantage of his position as a member of Parliament to make a complaint to the Government. He says the Major-General said that was not the duty of a member of Parliament nor of a gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps I am giving a wrong interpretation to it; the Secretary of State will be more correctly informed as to the statement. The General stated that he remained at Cobourg for a day or two afterwards, and that if Col. Williams was offended there was open to him the course as between one gentleman and another—he was there: or that, as a junior officer, he could take the course which is provided by the rules and regulations of the Army, and if he chose to take that course, he had the military channels, through which to make his complaint. Lieut.-Colonel Williams did not take this course. He did not go over to see the Major-General and make the requisite explanation to him, but he took the course of sending a complaint directly to Ottawa, which ought to have been sent through the Major-General's hands. The Major-General justly complains of such a course as that. He says it is extraordinary conduct; that if in the privacy of social gatherings a gentleman, because he happens to be a member of Parliament, is permitted afterwards to bring to the notice of Government what occurred at that gathering, the question will naturally arise whether, in any society where a member of Parliament is present, he might not make similar complaints. But I will give you the exact words of the Major-General:

"Extraordinary conduct. If, in the privacy of social gatherings, a member of Parliament is surrounded with privileges which permit of his afterwards bringing to the notice of Government what has taken place, will it be possible for gentlemen to meet in society with confidence so long as a member of Parliament is present."

The gallant General says afterwards:

"Most certainly I would not attend any meeting at which a gentleman was present who availed himself of any such privileges as that."

Now, I think it is pretty hard lines if an old gentleman—a kindly old gentleman, I believe he is, in private life, a gallant soldier who has distinguished himself in several engagements, who has served in every part of the Empire—should come here and have fault found with him, and for what? Because at a little conversation at luncheon he rebuked a Lieut.-Colonel who happened to be a member of Parliament because he differed from Col. Gzowski, an Aide-de-camp to the Queen. It is hard that an old gentleman who has so distinguished himself should be so persecuted that he should have to ask for leave of absence for the purpose of withdrawing from this country. Now I say that there has been no General who has ever commanded the forces in Canada, so far as I can learn, who has done more to discipline the Force than Major-General Luard. Instead of adopting the swaggering, bullying tone that the hon. member for Ottawa talks about, he comes up and talks to you in your face, as a soldier should do. He speaks out sternly to them and tells them to do this or that.

Mr. WRIGHT. I must correct the hon. gentleman. I gave my authority. I know nothing of the circumstances myself. The hon. gentleman did not give his authority, but he read from an article where he was accused of doing that.

Mr. HAGGART. I read from the *Mail* newspaper. Perhaps he speaks in a commanding tone, to which the officers are unaccustomed. Perhaps he does not understand the genius of the people. Are we a lot of Yankees to whom he should say: Will you be kind and condescending enough to do this, and that and I will be under a great compliment to you? No, he is an officer and a soldier, and the general opinion throughout Militia circles over the whole country is

that he has done more efficient service for the Force than any officer who preceded him. The trouble which he has taken and the boldness he has displayed as an officer and a soldier in doing his duty to his Government and his Queen, in speaking out boldly, and where anything was wrong saying it was wrong, encouraging those who wanted encouragement and rebuking those who were unsoldierlike, are matters which will cause him to be long remembered in this country; and the people will always give credit to the soldier who does his duty, who sees that the officers and men under his command are kept up to the regulations, and who uses every possible means to make the Militia efficient, so that they may be ready when required. They will remember him, and remember that he did his duty, when they have forgotten commanding officers who have preceded him, and whose principal duty seemed to be to tell his troops that this was the finest regiment he ever reviewed and that no troops he ever saw in his life excelled them. It is a most difficult duty, at any rate, that the General Commanding Officer of the Canadian Militia has to perform. Our Militia contains some as efficient and able officers as are to be found in any Force in the world. All of us have read the speeches delivered by a certain gallant Colonel who commands a regiment which we have here at the opening and closing of the House, and which we are all proud of, and we gather outside to watch their martial bearing when they come along, marching to the beat of the drum. Then there is another Colonel. He was over in Europe a few years ago, and had an opportunity of witnessing reviews of the troops of the different military nations of the continent. When he returned he paid his regiment the compliment, that the European troops were very similar to his own. We have another gallant Colonel in this city who commands another gallant regiment. He has leisure time enough to devote himself to a high course of study in strategy and the campaigns of the Duke of Wellington. Then we have a celebrated Colonel who is Aide-de-camp to Her Majesty—Colonel Gzowski. So we can all see the difficulty that a plain soldier like General Luard experienced in coming here to direct such a scientific corps as that which we have in this country. Let me make a comparison between the state of efficiency of the Militia of this country and that of our Navy. A few moments ago I observed Commander Fortin in his seat. Let us see how men in the navy have learnt that the first duty is obedience; when an order comes from a superior they at once obey it. On one of the little excursions down the river St. Lawrence, Commander Fortin, of the Canadian Navy, was on board. While going down the river the men had a line run out aft for the purpose of catching fish. They hooked a porpoise. On hauling it on board the steamer Commander Fortin said it was a shark. The men all thought it was a porpoise; but the Commander said it was a shark, and ever from that day to this, wherever the broad pennant of the Canadian Navy floats, a porpoise is known as a shark. I draw attention to this incident to show the value of obedience. That is the way Col. Williams should have looked at the matter at luncheon. Colonel Williams was there as Lieutenant-Colonel of the gallant 46th. Whatever might be said, his first duty was obedience. Col. Gzowski might have been right or might have been wrong, but Colonel Williams should not have ventured an opinion on the subject. That is what I call true military discipline. I have nothing more to say on this interesting subject further than this: an old General has gone from us. He has a good military record in the Imperial service; the people with whom he is acquainted will remember his kindness; the Militia Force will acknowledge that he was a soldier and did his duty; and after all this political fuss has past away, he will be remembered by the Militia Force for his kindness and for his soldier-like qualities and for

having impressed on the Militia Force that the chief duty of a soldier is to obey his commanding officer.

Mr. MACMASTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that this subject has come before the House. Evidently it was the intention of the hon. member for East Durham that after the end required to be subserved for the Service had been attained, the matter should be allowed to drop. Nevertheless, it has been the desire of some hon. members to bring it before the House, and as it has been so brought, it becomes our duty to discuss it in a temperate spirit. A great deal in the way of joke and jest has been said in regard to this subject. I do not object to anything of that kind, but the question has a serious side to it, and although it is always very pleasing to hear a speech by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright), and it is presumed in this House that when he speaks the occasion is the best show of the season, yet there may be other considerations than extending sympathy to the hon. member for East Durham, on which comment may be fairly made. I regret, on this occasion, he ventured to trot out a dead horse and rake up some imaginary grievances he had in connection with another officer of Militia. I do not wish to say anything which might appear disparaging to the gallant Major-General with regard to this matter. In fact, if the Major-General had heard the speeches delivered in this House, he might have truly said: Save me from my friends. There is quite enough in the record of the Major-General to enable the House to look upon the matter now before it in a thoroughly impartial spirit. I regret, however, that the hon. member for Ottawa County while discussing this subject should have interjected two other subjects thoroughly alien to it. One was the subject which occupied the attention of the House a few days ago, and on which, with great liberality, we undertook to dispense on certain terms a large sum of money. I came to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman had intended to speak on that subject, and that because he had no opportunity, or for some other reason, he did not speak in that debate and that, therefore, he has thought it proper to interpolate his remarks in this discussion. The other was the reference he made to the interest he had in a gallant Militia officer who, he thought, had not been fairly treated in this House. The hon. gentleman said that he did not think that his opportunity of repaying the hon. member for East Durham would come so soon, and it would therefore appear the hon. member was quietly watching for some opportunity to bring to the notice of the House something which might be amusing to hon. members and by which he might, at the same time, get even with—I believe that was the expression he used—the hon. member for Durham.

Mr. WRIGHT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I never used such an expression. Those words are the hon. gentleman's own words.

Mr. MACMASTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not use the identical expression, but substantially he took the position that his friend had been injured in a previous discussion, and that he did not think that an opportunity would have come so soon of giving the hon. member for East Durham a *quid pro quo*. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is in that view of the case, a little of the element of revenge—something which is not quite like the hon. member for Ottawa County. I think I may apply to him, on this occasion, the language of a poet of whom he is no doubt an ardent admirer—I mean Lord Byron:—

“Sweet is revenge—especially to women,  
Pillage to soldiers, prize-money to seamen.”

Though revenge is sweet I did not think that it would prove quite so attractive to the hon. member for Ottawa County,

that he should rub it to such an extent into the gallant Colonel who represents East Durham. But we all know so well the excellent qualities of the hon. member for Ottawa, we are all so greatly pleased to hear him address this House with so much ability and pleasantry, that we could thoroughly understand that good feeling was underlying his remarks, and that the hon. member for East Durham has no warmer friend or greater admirer than the hon. member for Ottawa County. Now, what is this all about? The hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) said truly that the hon. member for East Durham was a gallant officer and knew his duty as a military man. But how did this discussion originate. We find that on a certain day a tragic event took place in the Town of Cobourg. I will not attempt to describe that event, as my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Haggart) has described it much better than I could. The day was an eventful day—a historic day—the 20th of September, the anniversary of the battle of the Alma. It is no wonder that the Major-General imagined that he should carry out his military ideas with greater stringency than on ordinary occasions. From one end of the country to the other we find that the press, which represents the feeling and the experience of the country—experience which was based not merely on the inspection held that day in Cobourg, but the inspections held at all the other camps—represented that the Major-General on that occasion lost his temper, and used language which certainly could be called profane; that he damned and jeered at the officers, and otherwise so deported himself, whether rightly or wrongly according to military laws, as utterly to destroy the otherwise good effects of his Major-Generalship. We find that in the mess-room he engaged himself in a dispute with certain officers with regard to the speeches of the members of the House of Commons on military subjects. I think, to say the least of it, that is a subject which he should have avoided. However, in that discussion he came in conflict with Col. Williams, who resented the attack he made on the members of the House of Commons. I think in this connection I may be permitted to give the testimony of a paper, the *Port Hope Guide* which said:

“Col. Williams is deserving of praise for the manly stand taken by him.”

The press from one end of the country to the other justified Col. Williams for the stand he took on that occasion in defence of members of the House of Commons, and in resenting what cannot be characterised otherwise than as a gratuitous insult to members of this House. I do not think however it is one which is worthy of further notice from this House. I do not think it is necessary that Major-General Luard should be brought to the bar of the House, but I say that the attack was an indiscreet one, and should not have been made.

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

#### After Recess.

Mr. MACMASTER. I closed my former remarks by the enquiry, what was the whole discussion about? What was it that the hon. member for East Durham did to justify the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), in bringing this matter to the attention of the House? Now, it turns out, that the hon. member for East Durham, brought to the notice of the Government certain occurrences of a public nature in connection with the public inspection of the Volunteer Militia Force at the town of Cobourg. In so bringing the matter to the notice of the Government, the hon. gentleman transmitted a copy of a newspaper, circumstantially setting out certain things which were alleged by way of misconduct against the Major-General. Col. Williams did not make specific charges—it was not for him to make charges against an officer of the Imperial Service; he did not assume the responsibility of making such charges; but he simply called the attention of the

Mr. MACMASTER.

Government and of the Governor General to certain matters which had become of public notoriety in connection with the officer commanding the Militia Force of this country. That was all the hon. gentleman did. The Major-General at once constituted the hon. member for East Durham a complainant, a prosecutor, and he demanded that he should specify his charges. Sir, these charges were specified in the public press of the country. The paper containing them was communicated to the Secretary of State, and, with Col. Williams' letter, was communicated to the Major-General commanding the Forces. After these charges were so communicated, what course did the Major-General take? He did not meet the public issue, he did not meet what was the substance of the communication of the hon. member for East Durham—not that he had a personal grievance, but that the Force was being injured and demoralized by the course of conduct pursued by the Major-General. The Major-General responded, and endeavoured to turn the whole affair into a personal quarrel, a personal difficulty, a personal contest, between Col. Williams and himself. He evaded the main issue, that the Service was being demoralized, and he wished to engage in what practically amounted to a private quarrel with Col. Williams. Well, the hon. member for East Durham replied. He said: This is no affair of mine; I have nothing to do with this matter personally; I speak as a member of the Canadian Militia, as a man interested in the public affairs of this country, and I represent to the Government of this country that the Militia Force is being disorganized by a want of discipline, by displays of temper, lack of judgment, and lack of tact on the part of the chief officer commanding the Forces in this country. That was the position taken by the hon. member for East Durham. He had no quarrel with the Major-General; he had no cause for quarrel with him. There were only two possible causes of a quarrel. The first was: Did the Major-General make any charge against him in connection with his services as an officer? Not at all; because the Major-General, in a letter addressed, a few days afterwards, to the *Globe* newspaper, of Toronto, spoke as follows in reference to Col. Williams:

“I hope a difference of opinion on a matter which need not be introduced into this note, may not interfere with the friendly feelings I entertain towards this valuable Militia officer.”

So we have the Major-General's testimony that Col. Williams is a “valuable Militia officer.” Neither was there any personal quarrel between the hon. member for East Durham and the Major-General, in connection with the affront that was offered to the House of Commons. Why? Because at the mess at which the difference of opinion occurred, the hon. member for East Durham had resented, and resented properly, and with becoming dignity, the reproach that was there offered to the House of Commons by the Major-General, in placing the opinions of this House on Militia matters at the low value of ten cents. I think the Major-General should not have endorsed that remark if he was a prudent man. He is absent to night, although he is not without able representatives on the floor of this House; and I do not wish to do the slightest injustice to that officer, who holds a high position in the Service of the Mother Country; but I do say that to comment on the remarks of hon. members in this House and to place them at the low value of ten cents, was something that a gentleman holding the high Commission of Major-General in the Imperial Army should have refrained from making. The Major-General, in reply to the statements made by Col. Williams, set up two or three matters that had nothing in the world to do with the public consideration of this question. One of the petty matters which he set up was that Col. Williams had been too late for lunch. Well, we all appreciate that Col. Williams, in being a minute and a-half late in coming to lunch, committed a very grave offence. But the Major-General, in his

answer to Col. Williams, cast a grave reflection on the members of the House of Commons. This was a second reflection. Have the members of this House any regard for their own dignity? Have they any self respect? I submit the following statements, and let hon. members consider for themselves. The Major-General says :

"To me it appears that Lieut.-Col. Williams has taken advantage of his privileges, in the capacity of a member of Parliament, to bring to notice an article relating to himself in his capacity as an officer of Militia."

Now, that statement is inadvertently incorrect. What Col. Williams did bring to the notice of the Government was, not an article relating to himself, but a matter in which the public press of the country had commented adversely on the public conduct of the Major-General. So that the Major-General's attempt to make it appear that Col. Williams had referred to himself, is a complete displacement of the controversy between those two gentlemen.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I rise to a point of order. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman is reading from. Is it something which is before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not read from any document without placing it on the Table of the House.

Mr. MACMASTER. I shall be delighted to place it on the Table of the House. The Major-General says :

"That his conduct, which seems to be extraordinary, and naturally leads to the question, if, in the privacy of a social gathering, a member of Parliament is surrounded by privileges which permit of his afterwards bringing to the notice of the Government what has taken place, will it be impossible for gentlemen to meet in society with confidence, so long as a member of Parliament is present."

The Major-General makes an insinuation against members of Parliament. He might have had, according to his own view, a cause for quarrel with the hon. member for East Durham, but he went beyond that. He does not even say this is not applicable to members of Parliament in general, but he pointedly and broadly makes the insinuation that members of Parliament may not, with confidence, be met in the social relations of life, by reason of their privileges as such. I do not think any member of Parliament ever claimed any such privilege. The hon. member for East Durham, in bringing this matter to the notice of the Government, did not claim that privilege. What he did was to voice the universal sentiment of this country, expressed from one end to the other, not in the press of any political party in particular, but in the press of both of the great political parties of this country, that the Major-General, notwithstanding his distinguished military services—and I am willing to admit there was a conscientiousness in his devotion to his duties—he so performed those duties as to completely destroy the efficacy of his endeavours in the interests of the Militia of our country. We find, further, that the Major-General said :

"I remained at Cobourg until the following day, and Col. Williams might, if offended with me, have found me, and I would have been glad to have afforded him explanation, either as between one gentleman and another, or as between two officers, the junior offended with the senior."

What is the meaning of these words? Was the hon. member for East Durham, whose record for twenty years in connection with the Militia Force of this country is entirely beyond cavil, was my hon. friend who came to this country not yesterday, but who grew up with and has been for years connected with the Volunteer Force and obtained a distinguished position as Colonel of a battalion—was he to know for what cause Major-General remained over from one day to another at a hotel in the town of Cobourg? Later, a communication is made by the General stating that he was there. For what purpose? To give the explanation that one private gentleman might give to another—he intimates, therefore, that an explanation should be given—or to

give a further explanation—which might be interpreted in another sense if we were to strain the words in this connection—that one military gentleman might give to another, the junior offended with the senior. Is this an appeal to "the Christless code that must have life for a blow?" I hope I shall not have to come to the conclusion that the Imperial officer, representing all that is great and illustrious in the army of the Mother Country, did loiter twenty-four hours about the town of Cobourg, until the hon. member for East Durham, who did not know the cause of his remaining there, should send him a challenge to meet in mortal combat. Surely the suppressed belligerent tone, the unexplained conduct of the Major-General, are not to be commended by the members of this House. But if that be the construction to be put on the document, I ask every hon. member of this House, I ask my hon. military friend from Muskoka, who has, I have no doubt, been "out" several times himself—I ask him if it is not a violation of the law regulating the discipline of the Army and Navy, for an officer to insinuate or suggest anything in the nature of a duel. Had the Major-General thrown off this cloud of mystery involved in his remaining around Cobourg, had he communicated, as gentlemen and officers do with one another, his desire for blood, his wish to meet the hon. member for East Durham in mortal conflict, I am sure that the hon. gentleman, who has so frequently whipped into line the majority in this House, would not have failed on that occasion. But Mr. Speaker, what have hon. members to do with this private difficulty? The hon. member for Ottawa, with that happiness that always characterizes him in debate, has given us the pleasant side of this discussion and has thrown in a large subsidy of truth under the cover of comicality. He is always right. This is not a joke, for the King can do no wrong. But we see involved, on the serious side of this discussion—what? The honour of Parliament, which no man would be more ready to maintain than the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright). We see more; we see involved in it the honour of our Militia Force, which has not hesitated to come to the front when real and serious duty is to be performed. What was the history of this country in 1866, when a foreign invasion was on our shores? Who were first at the front, giving their services and lives in the defence of their country? I appeal to every hon. member whether the 13th Battalion of Hamilton and the "Queen's Own," from Toronto were not ahead of the regular Forces of the Empire by twenty-four hours, and the first to engage with the enemy. From one end of the country to the other, irrespective of nationality or politics, for in the defence of our country we have no politics, the Militia Forces of this country, under the guidance and the instruction and the leadership of the patriotic men who have undertaken to bring them to efficiency, have always been ready to render that duty to the country which they owe to it, and to conduct themselves in a manner worthy the traditions of British arms. I do not think that the officers and men of this Force should be wantonly jeered at—I will not use the strong term, insulted—I think there should have been moderation in the remarks of the Major-General. The Queen's Regulations require that officers commanding forces should demean themselves with civility and respect toward those forces, and it is no part of the duty of the General commanding to walk up to officers commanding regiments, or even to officers commanding companies, and to "damn" or jeer at them. That conduct may have suited under the old *regime*, but it has no part of the present *regime*. What say the Queen's Regulations:

"Courtesy among military men is indispensable to discipline. Commanding officers should not only bear this in mind, but they should inculcate the principle in those they command."

I leave it to you, whether the epithets actually used—of course I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but I

take it for granted that what all say must be true—I leave it to you whether language of the character attributed to the Major-General was of a character to improve the discipline of the Militia. I detract in no respect from the honourable services of the Major-General in war. No doubt he rendered noble services to his country before coming here, but we are not here to pass judgment on that. We concede all that, but what we are called to pass judgment on is, whether his acts or deeds were of such a character as to injure our military forces. Only that and nothing more. Anything more we may concede, but with that alone we have to deal. On that point, unfortunately, there is a consensus of opinion, from Halifax to Port Moody. The Major-General, through an infirmity of temper, has not so conducted himself as to promote the efficiency of our Forces. That much must be conceded. It is to that that the hon. member for East Durham wished to call the attention of the proper authorities, and it is to that I would point. I do not know if it was the duty of the Canadian Government to institute an enquiry. I believe that the Major-General commanding is an Imperial officer. Perhaps it was beyond the power of this Government to institute an enquiry, but whether they instituted an enquiry or not, my hon. friend says that the Major-General has left this country on leave of absence without trial. I am not aware whether we have the right to try him or not, but this I conceive, that the Government of this country had the right, when they found there was a general opinion among our Volunteer Forces, that his usefulness had practically ended, to make such representations as would lead to his retirement. There is nothing I can see that is more regrettable than for a man to retire under a cloud. The hon. member for East Durham, like the true and hon. gentleman that he is, did not press this matter as a persecutor. He let it stand, and left the universal testimony prevailing in this country to bring conviction to the officer commanding the Forces, and in due time General Luard asked leave and received leave to retire and did retire, and I believe is not to return. I am sure every hon. gentleman wishes the Major-General success in his future career. We wish that he may be transferred to those scenes where his temper may not be irritated by the frail performances of patriotic men, who give their service to this their native or their adopted country for very small considerations; who at great personal inconvenience, from year to year, come out to do that drill which many other laggards avoid; who are ready at all times to render their services to their country; and that he may be transferred to a sphere with which he is no doubt more familiar, for which he is more qualified, and where he may engage in that active service in which, I have no doubt, he will attain, and I hope he will attain, that distinction which awaits all gallant officers of Her Majesty's Service. Mr. Speaker, as I said, it is regrettable that this subject came up for discussion, and I do not intend to detain the House longer in the remarks I intended to address to it. Having come up, it was necessary to refer to it to a limited extent. I hope I have said nothing—I am sure I did not desire to say anything—to reflect in terms, beyond what the necessities of the case required upon the conduct of the Major-General; but, when the conduct of my hon. friend from East Durham was put in the balance, when it was represented in this House that the controversy now engaging its attention was not the question of the conduct of the Major-General, but, as was sarcastically said, the trials and tribulations of the hon. member for East Durham, then it becomes hon. members of this House to investigate the question, to weigh it carefully and calmly, and to see where the blame should be apportioned. I see on one side a gentleman who is retiring from the service, who is retiring to the Mother Country for reasons it is unnecessary to discuss further, and on the other side the hon. member for East Durham who has been an officer for over twenty years

Mr. MACMASTER.

in the Militia Force of this country, who rendered not merely holiday service but active service, whose character as a military officer is recognized by the Major-General himself, who had no personal part or lot in this quarrel, and who is entitled to the vindication of the hon. members of this House. When that vindication came—not by persecution, not by prosecuting to trial the Major-General who had become his temporary opponent in this matter, when the result came about that naturally flowed from the proceedings I have referred to—what did Col. Williams do? He withdrew his letter, not his charge. Like a true gentleman, he said: The end being attained, I have no desire to press or harass any individual, and I therefore will let the matter rest. The bringing up of this matter is no act of his; it originates elsewhere. I do not pretend to characterize the propriety or impropriety of bringing it up before this House; I only say I regret it should have been brought up; but whether hon. gentlemen may regret it or not, this must be perfectly apparent, that my hon. friend from East Durham, whether you regard him in his military character or in his character as a member of this House, has but echoed the universal sentiment of the people of this country with regard to this subject. Furthermore, I think I have only to appeal to the hon. members of this House, to those who are familiar with my hon. friend, year in and year out, not only to those who know that he enjoys the confidence of the great political party with which he is connected, and who know that he enjoys the confidence of the chiefs of that party, but to our hon. friends opposite, with whom he has had to come in contact frequently, in order to secure their and our testimony to one common verdict, that it is impossible to conceive of any set of circumstances in which my hon. friend from East Durham would be untrue to himself or untrue to the grand old name of gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings). It is only my intention to say a few words upon the subject now before the House, as I am suffering from a very severe bronchial affection, which renders it not only painful for me to speak, but an effort to make myself heard; but I think, as we are told that Major-General Luard has left this country to reside in England, it is only due to the people of Canada that his successor, whoever he may be, should be made aware of what the people here, and particularly the volunteers, expect at his hands, and that at least a little more courtesy should be extended to them than was done by that officer. When the Imperial troops were withdrawn from this country many years ago, and we were left to our own resources, we were told we had plenty of loyal and brave and hardy young men who would form themselves into a Volunteer Force and afford to us the same protection that we had received from the Imperial troops, and who would defend our homes and our borders from those who were hostile to us. This announcement had scarcely more than been made by the Imperial Government, the fiat had only gone forth, when we found hundreds and thousands, not only of young men willing to defend their country, but of middle-aged men and those who had already seen service, who were prepared to band themselves together as one man into a Volunteer Force, and who not only manned the companies but officered them, and completed the battalions and the batteries, and have given to us that of which we have just reason to feel proud, not only one of the most efficient Volunteer Forces, but one of the most excellent Volunteer systems that exist in any part of the globe. Well do I remember, in the section of country in which I live, when the 15th Argyle Light Infantry was organized, of which I was a member, commanded by Lieut.-Col. Campbell, an excellent officer, and a brother of our Minister of Justice, how quickly the men responded to the call and filled up the ranks. We had good men volunteer-

ing as officers, and we had more than our complement of men, so that there was not a place left in the ranks for those who were anxious to become members of the battalion. I was placed on that occasion in the very anomalous position of being promoted from the position of Ensign to that of Sergeant, not through any dereliction of duty on my part, but because a gentleman was desirous of becoming a Lieutenant of our company, and our Lieutenant very kindly suggested to me that, if I would take the Sergeancy of the company, he would take the Ensigney. I did not know much about military matters in those days, and I conceded to his request, but it was not long before I learned that there was a great distinction between an officer and a non-commissioned officer; and, did I not salute my Ensign in due and ancient form, the probabilities are, that I would have gone to the guard-house. We have in the County of Hastings two excellent battalions, the 49th, which was commanded by Lieut.-Col. Brown, who sat for many years in this House, and was an old and tried officer—and by the way, I might say, it was by certain deeds of heroism and valour that my hon. friend on my left (Mr. Bowell) succeeded in earning the distinction he now enjoys of commanding that battalion as Lieut.-Col.—and the 15th Argyle Light Infantry commanded by Col. Lazier, a very excellent and indefatigable officer. And I would say *en passant* to my friend, the hon. Minister of Militia, that I hope when the Estimates come down he will not forget us, as we are very sadly in need of a drill shed in our county. Now, Sir, amid the very hard knocks and, I may say, exposure to the broiling sun in learning the goose step as a member of the awkward squad myself, and subsequently in drilling the members of that squad, and perfecting myself as far as I could in military knowledge, I eventually succeeded in obtaining the position of Captain of my company. Subsequently I went down and passed my examination before the Military Board at Kingston, securing first and second class certificates, and though not now an active member of the Volunteer Force, I feel very proud of those certificates. Now, it is a very significant and well known fact that until the time that General Luard took command of the Forces in Canada we never heard a word of dissatisfaction or discontent of any kind, there were no complaints. The men were proud of their battalions, they endeavoured to attain efficiency in drill, and looked forward with a great deal of pleasure to inspection day. They expected on that occasion, to make as presentable an appearance as possible, after the very limited time placed at their disposal for the purpose of acquiring a knowledge of their drill. But we find that instead of receiving encouragement and a kindly word at the hands of the inspecting officer, they were very often treated, not only unkindly but harshly, and even insultingly. Now, a commanding officer may be a strict disciplinarian, he may pride himself upon being, even, a martinet; he may be imperious, haughty and proud, but he should not forget that this is, comparatively, a new country; that we are to a great extent novices in military matters, and we expect to be treated, if not as gentlemen, certainly as men, and not as menials or *serfs*. Now who are the volunteers in this country? Who comprise the Volunteer Force of Canada? Why, Sir, we ourselves, our sons, our brothers, and our nephews—and I was going to say, in the words of the opera, "our sisters, our cousins, and our aunts," because I believe they are as loyal and as patriotic as we are. How often do you see the sons of the officers of battalions holding positions in the ranks? The ranks are filled up by the sons of professional men, by the artisan, the mechanic and the labouring man—all anxious to do their duty, and to secure what distinction they can, and to take their chances for promotion. Now, from the time that the grand old United Empire Loyalists, true to their allegiance, and standing by the good old flag, despite privations and con-

ditions, were driven from the neighbouring Republic to the wilds and wildernesses of Canada, who hewed out for themselves and their families a home in the forest, amid great hardships and trials, and gave to us as a heritage—this great Dominion of ours—down to 1812-14, to 1837-38, and to 1866, when our young men left their desks and counting houses and their places of business, and many of our loyal young men, even, who were occupying positions of trust and emolument in the United States, came forward to defend our borders. From that time down, even to this present day, a spirit of loyalty has animated the breasts of every Canadian and of every Canadian volunteer. It is our duty to do all we can for the purpose of encouraging our Volunteer Force. We should not put any obstacle in their way, we should not check their enthusiasm, but we should endeavour to do what we can to make them proud of themselves, proud of their battalion, and proud of their country. We may hope that the time will come when war will be no more upon this earth, when the desire for territorial aggrandizement and for the acquisition of a few additional acres of land—when a dispute about the navigation of a certain river or the menace or insult to a subject—will be submitted to the arbitration and award of some of the great nations; and when, Sir, instead of depleting our exchequers, and decimating our population, and making thousands of widows and orphans, the sword will be turned into the pruning hook, and all our superfluous population will be sent to our great North-West, where there are thousands of acres of arable and tillable land awaiting cultivation and ready to receive them and supply them with homes. But until that time does come, I am satisfied that should our country require the services of our noble volunteers, when the bugle shall sound they will be ready to answer to the roll call, and to defend not only our rights, but our homes and our firesides, with their lives, if necessary. I trust that the gentleman who is sent out here as the successor of Major-General Luard will be one, not only suitable for the military interests of the country, but that he will also be congenial to the feelings of the volunteers.

Mr. COURSOL. I would not have said a word upon this occasion were it not for an expression that was used by the mover of this motion. In alluding to the member for East Durham, he said he was sorry the gallant Colonel had acted as a sort of reporter, and that in doing so his conduct was not such as it ought to have been, either for a gentleman or for an officer.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to correct the hon. member; I used no such language. I say that it was intimated in the correspondence, which I was forbidden to read, that the hon. member for East Durham had communicated to the press certain information that had been embodied in the report; but I added, as my own opinion, that I believed he was too much of a gentleman to do any such thing.

Mr. COURSOL. I am very glad to hear the correction. I heard the word reporter used, and I thought it was used in that sense. I am sorry, Sir, that General Luard is now on his way to England; I am sorry he has left our shores before this discussion came on, as I would have been pleased had he been present in the gallery this evening. He would have heard the highest eulogiums passed on his services, he would have heard hon. gentlemen mention his name in terms of the highest praise on account of his military attainments and his brave conduct on the field of battle. But, Sir, as a brave man himself, he would also, doubtless, have heard without offence, some severe criticisms made on his conduct as General commanding the volunteers of Canada. Now, Sir, there is a fact which cannot be denied, either in this House or out of it, nor yet by the press, and that is, that the whole Volunteer Force of Canada, and nearly the entire press, agree in stating that General Luard was not the right man to command our Volunteer Forces. General Luard,

I know, is a gentleman of high military attainments, who has distinguished himself no less on the field of battle than as a soldier in time of peace, and I would by no means detract one iota from his high reputation in this regard. General Luard was not the first man who had those duties to perform. Other Generals, equally distinguished with himself, have occupied the same position, but never before did the Volunteer Force complain of such language and such conduct; never before did commanding officers dare to insult the Volunteer Force, or insult its officers, who were gentlemen, their equal in every respect. General Williams, the hero of Kars, had charge of the Force for a long time, and during a most memorable event, that of the Trent affair, and everyone praised his conduct towards the volunteers. General Windham had command of the volunteers also. General Ross, Sir Patrick McDougald, General Sydney Smythe and others had the same duties to perform, and no complaints were made. They were strict disciplinarians, and yet at the same time they had the esteem of the entire Volunteer Force of the country. And why did not General Luard have it? Because his manners were not becoming, because on many occasions he forgot himself; he spoke of the volunteers as if they were men coming from the Soudan, as if they were men who were forced to do their duty and take the shilling every day. He did not know enough to make a distinction between citizen soldiers and ordinary men, who seek to be enrolled for the pay they receive. I know well this, that if General Luard was commanding the Militia in England, the proud sons of Albion would not bear such language for one moment; he would not dare to speak in England as he spoke to the volunteers in Canada, and I hope this is the last time England will send an officer who will treat the volunteers of this country as he has done. What did Col. Williams do on this occasion in question? He was at the mess dinner which was presided over by General Luard. The General used expressions which should not have been used before subalterns. If they had been used before officers of the same rank, and not in uniform, he would have had to retract his words. What business had he to insult members of the House of Commons; and why should Col. Williams, because he defended the honour of this House, be called a reporter, when the General, after all, was under the orders of the Government and of the Minister of Militia. The General had no occasion to do so, he had no right to do so, and in adopting the course which Col. Williams took upon that occasion, he acted properly. If the complaints had been lodged before a proper tribunal, it might perhaps have been better. We all remember the "towel" case. Correspondence took place in the papers. An officer of high rank and very highly esteemed, was treated as if he were a common private in the ranks. On that occasion the whole press of Canada supported Major Mudge. No redress was obtained. There was no court to which to go. Was redress to be sought at the Horse Guards in England? No. On this occasion in question, the General treated the officers in a way which he had no right to do. No doubt he was strict, and he should be strict on all occasions; but at the same time there is a proper way of using expressions, and he should not have used the language as he did use it. The General has now gone; I wish him God speed, and I hope his great services and high education as a military man and undoubted courage will find a suitable field. Let him do as did General Gordon, a man known for zeal, urbanity, power and great courage; let General Luard also be sent to the Soudan by the British Government, and he may talk to Osman Digma and the soldiers there as he pleases, and I hope he will be covered with glory, but never come back again to this country.

Mr. GUILLET. As representing the Riding in which Cobourg, where this camp was held, is situated, and knowing Mr. Coursol.

something of the circumstances which transpired at the camp, especially during inspection, I desire to offer a few remarks. I may say at the outset that knowing the circumstances as I did, I felt very much surprised indeed to observe the manner in which this subject has been discussed by the mover and seconder of the resolution and those who have supported it. I am sure if they had understood the circumstances they would not have indulged in so much ridicule and burlesque in discussing this matter, which is a serious one, and the use of such language under the circumstances cannot but tend to very seriously impair and injure the Militia Force. Throughout the country there was a strong feeling that on this, as well as on many other occasions, the language used by the Major-General was of the most offensive kind and deserving of severe condemnation. I was not present during the parade, but upon all hands the opinion was expressed by our leading citizens that language most offensive was used, and such as could not fail to do serious injury to the Force. I think it ill becomes hon. members of the House, when the press have noised abroad the character of the proceedings in question, as they have done, to treat the matter with ridicule and contempt. I believe it is our duty to seriously consider matters affecting our Volunteer Militia which have become so prominent, for it must be remembered that \$1,000,000 are annually expended in maintaining the Force, which is of great value to the country, which represents the military spirit of the country, and which has within it to-day elements for the performance of as noble and daring deeds as have characterized the lives of those who preceded them in the Militia Force of Canada. I think it is unjust, therefore, when the country so liberally supports a Militia Force that we should treat matters connected with it with ridicule, instead of with that seriousness which they deserve. General Luard, on the occasion in question, was specially offensive to the Force. There were, perhaps, reasons why his feelings were aroused. He probably felt, as a strict disciplinarian, as an officer who desired the Militia to be like the regulars, and looked at it from the standpoint of an officer commanding regulars rather than from one commanding Militia. I believe the Force representing the district on that occasion was not so efficient as it has been on other occasions. It is a season of the year when it was difficult for officers to fill their companies. The harvest was backward, and there was great difficulty in obtaining men sufficient to fill the ranks. The Adjutant-General, in reporting in regard to the camp, states that seven-tenths of the men were recruits. They were in camp only eleven days, and only nine days before inspection, and of those nine days one was the Sabbath, and of the remaining eight, only five were available for drill. One of the days was devoted to target practice and another given to the reception of the Marquis of Lorne and the Princess Louise, while on another day a heavy rain prevailed. There were really, therefore, but five days devoted to drill on that occasion, and we can well understand that neither the officers nor the men were in such a shape as to perform the brigade drill with such credit and efficiency as might be expected by the commanding officer. Officers and men were at least entitled to the greatest kindness and consideration, and the most generous construction should have been placed upon their conduct. Instead of that, we find that they were treated with insults, they were brow-beaten and addressed in such language as should not be used even towards menials and which, I doubt, if the Major-General would use towards his own flunkey. On calling the men out of the ranks, he spoke to them as if they were disgracing themselves, and in one case, when an officer was rebuking the men, he turned sharply upon him and said that he should have shown them a better example. In another case, the Adjutant of one of the battalions was taking a point and the men had formed up upon that point

—had moved beyond it, and had gathered around the horse. The Major-General asked the Adjutant what he was doing, and told him to move out of that. The Adjutant's horse did not respond to the spur immediately, and the Major-General said to him, with an oath, "If you cannot ride out of that, get off and walk." One hon. member has spoken as if it were a trifling matter that this officer should use profane language, even to the extent of following the example of the army in Flanders; but the Queen's Regulations require officers to refrain from using profane or offensive language towards their men. Such language as the Major-General used was not justifiable, even in a Major-General, though he may have led a storming party against Chinese braves and captured a Chinese fort. That fact should not overawe the Canadian Militia, and compel them to submit to insult at his hands. The universal opinion was that the men were treated in the most unbecoming manner on that occasion. As an evidence of the feeling evinced on that occasion, it was observable that an invitation, which was given by the Superintendent of the Cobourg and Peterborough Railway to the officers of the camp, to attend an excursion, out of compliment to the Major-General, was only accepted by some twelve or fifteen of the 120 or 150 officers who were in camp. I think it is not fair towards the hon. member for East Durham to assume, as has been done on this occasion, that he had actually inspired the article which appeared in the *Port Hope Times* upon which the complaint is based. I am personally aware that the correspondent of the *Times* was present in the field throughout the whole camp, getting such information as would interest the readers of that paper. As it was a matter of universal notoriety that the General used offensive language in the mess towards Col. Williams, and another person who was there, it cannot be assumed for a moment that the information was given by the hon. member for East Durham; but, on the contrary, it is only fair to assume that the paper received this information by the regular channels for obtaining news. I am aware that there was another member of the House of Commons present as a civilian, and therefore I think it was unbecoming in the Major-General to have used this language, knowing that he was in the presence of members of the House of Commons, who were in fact representing the political party who supported the Government, who employed him—a Government who enjoyed the confidence of the House of Commons. Under these circumstances, I think it was the duty of Col. Williams to call attention to the matter, in order that such conduct might be resented, and that it should not be repeated. I have made these remarks in justice to Col. Williams, and in order to set the matter right before the House, if possible. We have had distinguished English officers in command of the Force heretofore, and there has been no disposition to complain of their treatment, so that the conduct of Major-General Luard appears to have been entirely exceptional, as far as our own experience goes.

Mr. MASSUE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this incident pass without making a few remarks. In 1875, our volunteers were suddenly called to the frontier to defend our country from a threatened invasion. If we had then had at the head of our military forces an officer of the same stamp as General Luard, who would have upbraided our volunteers as they have been upbraided lately, I think that those volunteers—who nobly did their duty at that time—would have been so thoroughly disgusted with these proceedings, that they would have resigned in a body, and I think that they would have been right in doing so.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as I belong to the volunteer militia of this country, I think I ought not to let this occasion pass without saying a few words on the

motion which is now in your hands. We have, on various occasions, had official dealings with Major-General Luard.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder, louder.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) I believe those who are asking me to speak louder do not understand a word of French. I say we have on several occasions had official dealings with Major-General Luard whose conduct is criticised to day. He has come twice in the Lévis camp to review our battalions, and I must say that on both these occasions, we, the volunteers of the district of Quebec, could only congratulate ourselves with the dealing we had with the General. Under those circumstances, I think I am in as good a position as anybody to speak pertinently on this subject. I am not actuated by any personal animosity towards the General; I have no personal abuse to avenge on him, and consequently the opinion I can express is free from any party spirit and from any ill-feeling whatever. Well, considering the energetic stand taken by several members of this House, by the press generally, and by all those who take some interest in militia matters, I think that the Government was justified, I may say, in adopting the policy which has been followed, and which has caused the Major-General to leave the country. It may be considered that there are two men in a military officer: the soldier, and the man who has to deal with the military authorities and with the military forces of the country. If we consider in General Luard the soldier proper, I think we have nothing to say against him, but if we consider him in his dealings with the officers of our volunteer force, in his dealings with the volunteers of the country themselves, we can reproach him with failings of a serious character. The manner with which he has acted towards our volunteers, especially here in Ottawa, a few years ago, at a shooting match, indicates that this man had no knowledge whatever of the wants of our country; that from the very outset to the end, he has not had the least idea of the requirements of the service. He was here in rather intimate connection with a body of men whose good-will, as their title shows, is the only agent which calls them to arms. Our militia system is not the same as that of other countries, and here we have under arms and in camps only those whose good-will has called and assembled them. The General ought to have taken this element into account, and governed him-self accordingly. Failing to do that, he has shown his utter want of tact, and he has gathered the storm which to day breaks upon his head. He has not understood our military system, and it is because he has not understood it that he deserves to day the general reprobation of the country. I think that, in justice to me and to all those who take an interest in the advancement of the militia of the country, I ought to raise my own voice in support of those who have already uttered complaints, and to approve of the action of the Government. This discussion concerning the General's conduct will, I trust, have a good effect. If it does not heal the wounds that he has left after him, his departure will at least be a lesson to whoever shall succeed him, and I would fain believe that in the future we will never have occasion to make such complaints as have been made to day, for his successor will have, besides the ability attributed to him, the experience of the past services of the man who has just left our country.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have listened with great attention to the course of this debate, and have heard, with some amusement, the remarks which were made by some hon. gentlemen. I think, however, amidst all this amusement and merriment, some things have taken place which are not in accordance with the sense of dignity and honour which should actuate hon. members of this House. The hon. gentleman who made this motion commenced his speech by attempting to read some correspondence—something which was contrary

to the rules of debate—but if I am not mistaken, an hon. gentleman who spoke from this side of the House, read, without interruption, precisely the same letter which the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) was debarred from reading. I will retract what I have said on this point if I am mistaken, but I believe it is the fact. The whole case has been argued as though there was any evidence upon which to base an attack upon the Major-General. Now, Sir, I say that there is not a word of evidence brought against that gentleman, which would be admitted as evidence in any court of justice or in any court of enquiry. The whole attack is based on newspaper correspondence and reports, and there is not an hon. gentleman in this House who does not know, from his own personal experience, what amount of credit is generally to be attached to newspaper reports of that description. I know nothing about the *Port Hope Times*, which appears to have originated this whole report, but when the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) in the course of a speech which we all admired for its ingenuity and for the skilful way in which he dragged in all sorts of irrelevant matter, which had as much to do with the question as the war in Egypt, spoke of charges such charges, if charges they were, were based on an extract he read from the *Mail* newspaper. Now, the Conservative party have to accept the *Mail* as an exponent of their views; but all I have to say is that, if the person who wrote that article in the *Mail* respecting General Luard, which is merely a re-hash of what appeared in another paper, and was not based on any evidence whatever—I say that if the person who wrote that article had no more regard for veracity, to say nothing of generosity or justice, than the same paper has in the remarks it makes concerning hon. gentlemen in this House who are opposed to it in politics, then I say that very little confidence ought to be placed in its statements. Sir, the whole thing rests on no evidence whatever, and the newspaper statements may go just for what they are worth. There has not been a single statement made, except a second-hand statement made by the hon. member for East Durham, to justify the charge made against the Major-General; and the whole thing is a mere fabric, built up on general rumour, which, I venture to say, is not in accordance with the real facts of the case. I think that one thing must be evident to hon. members of this House, and that is, that this discussion should not have been allowed to proceed until the papers were before us. We have had bits of evidence and bits of correspondence commented upon, as the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) commented; and the hon. member, with his brief in his hand, was allowed to read extracts and to quote papers which this House has not seen, and is not able to judge of. Some hon. members have asserted that there was a general consensus of opinion against General Luard among the militia officers of Canada. I, as an officer of that Force and a member of this House, deny that assertion. I say nothing of what happened at Cobourg; I was not there, and have no means of informing myself as to what took place, and I certainly am not going to believe, as a fact, what is a mere matter of opinion, or what is read by any member in this House. But I say that there were gentlemen present at that occurrence whose word is certainly better than the statements of those who speak merely from hearsay, and they declare that the statements made in that paper were very grossly exaggerated and misrepresented. We have heard hon. gentlemen speak about insults to this House. If there was any insult, it was not offered by General Luard, but by another gentleman. There is no evidence, whatever, to show that General Luard made any remark that was derogatory to any of the members of this House. The hon. member for Glengarry took the trouble to point out to us how very fair and proper was the conduct of the hon. member for East Durham. Now, I am not going

Mr. O'BRIEN.

to cast any reflection on the conduct of the hon. member for East Durham; I would be the last man in this House to do so; but I would like to ask this House, if it is fair that a gentleman should lie under the imputation that General Luard has lain under ever since the month of September last, in regard to this matter, without being able to learn, until a recent period, from the Government, whether the charges against him were to be pressed or not. I am surprised that the hon. Minister of Militia has not yet had a word to say in regard to this matter. I am surprised that that hon. Minister, to whom we ought to be able to entrust all matters of this kind with perfect confidence—that he will, at all hazards and under all circumstances, maintain the honour and the discipline and the dignity of the Force—has not uttered a single word on this subject. I say we have a right to expect that he would not have sat in his seat while one member after another rose up and traduced the character of a man holding a high office under him. I think he ought to have put a stop to this discussion, or, at any rate, to have stated that he would not allow gentlemen to stand up, and, on mere hearsay evidence, traduce the character of a gentleman holding the high position of General Luard. Now, I have attended two camps at which General Luard was present; and there was nothing in his conduct, on either occasion, that did not call forth the best wishes for him on the part of every officer and man there. He was careful and strict in his inspection, but not a single word escaped from him that any one could object to. I say more than this. When General Luard took command of the force, its discipline was at the lowest ebb. We had had so much butter and taffey rubbed on the Force that it was hardly possible for any man to say anything in criticism of it; but when General Luard came to this country, he brought to light existing abuses, and in that way did a great deal of good to the Force. Although we are proud of our Force, we must not blind our eyes to its defects. One speaker quoted a remark that the Major-General did not understand the genius of the people of this country. I have heard that remark before, and I think it means just this: that when a man does not understand the genius of the country, it is because he has found fault where there was good reason for doing so. I was going on to say that when General Luard came to this country, he found the discipline of the Force in a very bad state, and I am satisfied every officer of the Force knows it, and will admit it; but he went to work to redress the evils he found, and the result is that the Force stands to-day in a much better position, as regards discipline, than it did when he took command. I do not say that General Luard has not faults of temper, and may not occasionally have used expressions which gave offence; I do not know that he did, for I never heard him use such expressions, but to show the sort of treatment to which he has been exposed, even by officers of the Force under his command, I will just read an extract from a letter which, I hope, has before this attracted the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia. An officer at London, a Col. Cole, was found fault with by General Luard, because of the condition of his regiment, and what did he do? Instead of even taking the course pursued by the hon. member for East Durham, and bringing the matter before the attention of the authorities, he took the favourite course in this country and wrote a letter to a newspaper. And what did he say? From this letter, hon. gentlemen can judge of the sort of attacks to which General Luard is liable; and they can also judge how the condition of the Force can be maintained if this sort of thing is tolerated. This officer, in his letter, finds fault with Col. Jackson, the Deputy-Adjutant General of the district. He could have no fault to find with the manner of the Major-General, because he never saw him, and goes on to say:

"Mr. Luard recommends my removal from the command of my regiment. In answer, I would say that Luard's recommendation troubles me but very little. I do not understand why this fraud should pitch into me and my regiment, for I never gave him any reason; and further, I never spoke to him. In conclusion, I consider there is no necessity of importing cranks that call themselves military men."

That is the sort of attacks made in the newspapers on General Luard. Even supposing there was nothing in this officer's conduct to justify his removal from his command, what sort of a regiment is that whose commanding officer writes in terms like that of his superior? This is just a sample of the way in which General Luard had been treated by a portion of the press of this country. I totally deny, as a matter of fact, that there is general consensus of opinion, to the effect that his conduct of the Force has been other than what it ought to have been. On the contrary, I say that there was very good room for fault-finding, and that public opinion is agreed that in the main the General's comments were justifiable, and his strictures deserved. I should be altogether wanting in my duty to this House and to the Militia Force if I were to allow the remarks made concerning General Luard to pass without answer. From the facts, as I know and heard, of my own knowledge, I deny that there is any ground for the statement made reflecting on his conduct. I believe the evidence on which they are made is altogether exaggerated, and I ask this House whether it is consistent with their sense of justice, that a gentleman should have been allowed to remain in this country so long, with this charge pending against him, and no opportunity afforded him for reply. I ask if it is just that hon. members should arise, one after another, and make remarks respecting that officer which they know they cannot make with any proper sense of justice. The hon. member for Glengarry said the Major-General, in asking for specific charges, made a mistake. What else could the General do? Was he to ask the Government to make an enquiry on this vague statement? This charge was made; up to the month of January he was given no opportunity to reply, and then, just as he leaves this country, he is told that the charge is withdrawn. I hope the hon. Minister of Militia will give a satisfactory explanation to this House. I call on him to explain to this House how it happened that the officer commanding the Forces of this country was allowed to remain in the humiliating position in which he was placed. So far as any one can judge from the general appearance of the case, it seems hard measure to mete out to a man, that no opportunity should be given him to meet attacks; that his mouth shall be shut and his hands tied, while he is made the subject of attack in the newspaper press, and then after he has left this country that hon. members should rise and reiterate those charges. I appeal to the sense of justice—I will not say generosity—of hon. members, to say whether that is the way an Imperial officer, or any officer, or any man ought to be treated here, by those who stand in the position of representatives of the people and supporters of the Government. I hope the sense of the House, apart from all personal argument, will be that they have hardly treated General Luard; I hope they will agree with me that, standing in the position he did, it is hardly reasonable to make this attack on him, and I am very glad to have this opportunity of standing up in his defence and justifying him, as I believe he deserves to be justified.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I quite agree with the opinion of the hon. gentleman who has preceded me, that it would have been far more satisfactory had the papers in connection with this matter been brought down before the matter was so thoroughly discussed. If they had, the hon. gentleman would have known upon what false premises he has been arguing. The hon. gentleman would lead the House to believe that no correspondence had taken place since the letter addressed to the Secretary of State by General Luard, in

which he asked that certain charges should be formulated. Such is not the case. I have always been ready to attend any court of enquiry, and expressed my readiness so to do, in my last letter dated December 6th. As regards the evidence to sustain the charges, which the hon. gentleman says has never been brought forward, I took particular pains, before making the charges, to have evidence on which I could perfectly rely, and went to some expense to gather evidence, which I found was far stronger than I anticipated. I will not be dragged by the unfair remarks of the hon. member for North York, nor by the flippancy of the hon. member for Ottawa, or the badinage of the hon. member for Lanark, into a personal discussion of this question. I feel, from the position I am placed, that I am not in a position to do so, but, under all the circumstances, I deem it my duty to make a brief statement of my position, which is this: In view of the early retirement of General Luard to England, I agreed to withdraw the letter of complaint which I had filed against him, and I feel it would be unbecoming in me now to enter into any discussion of the merits of the case. I regret to find that some of the papers have fallen into the hands of hon. members; and that my hon. friend from North York, who, I had hoped, would have approached the discussion of this question with a calm, judicial spirit, adopted rather the style of an attorney, and spoke closely to the brief placed in his hands by General Luard, which is simply a copy of the letters from the General, and which I regret to have to state are in his own handwriting. My own correspondence I carefully kept back from the House, as I felt I was in honour bound to, knowing that when it was brought down hon. members and the public would be able to judge the merits of the case, and, as far as I am concerned, that my position would be thoroughly sustained. The hon. member for Muskoka seems to think that the proper course for me to pursue was to lodge my complaint with the hon. Minister of Militia. As far as I was concerned, I had no personal grievance, no personal feeling, but my constituents had a claim on me; if they felt that the public interest was in any way being injured, they had a right to appeal to me, and it was my duty to forward their desire to the Government. Under the circumstances, I did forward a letter to the Secretary of State, asking that an enquiry be made. I took this view thinking that the Major-General was hardly a Departmental officer and was hardly amenable to the Minister of Militia, and I considered that I was pursuing the right course in forwarding the matter to the Secretary of State, asking him to make such enquiry as might be deemed proper, and assuring him of my earnest desire and intention to back up what I said. I shall not deal with the matter at any further length, but shall wait until the correspondence comes down, when my position will be found to be fully justified.

Mr. CARON. Mr. Speaker, before the motion which is now in your hands is submitted to the House, I may be allowed to say a few words in reference to the matter which has been occupying the attention of the House for some time. Even before my hon. friend the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) rose and expressed his ardent desire to hear a word from the Minister of Militia, it was my intention before the discussion closed to say a few words. I agree with the hon. member, so far as to believe that the discussion which has taken place to-day might possibly more properly have been put off until the papers had been laid upon the Table of the House, but I cannot regret the discussion which has taken place. I consider that the Militia Force of Canada has no reason to regret the discussion which has taken place to-day. I consider that the Militia Force of Canada has made some very valuable recruits to-day. My hon. friend the member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright), the hospitable King of the Gatineau, who

does not often take an interest in discussions affecting the Militia Force of Canada, has thought fit to-day to assume a new rôle, and to interest the House, as he always does, with one of his speeches, so brimful of humour, so brimful of wit, and so brimful, I may say, of interesting historical allusions, which are always welcome to the members of this honourable House. Other members have also taken up the discussion, and, from the expressions which has taken place, I think that the expressions used in speaking of the Militia Force of Canada are such that the Militia Force of Canada can well be convinced that, among hon. members of this honourable House, this force is appreciated, as it deservedly should be appreciated. My hon. friend the member for Muskoka, to my astonishment, has taken up the cudgels in a manner in which he does not generally take up questions which come before this honourable House. He surprised me somewhat, Mr. Speaker, in stating that he was away in England when all the circumstances which affect this case took place at Cobourg, and still the hon. gentleman says that he, absent, away in England, is not ready or prepared to take the statements of hon. gentlemen who were present at that occurrence, and who have laid their own statements, from their personal knowledge, before this House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He said he had statements from other parties who were present, contradicting the others.

Mr. CARON. That may be, but I have statements from hon. members of this House who were also present, and have laid their statements before the House, and I consider that these statements, coming from hon. gentlemen who were present, were more reliable than other statements that have been transmitted to us through three or four people who have received them from one another. Now, the occurrence which led to this protracted discussion, is very much to be regretted. I regret very much indeed that anything like what took place at Cobourg should have taken place, but I think that every member of the Volunteer Force of Canada who knows the hon. member for East Durham, an hon. gentleman who for so many years has given so much of his time and consecrated so much of his energy to the maintaining of a battalion in the state of efficiency in which the battalion he now commands is, will say that, if the hon. gentleman thought fit to make a complaint to the Government, he must have done it believing that what he was doing was in the interest of the Militia Force of Canada, and that he was acting, as he always does, in the circumstances alluded to, as a member of this House who was trying to maintain what he believed to be the dignity of his colleagues, of hon. members who were not present. Now, my hon. friend the member for Muskoka has charged me with not having put an end to this discussion immediately. Evidently, the hon. gentleman does not know that the charge was not made to my Department or to me as Minister of Militia. The charge was made by the hon. member for East Durham, as a member of the House of Commons, and, as such, was not a charge that could properly come under me as head of the Department of Militia. In submitting his charge, he very properly submitted it to the Secretary of State. And let me say here, Mr. Speaker, that, if the matter was not disposed of immediately, my hon. friend the member for Muskoka forgets that a long correspondence took place between General Luard and the hon. member for East Durham, and that correspondence was continued almost up to the period of time when General Luard left the country. I may also state that my hon. friend the member for East Durham was called away and was absent from Canada after the matter had been submitted to the Government, and, naturally, during his absence, it was necessary that the proceedings should be suspended until he returned. Naturally, the matter could not be disposed of, as hon. members will

Mr. CARON.

easily understand, until the correspondence was closed; and when, or shortly after, the correspondence was closed, my hon. friend the member for East Durham withdrew the charges which he had laid against the General. The hon. gentleman has made his own statement. He has shown us under what circumstances he considered it his duty to withdraw these charges, and, under these circumstances, it was quite impossible for the Government to dispose of the matter sooner than it was disposed of. I believe if the hon. member for Muskoka had waited, as he advised us all to do, before discussing this matter, until the papers had been laid upon the Table of Parliament, if he had followed the advice he was giving us, he would have seen that no time was lost in disposing of the matter. I repeat that I regret extremely, not only in this circumstance but in other circumstances, the difficulties which have arisen between the General and the Militia Force of Canada. It is not, as I believe, a fitting opportunity to-day to take up these matters, but let me say that, in Canada, we require in command of the Militia Force a gentleman who not only will be a strict disciplinarian, as every British officer who is sent out from England is supposed to be, but who also, in dealing with and meeting the members of the Militia Force, will have the *suaviter in modo* which, I believe, is certainly as indispensable to a commanding officer as the other qualifications which hon. gentlemen have spoken of as pertaining to a commanding officer. Now, Sir, I regret sincerely that any trouble of that kind should have occurred. Before sitting down, I wish to answer a remark made by my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), who stated that the General commanding the Militia Force of Canada was an Imperial officer. Mr. Speaker, the General commanding the Militia Force of Canada is an Imperial officer in so far as belongs to the Imperial army, but when he comes out to Canada he is an officer under the control and in the employment of the Canadian Government. I have always approved of the system which is followed in Canada of getting an experienced officer from the old country, until we in Canada can have men sufficiently experienced to take command of the Militia Force, but I believe it would be a great mistake if an officer, on coming here from England, imagined himself independent of the Government of Canada, and as merely an Imperial officer coming from England. These are the remarks I wished to make before the discussion closed.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad the remarks of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) have at last called the Minister of Militia to his feet, and induced him to give the explanations on this subject which he really ought to have given long ago, as that hon. gentleman pointed out. I think the debate on the resolution of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) has gone entirely beyond the record. That motion asked for papers and correspondence in connection with one definite charge made against Major-General Luard, as to his misconduct on a particular occasion; but the discussion has ranged over the conduct of Major-General Luard during the whole time he has been here, and has been made up of attacks and defences of the general policy he has pursued towards the Militia of Canada. That having been the case, it is perhaps impossible to go on to consider the particular case before us without saying something on the general question. It has been practically admitted by all, that General Luard's mistakes, General Luard's errors, General Luard's alleged misconduct, have been due chiefly to faults of temper. Nobody has charged that he was not an efficient soldier, that he was not actuated by the highest desire to improve the efficiency of the Canadian Militia. The only charge has been that on an occasion when he saw things in a shape that appeared to him to be unsoldierly, he has given vent to his opinion in language that was considered by those who made the charge as scarcely gentle-

manly, and scarcely proper to be addressed to Canadian volunteers. I cannot speak on this from any personal knowledge, as I have not been for some years connected with the Force; however, I think, from all I can hear, from testimony brought forward in the House by independent gentlemen connected with the Force, and from other quarters, that there is a general agreement that General Luard's severity and strictness did something, at least, for the Militia Force. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Muskoka, when he says that some years ago, when General Luard first took charge of the Militia discipline was at a low ebb—in fact I do not know that even yet it has reached that point that volunteer discipline should reach. I am inclined to think that when an officer, who has had experience in volunteer matters, as General Luard had long before he came here, found so much to object to in the state of militia discipline, there must have been some cause for it. We find that this dissatisfaction has not been general, but it has been confined to special cases, and I think it probable that in those cases there was something to find fault with. But I have no doubt that some of the expressions alleged to have been used by him were rather too strong, and not conducive to the interests of the Service. Yet I think that, none the less for that, it is highly improper for us to make this motion an occasion for a general attack upon General Luard, who has now left the country, as it is understood, not to return again to occupy the same position. A man who is now practically out of the employ of this Government, I think, should not be attacked for his past conduct in this indiscriminating way without, as the hon. member for Muskoka has pointed out, the production of any evidence whatever. Speaking of this particular case, I must say that the offence against the dignity of this House charged against General Luard, is a very grave one. If he did really, on that occasion, express himself in contemptuous language in regard to the members of this House, it was something which ought not to have been passed over. The Minister of Militia has pointed out that the member for East Durham made the charge which he did make, in order to sustain the dignity of this House, as well as to further the interests of the Militia Force. Sir, if the offence was as grave as he conceived it to be at the time, if he was not mistaken, as to the import of the General's language, the offence was one affecting the dignity of this House, especially after it became public. If it had been kept within the walls of the mess room in which this mess room dispute occurred, I do not know that the dignity of this House would have been injured in the slightest degree; but, since those who were present on that occasion chose to make the affair public, and to spread abroad over the country that General Luard had attacked the dignity of this House, then I think the matter was a serious one, and should be examined, either by the Militia Department or by this House. If all the facts can be established and the charges turn out to be as grave as they appeared to have been to the hon. member for East Durham when he made them, then I say General Luard ought not to be allowed to slip out of the country in the quiet way he has done, and to take leave of absence on the understanding that he is not to return here. If he has insulted this House he should either be made to apologize to this House, or should be dismissed, instead of being allowed to retire. The Minister of Militia has pointed out that he is an officer fully under the control of this Government. He is an officer under the control of his own Department, he is a departmental officer, and could have been dismissed at any time on the recommendation of the Minister of Militia. I think it was his duty, when these charges were made, to have had them investigated, and either have secured an apology from the General to the House of Commons, or from the gentleman making the charges to General Luard, accord-

ing as the facts might turn out to demand upon enquiry, I say the hon. Minister has been guilty of a grave dereliction of his duty in allowing a charge of this kind to have been made to a member of the Cabinet, made in the press throughout the country, repeated until everybody has taken sides on it one way or the other, and then allowing the correspondence in connection with it to be withdrawn and letting the whole matter fall to the ground.

Mr. CARON. The charge was not made to my Department at all.

Mr. CASEY. Well, it should have been made to him as Minister of Militia, and when he knew the charges were made he should have insisted upon their being laid before him as the proper person, and he should have taken cognizance of the case and prosecuted it. I have no doubt that the hon. member for East Durham must have spoken to the Minister of Militia about the matter, or communicated with him in some way about it. It is scarcely possible that such an affair should have taken place without some communication between these two hon. gentlemen. It may have been on the advice of the Minister of Militia that the charges were made to the Secretary of State instead of to his own Department—I do not know how that may have been. The hon. member for East Durham shakes his head. I conclude, then, that he simply followed his own idea in writing to the Secretary of State instead of to the Minister of Militia. He was undoubtedly mistaken in taking that course, because the Militia Department was the one to which he should have made his complaints, especially as he himself was an officer of the Militia. But the Minister of Militia says the charges were made to the Secretary of State, because the hon. member for East Durham acted in his capacity as a member of the House, and not in his capacity as an officer of the Service. I do not see what difference this could make. If he acted as a member of the House, his proper course was to bring it up in Parliament and ask that an enquiry be instituted. If he acted as an officer, his only proper course was to make complaint through the proper military channel. But it seems the charge was made to the Secretary of State. No doubt the Government followed the usual course in matters of this kind, and referred the complaint to the proper Department. No doubt the complaint was referred to the Minister of Militia, although it was not at first lodged in his Department; no doubt he was cognizant of the matter ultimately and directly. And the responsibility, therefore, comes back to him and rests upon him quite as fully as if the complaint had been made to his Department in the first instance. It appears this was not an ordinary complaint, a letter of complaint written by a member of the House, to call attention to a matter of public interest. It was a case carefully worked up by the member for East Durham, who said he had gone round with a solicitor and worked up the case and found it was stronger than he had anticipated. The case, he says, was sent to the Government. Now what has become of the case? The Minister of Militia said the correspondence was allowed to be withdrawn, and the hon. member for East Durham makes a similar statement, because forsooth, the General was about to leave the country. I do not quite understand what is meant by the withdrawal of the correspondence. If it means that the letters and correspondence by the hon. member for East Durham and General Luard were given back to them, it is a very improper conclusion to a charge of this nature. It should have been forced to some issue. If the hon. member for East Durham has withdrawn all the charges against General Luard, it is a perfect justification of the General. If that is the meaning of the withdrawal of the correspondence, it should be clearly stated to the House, and the General should not be allowed to rest

under the imputation that the charges are still hanging over him, unsettled. From the silence of the two hon. gentlemen, who alone can answer this question, I am still left in doubt. We must therefore judge from the general tone of their remarks, though not from their express words, that the charges are not withdrawn but are still insisted on by the hon. member for East Durham, but that he does not care to have an investigation, and the reason he gives is the approaching departure of the General. I do not think that is any reason whatever. The General should either leave here as a dismissed official, dismissed because of improper conduct, or he should leave here with his character unstained. I do not pretend to say how far the hon. member's idea of General Luard's meaning may have been borne out by the General's intention on that occasion. The hon. member for East Durham may have been mistaken as to the words used by General Luard. I do not know how far this might have been borne out by evidence. No evidence has been taken, and the General has been allowed to leave the country quietly, neither cleared of the charges nor convicted of them. That is a state of things most damaging to the Service and unworthy of the dignity of this House. The hon. Minister of Militia expressed surprise that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) did not believe the evidence given to us to-night, by hon. members who were present on the occasion referred to. I do not remember that any hon. gentleman has spoken who was present on that occasion, except the hon. member for East Durham himself, and he carefully abstained from making any further statement about the matter, simply saying that the whole of the charges were contained in the correspondence. We have no information from hon. members or anyone as to what took place on that occasion, except from the letter so irregularly read by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). I, too, felt curious at that time, and feel curious to know how the letter got into the possession of the hon. member. The hon. member for East Durham said that none of his letters fall into the hands of any member. If they were obtained from the Government, it was a very strange proceeding. If the letter was placed in the hands of the hon. member by General Luard, it is a different matter; but the House should be informed by the hon. member as to how he got possession of it. Both the Minister of Militia and the member for East Durham, have referred to what we shall see when the correspondence comes down; but if the correspondence has been withdrawn, how can it be brought down? Does the hon. Minister mean there is still correspondence in the Department?

Mr. CARON. I have already stated that it did not come before my Department.

Mr. CASEY. The Secretary of State is present in the House, and I hope he will pay attention to the question. I wish to ask him if there is any correspondence on this question in his Department; if the correspondence making and answering the charges is in his Department, and can be brought down?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman will receive his answer when the Government informs him whether the correspondence can be brought down or not.

Mr. CASEY. That is not a proper answer to the question. The question is one which should be answered now. The question is, whether correspondence exists and can be brought down. The Minister of Militia has led us to infer that when it comes down we shall see so and-so, and the hon. member for East Durham says the same. Now, the Secretary of State refuses to say whether there is any correspondence, and whether it is going to be brought down. The question should be answered now, as it might prevent useless and prolonged discussion.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman has no right to put such a question. We are discussing a demand to bring down papers. Let the discussion be concluded, and let the answer be given to the hon. gentleman. I do not want to be catechised here; the hon. gentleman has no right to do so.

Mr. CASEY. If Ministers are not here to be catechised, what are they here for? I say they are here to be catechised respecting the business of their Departments; that is what they are paid for. If the Secretary of State, who is very new to the position, feels so much more dignity than any other Minister, and refuses to answer questions, it is no use to ask them. The Minister in whose possession the correspondence must be, if it still exists, refuses to say whether there is any or not, and the Minister of Militia leads the House to infer that it does exist, and will be brought down.

Mr. CARON. I did not tell the hon. gentleman it would be brought down.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman said that "when the correspondence came down"—he did not say, "if it came down"—the hon. member for Muskoka would find so-and-so. If that does not imply that it will come down, I do not know the meaning of language. Leaving him to settle with the Secretary of State as to the propriety of making such disclosures beforehand, I will go on to some other points. I wish to say, before closing my remarks, that we had a matter, not exactly of a similar kind to this, but a question in this House, two or three years ago, in which the conduct of General Luard came up for discussion. On that occasion, General Luard was not charged with being too strict, as he is now charged, but with being too lenient, although that charge was scarcely borne out by the facts. A case had arisen concerning the conduct of a Colonel commanding a battalion (Col. W. Ross), one of as high standing as the gentleman whose case is now under discussion. The General reported on that Colonel's conduct, with regard to the establishment of a canteen, which was complained of by a political supporter of the Minister of the Militia, that the Colonel's conduct was correct, and was in consonance with the Militia Regulations. The Minister of Militia, considering that his supporter, the Conservative member for the county of Prince Edward, had a better knowledge of Militia affairs than the General, induced the General to amend the report in such a way as to have a *Gazette* censure passed upon the Colonel. That was a case of difference of opinion, and a Colonel of as high a position as the member for East Durham was, in fact, censured for an act which the Major-General, the fountain of discipline for the Dominion of Canada, declared to be exactly in accordance with usage and the Regulations, and the hon. member for East Durham sustained the Government on that occasion. Now, I think the hon. gentleman has scarcely put himself in the strongest position, when he takes the means he has taken of attacking this Major-General; for, whatever the General's faults and failings might be, he deserves at least the courtesy of a proper court of enquiry into his conduct before this matter was blazoned all over the country. I hope, Sir, the Minister of Militia will yet get his hands on this mysterious correspondence; which he does not admit his knowledge of at present, that he will get it before his Department, if not before the House, and will see that a proper enquiry is made into that question, that the matter is cleared up, whether for the benefit of General Luard or for the gentleman who has made these charges. It is absolutely necessary for the dignity of the House and the efficiency of the service that the matter be cleared up. I am not pronouncing any opinion on the matter, because I am as ignorant of the facts as every other hon. member must be until we see the papers; we are all ignorant of the facts, and cannot pronounce an opinion, but I think the mat

ter should be cleared up, out of regard to our own dignity, at all events.

Mr. CARON. I rise to a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman referred to the case of Col. Ross, and he has stated the facts differently from what they were. He has stated—whether he has forgotten the correspondence which was brought down, or whether he made the statement for the purposes of this case—

Mr. CASEY. Order. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman insinuates the possibility of my making these statements wrongfully for the purpose of this debate.

Mr. CARON. I did not say wrongfully, but I said for the purposes of this case. The hon. gentleman has forgotten the case of Col. Ross. In that case the Major-General in his report, states that Col. Ross has been guilty of a gross breach of discipline, and the hon. gentleman has stated here to-night that the General, in his report, stated that Col. Ross has done exactly what he should have done under the Militia Regulations. Now, the hon. gentleman must have forgotten completely the facts of the case, else he would not have made that statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think that there are such words in the report, as the hon. gentleman has stated.

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman who has taken his seat has discussed the points with me before, and he must remember that the Major-General stated most explicitly that Col. Ross was guilty of a gross breach of discipline.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The General recommended a different course of things from the Minister, and the Minister over-ruled the General.

Mr. CARON. That is another question.

Mr. CASEY. To the best of my recollection, and my recollection is pretty fair, and is, I think, likely to be as near right as the hon. gentleman's—my recollection is, that the first report of the Major-General was entirely favourable to Col. Ross; that he reported that Col. Ross, in demolishing the canteen which had been erected contrary to his orders, had acted within his rights as a Colonel commanding in the camp. That is my distinct recollection, and before the debate is over, or at all events before very long, I shall hunt up the report, and I fancy the Minister will find he has embarrassed himself somewhat by asserting so positively that the General had reported that there was "a gross breach of discipline." I recollect, also, that subsequently an amended report was procured from the General, which came much nearer the hon. Minister position than in the first instance, and that probably is the one the hon. Minister refers to.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I wish to say one word in reference to an insinuation which was made, perhaps not willingly, by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. The hon. gentleman was pleased to say that correspondence of a more or less private or confidential character should not have been brought before this House. I can state here, that so far as I am informed, and I believe I am well informed, the hon. member for East Durham has never communicated those papers since they were sent to the Department. I can vouch for the Department, for myself, and my officers, and I say that they have not been communicated to anybody. Any person who has communicated this information to members of this House or other people, has done an act which I shall not characterize. It might be military, perhaps, but certainly it would not be civil.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not propose to discuss the merits of this question as regards my hon. friend from East Durham and the General. A good deal has been said

to night about General Luard's conduct by officers of the Force. Now, I happen to have come in contact, as no doubt other hon. members have, with a number of militia officers who have been inspected at various times by General Luard, and I desire to say here, in justice to that officer, that I have heard from many distinguished officers of the Militia Force, that whether or not General Luard may have been a little over-zealous at times in the discharge of his duty, when the corps inspected by him were in a really efficient state, General Luard was always ready to bear testimony to that fact, and always spoke very handsomely, when he could honestly and fairly speak handsomely, of the discipline of the regiments who paraded before him. I think it is but justice to General Luard to say that I have heard that from many officers high in command. No doubt there have been complaints made that when the regiments whom he inspected were not in the state of discipline he expected them to be, the General expressed himself with much freedom, as I dare say the hon. gentlemen opposite know that very high officers in the British service are rather apt to express themselves. I dare say that even the most illustrious officers in the British Service would be found—and nobody knows it better than the First Minister—to have expressed themselves very strongly both as to regiments of regular troops, and as to regiments of volunteer troops. Whenever the discipline of these regiments did not come quite up to the standard they expected—and I think we would do well to remember in this debate, in which, as I understand, we have no evidence before us, that it would be rather unfair to allow General Luard to leave this country apparently under a cloud. If the Government thought there was anything in his conduct which deserved censure, it would have been the duty of the Government to express their views, no doubt, to Her Majesty's Government. But it is not our duty to assail that gentleman without much better evidence than has been, so far as I have heard the debate, submitted to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be quite improper to assail General Luard or anybody else without sufficient evidence; but let us consider for a moment who has brought up this subject and how it has been brought up. It has not been brought up by the Government as a charge against General Luard. No charge has been made against him. It has been brought by the hon. member for North York. Whether he brought it up on his own mere motion, or as representing General Luard, he has not told us. Neither has he told us why he has made this motion, for what purpose he wants these papers, if it is for the purpose of following up the matter, or if it is not, why he made the motion. It is a very inconvenient thing, and it is considered exceptional in England for discussions to be made about army discipline or the discipline of the Militia. The hon. gentleman, in making this motion, evidently did not want the information, for he has seen the papers which he has moved for; and therefore he must have made up his mind, when he gave this notice, that he would have to follow it up, or *cui bono?* For what purpose has the motion been made? Does the hon. gentleman mean to move for a Committee of enquiry on General Luard, or on the gentleman who made the charge against General Luard? We would like to know. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will object to be catechised in the matter, perhaps he will object to answer why he made this motion; at whose instance he made it; where he got these papers; and for what purpose he got them. I think we ought to know all this. But I gather that the hon. gentleman got the papers from General Luard, or some friend of General Luard, through whom they were sent to the hon. gentleman. I think either one or the other must have been the case. Now, Sir, I have

no hesitation in saying that if so, it is exceedingly unfortunate for General Luard; for whether his conduct at this mess meeting was liable to censure or not—whether he was altogether right, or whether my hon. friend from East Durham was too sensitive—one thing is clear, and I can state in my place that I know that General Luard has made the gravest possible mistake in giving these papers to any person in the world. General Luard has been treated with the greatest consideration and the greatest forbearance; and it was at my own special instance, and for the purpose of preventing probably serious consequences to General Luard, that I asked my hon. friend who sits behind me, in view of the probable consequences to a gentleman of his rank, and in the interest of the Militia Service, to withdraw the charge; because, Mr. Speaker, the question could not rest. It would involve an enquiry into all the numerous and various complaints that were made against General Luard; and some of them, I had occasion to know, were such as would probably involve consequences which would have been the reverse of pleasant to that officer—not in any way affecting his honour or his status as a gentleman, but as affecting altogether the question of the possibility of his continuing in his command; and he has committed a grave error, so grave that I can only attribute it to a very great want of judgment on the part of General Luard, or to his being very badly advised, in inviting, if he did invite, this discussion, or in inducing the hon. gentleman, if he did induce him, to bring down these papers. I have no hesitation in saying, Sir, that it is a very grave mistake on the part of General Luard, and I am sorry to say that perhaps he will find it so. Now, Sir, there is one statement made by the gentleman who moved this motion that is erroneous. Of course, he spoke from his general acquaintance with the subject. He stated that General Luard's promotion was stopped, that his position was affected by the statement made by Colonel Williams. That is quite a mistake, as I happen to know from General Luard himself. General Luard, in the course of the coming summer, was to get his Lieut.-Generalship—in the ordinary course, he was certain to be made a Lieut.-General—and then he was going to leave Canada. In no way did it affect his position, or his promotion, or his rank at the Horse Guards, or anywhere else, because he was obliged *ex necessitate* to go the moment he got the Lieut.-Generalship; and therefore he has not suffered anything in the world from the fact that Col. Williams made this charge. Well, Sir, General Luard ought, in my opinion, to have been well satisfied at the result. I may go so far as to say that those papers were all purposely withdrawn. There was an understanding to that effect; and if General Luard induced or authorized any hon. gentleman to use those papers after that understanding was come to, he committed a very grave breach of an arrangement which was entered into in his own interest, for the purpose of preventing his having any subsequent inconvenience from this matter, which, unfortunately, got into the newspapers. The whole action that was taken since that complaint was made, was taken with a view of putting an end to these various contents and charges, some of perhaps some force, some of no force; but they were accumulated; but the whole effort was to prevent any injury to that gallant gentleman, to prevent any unseemly or unfortunate discussion like the one that is going on to-day, and to allow him quietly to go away, as he was certain to go, in the course of the summer, without injury to himself or to the Militia, and without any scandal or discussion; and if the object which I had in view in inducing my hon. friend to withdraw the charge has been frustrated, it is altogether due to the injudicious and more than injudicious conduct of General Luard, contrary to the distinct understanding, in putting these papers into the hands of the hon. gentleman who has made this motion, or anybody else.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). For my part, after hearing the discussion, I think the thanks of this House are due to the hon. member for North York for having brought forward his motion, and I compliment him very sincerely on the dignified and impartial manner in which he made his statement. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House, as it has been already too long occupied with this question, but there are one or two points that I want to take up. I wish to add my humble testimony to what has been said by the hon. member for Muskoka with regard to the estimation in which General Luard is held by the Militia Service throughout the Dominion. I have taken care to communicate with many military men on the subject, and I fully agree with the hon. and gallant Knight from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the men who complain of censure deserved to be censured and that they were so thin-skinned because they were militia officers and perhaps held other rank, which they considered should exempt them from criticism. As regards the complaint of the hon. member for East Durham, that complaint affected the standing of General Luard towards the Militia. It was a complaint which affected the Militia of this country, and on that account it ought not to have been withdrawn, and the Government had no right to allow it to be withdrawn. With regard to the remark of the hon. First Minister, as to General Luard having committed a breach of the understanding, he was no contracting party to any understanding; I am not aware that General Luard ever furnished any papers to any member of this House, but I know that he was no consenting party to any understanding as to the withdrawal of the charges by the hon. member for East Durham. General Luard has left the country and I do not know whether he will return, but I know it is not fair nor just that he should be made a butt of here by hon. gentlemen and not a word to be said in his defence. I cannot listen to this when I know he has not, for some time back, received that treatment he ought to have received even from the Government of the Dominion. There is a general opinion throughout the country that he has not received that treatment from the Militia Department and the Government that a man, holding the position which he held was entitled to receive. There is also a feeling that the criticisms thrown out against him have emanated from men who are smarting under well-deserved censure, and believing that the discussion here to night will be read in England by the military authorities and will seriously affect the standing of General Luard at home, I feel it to be my duty to rise in my place and add my humble mite to whatever has been said in favour of that gentleman who, in the discharge of his duties in Canada, has done good service in the training of our Militia. He found the Militia in a very inefficient state and succeeded in raising the standard to a great extent. Every Militia officer who has not a personal grievance against the General, will add his testimony to what I say. If it were merely a personal charge between Colonel Williams, as a member of Parliament, and General Luard, we ought to know it. I protest against the idea that because a gentleman may by accident be a member of Parliament, he is to plume himself on that and on what shall affect the honour and dignity of the House. That can only be affected by the manner in which we carry on the business of the country in this House, and no hon. gentleman need be uneasy about the dignity of the House, as far as any remarks falling from any person at an after-dinner speech at a military mess may affect it. It would have been much fairer to General Luard if Col. Williams had persisted in urging his charge and having an investigation. It is extraordinary that six months should be allowed to go by and no investigation held, and that this old military gentleman should have been allowed to go home with a stain on his character. It is very well to say that the matter would have been quieted and allowed to drop if the

hon. member for North York had not brought up his motion. The hon. member did perfectly right, for these charges have been circulating during the last six months throughout the country; they found their way into the English press, and have been considerably detrimental to General Luard. In justice to that gallant officer, I add my testimony to that of the hon. member for Muskoka, in saying that General Luard deserves the thanks of the Canadian Militia for the services he has rendered them, and he has their thanks.

Mr. HESSON. It is of more importance to us that we should have the good feeling of the Volunteer Force of the country, and I know from personal knowledge that the members of the Force, from my own part of the country, were not pleased because General Luard, though a very good officer, was a gentleman better fitted to command paid soldiers than to command the volunteers of Canada. If he were to continue in that position for any time, the effect would be only to injure the position of the Force. I do not think the General's disposition was suited to the Volunteer Force of this country. I do not think he was brought up to understand the difference that existed between a man who shouldered his musket as a part of his duty, and another who shouldered it simply for pay. I know offence was given to men, very excellent men, in my own county, officers of a battalion with which I was once identified, and they expressed very unkind feelings as to the manner in which they had been treated when brought into contact with him, and I have come to the conclusion that he was unfit for the position, and I think it is well he has been removed, and I trust he will never be brought back to fill this position.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I think that this question has assumed a very wide circumference indeed, and that hon. gentlemen have taken a latitude inconsistent with the Rules of Parliament. I intend to move a slight addition to the motion of my hon. friend from North York, and I would not have made any remarks at all—nor do I intend to make any at length—had it not been for some observations made recently. The conduct of General Luard seems to have come into question here in a very positive form, and I think that if any of the hon. members who have spoken on this question had confined themselves as closely to the motion as the mover did, without censuring the conduct of anyone in particular but moving for these papers, so wide a range would not have been taken in this discussion. The hon. member for Muskoka, in particular, I think, was an offender in this respect. He, however, gave the answer to himself before he sat down, for he told the House he was not here and knew nothing about the question. If he had been here, he would have known that a great ripple had been made in military circles, which had extended to the whole Commonwealth of Canada, in regard to the conduct of General Luard, not only at Cobourg, but at other places. I am not saying this for the purpose of censuring the General, nor do I intend to censure him, but I say that it is known to everybody, if not to the hon. member for Muskoka, that the newspapers of the day, not only the *Mail* which he has attacked, but the *Globe* newspaper, its rival, the organ of the Reform party—the *Globe* came out in strong terms censuring the conduct of General Luard. If the hon. member for Muskoka had been as cognizant of this affair as he ought to have been, before he spoke and inveighed against the hon. member for East Durham, he certainly would not have used the strong expressions he did. I find the *Globe* newspaper, its make being followed by the lesser lights of the same party. On the 24th of September, the *Globe* spoke in this wise:—

"On Thursday, the brigade was inspected by Major-General Luard commanding the Militia Force in Canada. On riding to the saluting base, preparatory to the march past, he there discovered several Staff officers, including the Camp Quarter-Master, the Paymaster, the Surgeon

besides regimental Surgeons, who were not mounted. He demanded who they were, and on receiving the required information, peremptorily ordered these gentlemen off the field. During the field evolutions which took place, if the slightest irregularity occurred, the General seemed to become beside himself. In the inspection, not only did he scrutinize, with eagle eye, the brigade by battalions, but he ordered the battalions to be broken up into their respective companies, and inspected each one separately. There is no doubt he made many criticisms which were deserved, and offered innumerable suggestions which were invaluable, but the effect of these was almost entirely destroyed by the manner in which they were made. The slightest deviation of uniformity was everywhere made the subject of a military philippic. A folded overcoat strapped on upside down was in several cases a sufficient pretext for an onslaught on both officers and privates. Riding up to one company, he singled out on an unfortunate young soldier, whose countenance was bronzed by constant exposure, and denounced him as dirty and disgraceful. Turning to the officer in command, one of the most respected in the regiment, he politely informed him that he (the officer) did not look any too clean himself, and could not expect his men to be tidy with such an exemplar.

"THE LUNCHEON.

"When the review was over—"

An hon. MEMBER. This is good.

Mr. WOODWORTH. This is good. Yes; it is from the *Koran*.

"When the review was over, the General was gracious enough to accept an invitation to luncheon with the brigade and regimental Staff. During a conversation which took place thereat, in which Colonel Williams, of the 46th—"

That gallant 46th, that has been so often alluded to in this House—

"and the General were the chief participants, the former was given the lie direct by the latter."

This is the *Globe*.

"A painful lull in the conversation ensued,—"

I should think it would be painful—

"and shortly afterwards the General, accompanied by his A. D. C., arose and beat a hasty retreat. Colonel Williams will call the attention of the House to the question of the General's conduct. It is also rumoured that an arrangement has been made by influential members of the Militia, who also hold seats in Parliament, to agitate for his immediate recall by the Imperial authorities."

Well, Sir, afterward the *Globe* newspaper, in an editorial in the following issue, among other things, said the following:—

"A few things seem to be forgotten by General Luard,—"

This is under the head of "General Luard again."

"(1) That the volunteers of Canada are not regular soldiers. (2) That they give their time and services gratuitously. (3) That there is not an officer in the Force whose connection therewith does not involve—in keeping up bands, uniforms, and other expenses—sacrifices, alike in money and in time. If these things are borne in mind by inspecting Generals in Canada, their criticism will be more apt to be marked by moderation, justice and common sense."

Now, some hon. gentlemen, and especially the hon. member for Muskoka, have inveighed in very strong terms about this matter being brought up, about Major-General Luard being discussed at all, and the *Mail* newspaper has been attacked amid the plaudits of hon. gentlemen opposite, who did not seem to know—although the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) knew, as a journalist, right well, for I think he had a hand in it—that the Reform newspapers universally condemned the man before he was heard here in Parliament at all. And who is to be thanked, as the First Minister has said, for bringing this matter up? Is it any hon. member on this side of the House? No; it was brought up on that side of the House; but, I must say, in justice to the member for North York (Mr. Mulock), in that calm and judicial manner which became a scholar and a gentleman. He brought it up fairly and impartially, as he had a right to do as a member of this House; but it has been taken up without moderation, and sometimes without very good sense by some hon. members. Hon. members inveighed here as if it was a shuttlecock to be thrown about between parties, when Canada has been saturated from one end to the other with newspaper articles on the conduct of General Luard, and I do not think it behoves any gentleman in this

House to attempt to make this a party question at all. It has been said that the Militia has been insulted. I do not know whether it has or has not. I am not a militiaman or a militia officer. If it has been insulted, let the blame rest upon the proper shoulders. It has been said that this Parliament has been insulted by this gentleman corroborating the remarks of Col. Gzowski as to the opinions of this Parliament being not worth ten cents. I do not think we hold our seats amenable to any Polish officer, or any officer, no matter how high, and I think, in England, any officer who inveighed against the Ministry of Gladstone, or the Parliament of England, and said that the members of that Ministry, or the members of that Parliament, did not understand their business, and that their opinions on military affairs were not worth ten cents whoever he was, would stand a very poor chance of promotion. We are not officers here, but we represent independent constituencies; and, if we have no information at hand on military subjects, we have the means of information and can inform ourselves, and we do that before we speak to any question in this House, and I think, without reference to party at all, that the *esprit de corps* of members of this House has been offended by both those gentlemen who have spoken in such terms. I move, in amendment to the motion—and I believe my hon. friend will accept the amendment, because it is in keeping with his statements here—that the words “and all other papers and correspondence containing complaints against Major-General Luard” be added to the motion already made.

Mr. McNEILL. I had not intended, Mr. Speaker, to say anything on this question at all. Not only had I not intended to say anything, but I had made up my mind not to say anything. However, after some remarks which have fallen during the course of this discussion, and especially from my hon. friend who has last spoken, I think it would be scarcely right if I held in my hand a letter which I have received from the Colonel commanding the battalion in my county, without reading, at all events, a portion of it to the House. I do it in order that it should be seen that the statement made that there is a consensus of opinion among the Militia hostile to General Luard, and that his conduct in his position has been detrimental to the Volunteer Force, is incorrect, and that there is no such consensus of opinion. This is a letter from Col. Cooper, a man who is, I may say, a gentleman respected by everyone who knows him, a man of high education, and a man of very sober judgment. This is what he says of General Luard:

“Time and again have I seen attacks made on the Major-General in the press, which I would have liked to reply to had I not been an officer under command of the party attacked. Personally, I have only seen in Major-General Luard the signs of a soldier, desirous that everything should be done to make our Volunteer Force efficient. Wherever he has found fault, it has, so far as I am aware, been deserved, and the fault has seldom been as to the men, but more as to their equipment, and at times so as to remind those in command of their duty to the Force. Where praise has been all deserved, it has been bestowed, but not in such a way as to be fulsome. I can imagine that some, who think that the only use to be made of volunteering is to secure a little recreation and show and no work, may at times have been severely rebuked for remissness. And it may be that the expressions used have been severe. Of this I know nothing but from hearsay, and in this I place little dependence, as I know that the actions of the Major-General were grossly misrepresented in the Campbell affair at London, in 1881. I think I may safely say that the officers of my battalion, speaking from their own experience, will agree with me in saying that Major-General Luard has endeavoured to do more for the comfort and efficiency of the Force than some of his predecessors, and that so far as they have come in contact with him, they have nothing to complain of.

“If inefficiency can only be removed by harshness, it may be necessary to use it. Any harshness I have known in Major-General Luard, if so hard a term of harshness can fairly be used, with anything within my knowledge, has only tended to remove inefficiency and strengthen the Force. I can understand that even the reviving of efficiency may give some offence which possibly for a time would, in some localities, produce ill-felling. A popular officer, utterly unfit, however, for the position, may succeed in a section in bringing out for a time a good body of men who might, but for him, have remained at home. Such instances, no doubt, Major-General Luard has found, and if he has offended such a one the result to the Force might, by some, be considered injurious there.

Mr. WOODWORTH.

“I have heard the Major-General speak to an officer, finding a good deal of fault as to the appearance, etc., of the men of his company, for which neither the officer nor the men were responsible, but the fault lay with others in furnishing improper, or failing to provide proper equipment. But he would at the same time be careful to state that this fault was found, not with the officer or his men, but to show to each and all what was really requisite, to what they should aspire, and as a reminder to them to use their exertions in the right direction.

“I wish I could have expressed my feeling at less length, but I have always felt indignant at the attacks made so frequently on one who is, in a great measure, prevented from defending himself.”

Now, Sir, I think it was only right and proper that that letter from Col. Cooper should be read, in order that hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House might know that there is not that consensus of opinion that has been referred to. I think, Sir, there are three old British rules of fair fighting, that have been to a great extent transgressed here to-night. There is an old rule, that you should not strike a man when he is down; there is another rule, that you should not strike a man below the belt; there is a third rule, that you should not strike a man when his back is turned, and I think those three rules have been transgressed here to-night. As to striking a man below the belt, I refer to the fact of accusations being brought against General Luard upon a matter which is not before the House at all, and which should be dealt with only by those in possession of the facts. As far as striking a man when he is down is concerned, I think that sufficiently explains itself. I think that to any body composed of English gentlemen, and of French gentlemen, who are quite as gallant as English gentlemen, those three rules are rules that will commend themselves. I wish to say that so far as Col. Williams is concerned, and so far as Major-General Luard is concerned, I have had the pleasure of knowing them both, and I believe they are both courteous and kind-hearted gentlemen, and I believe, upon this occasion, they are probably, both of them, to a certain extent right, and both of them, to a certain extent, wrong. I think it is a great pity that this matter has been brought before this House. I think, perhaps, it is more to be regretted for the reason that the hon. gentleman from Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) has stated what I am quite sure, if he had been better informed, he would not have stated—that Major-General Luard had treated the volunteers of Canada in a different manner to that in which he would have treated the volunteers of Britain. If that hon. gentleman were to go to England and introduce himself there as a Canadian, he would find that the fact of his being a Canadian would be a passport to the hearts of the people of England; and I am quite sure that so far from any British officer doing, as he fancies General Luard has done, any officer coming here from England would feel that he was bound to treat the volunteers of Canada with even greater consideration and greater respect than he would treat the Militia or volunteers of England.

Mr. OUIMET. This discussion reminds me of something that occurred when I commenced my law practice. One day I was applying to a Judge of the Queen's Bench to grant bail to a client of mine. I had the record in my hands, and I tried to show, to the best of my ability, that my client was not guilty. After examining the record, the Judge quietly remarked to me: “Mr. Ouimet, your client may not be guilty, but certainly he has been very unfortunate.” Well, Mr. Speaker, if General Luard is not guilty, he has certainly been very unfortunate; and as bail has been granted to him, as it was to my client, and if we do not hear any more of him, as we did not hear any more of my client, then I think it would be a very pleasant thing for us all. As to General Luard's efficiency as an officer of the British army, I have nothing to say; but I think he has shown himself very deficient as an officer entrusted with the command of our Militia. He has very often insulted—and I use the word advisedly—gentlemen commanding corps, who, to my personal knowledge, did not deserve

it. I do not say that he meant to insult them, but he was very unfortunate in his expressions. Having been myself Commandant of a volunteer battalion in Montreal, I once had occasion to send a communication to the Department, through the Brigade Officer in Montreal. It was written in French. I supposed it was my right to write in French on a military matter as well as on any other matter. A few days afterwards, I received the communication back again, with a marginal note, written in pencil: "Do translate that into English." I thought that the command was military, but it was certainly not very civil. I might cite other instances. One day I asked for an armoury for the use of my regiment. We all know that the Militia in this country, and more especially in Montreal, are not well provided with drill sheds. My regiment was quartered in a public hall, open to the winds and to the public, and wanted an armoury in which to keep the equipments and accoutrements under lock and key. Well, I received an answer from the General, stating that he was very much astonished that the friends of the battalion, who were the only parties, in his opinion, who could be received in that drill shed, were capable of stealing the accoutrements. Well, I found that the friends of the battalion were the general public. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that here in this House we are all very honest men, but we have heard of caps and other things being stolen from the corridors, and yet it was never supposed that the friends of hon. members, who were introduced into the corridors, were capable of committing petty larceny. I might relate another instance. I was present last fall when the gallant 5th Royal Scots were inspected in Montreal by General Luard. They were thoroughly equipped; they wore the traditional plaid and kilt, and I suppose these cost the officers of the regiment several thousand dollars, nearer \$10,000 than \$5,000. It was late in October, or the beginning of November; it was a rainy day and cold, and I thought it was very creditable to see the regiment turn out as they did, and I certainly thought they did splendidly. The only remark made by the General to the regiment was this. He said—I will not repeat the word he placed at the head of the sentence—"Just think of a regiment going into service with such accoutrements." That was the only compliment paid to the battalion, and he then left. In my opinion, it was not becoming an inspecting officer to use such a disagreeable and unpleasant expression to a regiment which certainly did credit, not only to the Canadian Militia, but more especially to the Scotchmen who reside in Montreal. I did not intend to take any part in this discussion, but I desire to say, in conclusion, that the General was certainly very unfortunate, and yet it was very fortunate that he left under such good circumstances, and if he has something to complain of, it is that his friends were indiscreet in raising such a discussion here, which may bring back to him some unpleasant reminiscences of Canada.

Mr. VAIL. I did intend, Mr. Speaker, to have offered some remarks on this subject; but after the statement made by the First Minister, I feel I ought not to say anything beyond this: That it is very unfortunate for General Luard that this matter has been brought up; that it is very unfortunate also for Col. Williams, the hon. member for East Durham, and it is, I am afraid, rather unfortunate for the Militia as well. I think it was unwise on the part of Col. Williams to have allowed this matter to get into the press. I do not know who is responsible for the circulation of it; but I received two Port Hope papers marked, each referring to this case and giving an account of the whole matter. I was sorry to see it, of course. I happened to be in England in 1882, and found some of the articles copied into English papers, and I was several times spoken to on the subject and asked if the reports were true. One gentleman, high in authority, asked me particularly about it there, and

said he was very sorry to see the report, as he was a great friend of the General, and he asked me whether the reports were correct or not. I replied that I knew nothing about the matter, except the reports in the newspapers. I asked him not to place too much confidence in the newspaper reports, and said if there was anything in the charge it would be investigated by the Government and he would learn more about it from official sources. All I have to say in regard to General Luard is, that I have known him for a long time. During some three or four years he was Military Secretary at Halifax. He was known to be a thorough soldier, a man who stood high in the service, and who attained very nearly the highest position in his profession; and I am very much astonished to see this statement made in regard to his conduct, because every one who is acquainted with him intimately, knows him to be a gentleman. I am sorry the First Minister was not able to rise in his place and assure the House that the charges had been made, perhaps, without giving the matter proper consideration, and that after all, there was not much in them and that the General had left the Dominion with his character unstained.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the debate is closed, I desire to offer a few remarks in reply. In making the motion, I think I can safely say I did not venture to offer an opinion on any alleged state of facts. I did not criticise adversely or favourably the action of the gentlemen concerned in this matter; but from a sense of duty, to which I will refer further on, I made this motion. Why I made it, I will state, and I will take the responsibility of it. Before, however, passing to that branch of the case, I will refer to some remarks by some hon. gentleman directed towards a gentleman not a member of the House, and which were not, in my opinion, material to a discussion of this question; I refer to the references made to Col. Gzowski. Other hon. members are as fully entitled to their opinion as I am to mine, and I simply state my opinion, in order that it cannot be said there was no member to be found in this House who would stand up and utter a word in his defence when his name was referred to in not flattering language. I think that he is entitled to the thanks of this country for the service he has rendered in certain directions in developing an interest in military matters. He may not, as is the case with General Luard, have succeeded in pleasing all classes; but still I think we will all be willing to admit that he has been animated by a sincere and disinterested desire to do good to the cause he had at heart. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) has stated that the hon. member for East Durham was not desirous of shielding himself behind his position as a member of the House. I am sorry that I cannot agree with him in that statement. When I made the motion, I endeavoured to make clear two distinct propositions, not taking the responsibility of stating that the facts existed on which the propositions could be proved, but giving the facts, if facts they were, and asking and hoping for a denial. I first of all called the attention of the hon. member for East Durham to the tenor of certain observations, both in the press and in the correspondence, a portion of which I have, and how I got it I will explain for the benefit of the First Minister and the House. I say that correspondence pointed to this state of affairs: That after mess, after the officers had retired from parade, when the troops were disbanded, and each man had returned to his calling as a citizen, then it is intimated that the hon. member for East Durham gave information to the Port Hope *Times*, and inspired the article which subsequently formed the foundation of his communication to the Secretary of State. I stated that pointedly, and invited a contradiction. The hon. member for East Durham has not contradicted it; he has not denied that he had connection with the publication of that article; and sitting in his place in this House, if he does not deny it, I must, I think, be fairly entitled to

assume that he had a hand in the inspiration of the article. And if he does not now deny it, I will take the liberty of reading to the House what the Military Law upon such conduct is. Since the hon. member for East Durham has not now denied his connection with that article, I think I am fairly entitled to assume that he had a part in inspiring it. I shall now read from the Regulations and Orders for the Militia of Canada, 1883, page 48, section 170 :

"If officers, non-commissioned officers or men, whether on actual service or otherwise, have any complaint or accusation to bring against a superior or other officer, such complaint must be forwarded to the complainant's commanding officer, who will transmit the same, with his remarks, through the Deputy Adjutant-General commanding the district, for consideration at Headquarters if necessary. It cannot be permitted that they shall bring accusations against superior officers or comrades before the tribunal of public opinion, either by speech or letters inserted in any newspaper; such a proceeding would be in glaring violation of the rules of military discipline and in contempt of authority."

I also refer to a higher authority, that is to the Queen's Regulations, which are in substance part of the Regulations applicable to the Active Militia of Canada, section 6, subsection 46 :

"The practice of making anonymous complaints or publishing anything through the medium of the press, calculated to act injuriously on the interests of the Service, or to excite discontent in the army, is strictly prohibited."

I merely say, in passing, that to my mind it is not wise and proper for the efficiency of the Service for any person connected with the Volunteer Service to resort to the medium of the press in order by means of anonymous communications to ventilate his grievances. If he has a grievance, the discipline of the Service provides a remedy. His duty is to transmit his complaint through the next superior officer. The next superior officer to the hon. gentleman was the Deputy Adjutant-General for the district. He should have directed his complaint to the Deputy Adjutant-General of the district, and he would have seen that it was transmitted to the proper tribunal. If that tribunal was the Secretary of State, there it would have gone; if the Minister of Militia, there it would have gone, and he would have discharged his duty if he had adopted the clear course marked out by the Regulations for the Militia of Canada. It is said that the hon. gentleman is not shielding himself behind his position as a member of this House. If not, what is he doing; if not, why does he not adopt the regular course provided by the Regulations? I say that under the military law he has no privilege, which is not possessed by any private in the Service, which could justify his communication. I refer to a high authority on this point, to the case of a member of Parliament serving in the army, who was under arrest. His Majesty King George III communicated to Parliament that for a breach of military duty a certain member of Parliament was under arrest, and he asked, whether, under the circumstances, Parliament deemed it proper to consider the matter. The reply was that Parliament thanked His Majesty for his careful consideration for the privileges of its members, but did not deem it proper to interfere. I refer to Clode, on the Military Forces of the Crown, vol. 1, page 177, where this, the case of Major Stanhope is referred to. I have not brought this motion forward for any mere sentimental reason. I have not brought it forward as the First Minister intimated, at the instigation of anybody. I brought it forward on my own motion and responsibility,—on my duty to the House and as a citizen, and as one interested in the efficiency of the Service. Sir, the hon. gentleman asked me how I became possessed of this correspondence—for, no doubt, he referred to me. He did not refer to hon. members on his own side of the House, who are equally in possession of this correspondence, but I will tell him how I became possessed of it. I placed this notice on the notice paper when I saw in the newspapers that General Luard had been retired, or was about to retire, or was asking for leave of absence. If the motion had been allowed to come

Mr. MULOCK.

up when it was first reached, I would not have had the advantage of the correspondence. The motion was enlarged at the request of the Government, and an hon. member chose to forward to me by letter—a gentleman to whom I had never spoken, a gentleman who is a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite—this correspondence, stating that he had intended to make a motion himself, but as I had a notice on the paper, he forwarded the correspondence. As soon as I received it, I placed it in the hands of the hon. member for East Durham and told him that I had that information upon which to base my remarks, and he could take such a course as he saw proper. If the First Minister desires to have the name of his own supporter who sent the correspondence to me, I am prepared to give it. I have not the honour of the acquaintance of General Luard, and I have not had any request to make this motion. I repeat, that I make this motion in the general interest of the public and in no other interest. I think it is in the interest of our Service that we should have it clearly established, first, whether a member of this House, in the ranks as a soldier, has any rights and privileges different from those of another soldier, except during the time he is discharging his duties as a member of this House. If the hon. member for East Durham felt that the dignity of the House was offended, what was his course? His course was when the House met, to have moved in the House, and then to have availed himself of his position and privilege as a member of this House. But he did not do so. Instead of that, he allows this charge to hang over the head of a man of whom I can only say I do not know whether he is innocent or guilty. It is true, they may have succeeded in destroying his reputation, but unfair as that is to him, it is trifling in comparison with interfering with the efficiency of the Militia Service of Canada. I have moved in this matter because I have seen, in the first place, a man who strikes me from observation as having been unjustly treated—charged and yet not charged—no definite accusation, no opportunity of trial—struck below the belt, driven and exiled from the country which invited him here. What an example is that to the Militia of Canada! Is there a soldier in the Service who deserves that treatment. Whatever the faults the General may have been, there is not a man, from a Colonel down to the lowest in the Service, who would desire to have the whole Governmental power of Canada united in expelling from Canada, on an unproven charge, a vague charge, a man who is sent here at our request, a man having the record of Major-General Luard. Why, Sir, his greatest opponents did not treat him like that. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) told us of his record; that he had entered the Service in early life; that he had risen from a low position to be what he is, an ornament to the Service; that in the Crimea, in India, and China, he has fought for his country. I believe I can add to that record, that he served even against the barbarians, and that even the Zulus gave him a chance for his life, treatment denied him in free Canada. Surely I am entitled to make this motion without being addressed as I have been addressed by the First Minister. I simply then say, in conclusion, that I make the motion in the interest of the Service, and also in the interest of a man, who in my opinion has not had a trial.

Motion, as amended, agreed to,

#### THE CREDIT OF CANADA.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton), in the absence of Mr. MITCHELL, moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada of any of its members, and Sir John Rose, or between either of them, and Messrs. Baring & Glynn, the Financial Agents of

he Dominion, or either of them, in the year 1875, in relation to the conduct of Mr. Potter, the President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in decrying the credit of Canada; also the credit of the Province of Quebec, in relation to the effort of the latter to effect a loan in London, or the credit of that Province for the construction of railways therein. Also, copies of letters, correspondence, or communications, written by Mr. Potter, or by him as President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, reflecting upon or discrediting the credit of Canada, or the Province of Quebec, or written by any officer of the said Company in the year aforesaid, which led to the writing the letter or letters to Sir John Rose, before referred to, by any member of the Government.

Motion agreed to.

#### BANKING FACILITIES FOR AGRICULTURISTS.

Mr. ORTON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the following Resolution:

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to extend better banking facilities to the agriculturists of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman has a Bill on the order paper on this subject, for which the House has appointed a day for the second reading. I think there is a rule by which, when an hon. member has made a motion with reference to a measure, and the House has already appointed a day for its discussion, it shall have to be proceeded with in that form. I think we shall have to get rid of the Bill before we can go on with the resolution. I suggested this difficulty to the hon. gentleman when he was introducing his Bill.

Mr. ORTON. I may not have been heard, but when the matter was under discussion, I asked leave to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might now be allowed to have the order discharged, and then we could go on regularly.

Mr. SPEAKER. The order for the second reading of the Bill has not been discharged. I am not, at present, prepared to give a decision in the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is now half-past eleven, and I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has followed the suggestion of the First Minister, to get this matter in the Banking and Commerce Committee, among the gold.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:30 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 11th March, 1884.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to say a word on a question of privilege. I find in an issue of the *Chicago Inter Ocean*, a copy of which I hold in my hand, the following special telegram:—

"OTTAWA, Ont., March 5th.

"A resolution to test the members views on prohibition, was brought up in the House to-night by Prof. Foster of New Brunswick. He gave a lengthy speech, so it was impossible to reach a vote, much to the disgust of the temperance people, and the motion was therefore put at the foot of the order paper, which makes it doubtful its coming up again this Session. It is stated openly that Foster arranged to do this with the Government, as the Ministers were in a quandary how to act, with the prohibitionists on one side, and the licensed victuallers on the other."

I had the curiosity, after receiving this from a very earnest and warm friend asking what I meant by such action, to look through the files of the newspapers in the reading room, and I found the majority probably of the papers belonging, I am bound to say, to one political party alone, represented either that I was ordered by the Government, or asked by the Government, or of my own will and purpose did deliberately engage to talk out and kill the Resolution. Now, Sir, I wish simply to state this: the manner and the matter of my speech are legitimate subjects for criticism but my motives I hold are my own property, and I have a right to explain them to the House. With respect to these statements I may say that as regards fact and intention they are absolutely without foundation; they are utterly, entirely and completely false.

#### CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend "The Seamen's Act, 1863," and "The Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of ships, 1874," as to apply certain provisions thereof to Canadian foreign-going ships over one hundred tons register, instead of over one hundred and fifty tons register.

He said: The explanation of this Resolution is this: Under the Act which was first passed only vessels of over 150 tons were required to have certified master and mates. An Act was passed last year respecting coasting vessels, in which the limit was placed at 100 tons. This proposition is framed with a view to bring the two Acts into harmony.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON. Will the hon. gentleman explain the difference between the Acts in force and the present Bill?

Mr. McLELAN. At present if they are for the West Indies or other foreign ports, the Acts apply to those between 100 and 150 tons. The Act of 1873 applies only to vessels of 150 tons engaged in the coasting trade; but last year's Act respecting coasting vessels limited it to 100 tons. This Resolution is intended simply to harmonize the two.

Mr. VAIL. When do you propose to bring the Bill in force?

Mr. McLELAN. On the first of July.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 116) to amend An Act respecting certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, and the Seamen's Act, 1873.

Bill read the first time.

#### ENQUIRIES INTO SHIPWRECKS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend "The Act respecting enquiries and investigations into shipwrecks and other matters," as to the power of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in certain cases reported to him under it.

He said: The chief amendment made by this Act is to provide, that instead of the decision at these enquiries being announced in open Court, the report of the officer shall be made to the Minister of Marine, so that the Minister may have an opportunity of amending it in any way, or ordering a further investigation into any particular points.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman does not propose, I suppose, that the report shall be altered by his authority. He may over-rule it but the two reports are to stand, just as in the case of a court-martial.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, that is the case.

Mr. WELDON. How would the party be able to appeal when he does not know what the decision of the court below is?

Mr. McLELAN. The decision in all cases will be announced immediately, and an appeal could be made as in other cases.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee).

Mr. WELDON. Under the present law a master or mate, who is punished by the withdrawal or suspension of his certificate, has an appeal to the Minister of Marine; but under the proposed amendment the report is not published, but sent to the Minister of Marine, who then and there gives in reality the primary decision. This would therefore appear to deprive the parties of the right to appeal.

Mr. McLELAN. No; it is not intended to do away with the appeal, but we think it is well that the Minister of Marine should have some intimation of the decision of the Court has reached before it is announced in public. The decision of the Court will stand as the decision of the Court. The amendment is for the purpose of obviating the unpleasantness which sometimes arises in having the decision announced publicly when that decision may be amended or referred back for the purpose of having further evidence on particular points—evidence which might affect the decision of the officer as well as the decision of the Minister. Some points of the evidence might appear weak, and it might be desirable to strengthen them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The analogy drawn by the hon. member for West Durham to the court-martial is a very apposite one. The court-martial acts and communicates its action to the Commander-in-chief, but it is not promulgated in any way, and for a very obvious reason among many, that the Court may have acted illegally, and the Deputy-Adjutant General may send the matter back on account perhaps of some irregularity. But I quite agree with the point taken by my hon. friend opposite, that it would be very improper that the Minister should in any way alter the report of the Court below. That is quite clear; and it is also clear that before making up his mind before declaring his judgment either in support of, or adversely to the report of the Court below, the party should have an opportunity of expressing his opinion; because human nature is human nature, and if the Minister of Marine once gave his approval of the judgment of the Court below, that would be deciding without the chance of an appeal. I think this can be provided for in the Bill which my hon. friend proposes to found on his Resolution.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and concurred in.

Mr. McLEAN introduced Bill (No. 117) to amend the Act respecting enquiries and investigations into shipwrecks and other matters, as to the power of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in certain cases reported to him under it.

Bill read the first time.

Mr. McLELAN.

#### CO-OPERATIVE LIFE INSURANCE.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877, with respect to companies transacting the business of Life Assurance under the title of "Co-operative Life Insurance Companies," "Mutual Benefit Associations," and the like.

He said: Perhaps I shall best explain the nature of the Bill and the necessity for it by reading a memorandum which has been placed in my hands by the Inspector of Insurance:

"Associations of the nature described in this Bill have been declared to be Life Insurance Companies by several decisions of the Courts in the United States; and, according to the opinion of our Department of Justice, come within the scope of our Life Insurance Statute, and cannot therefore legally do business in Canada without a license and without making the deposit of \$50,000.

"In their original form, these were institutions of a fraternal or benevolent character, merely collecting assessments on the death of a member to pay funeral expenses, or a beneficiary gift to the family. Thus having no capital or accumulated funds, nor needing a reserve to be kept in hand, they would clearly be unable to comply with the Statute by making a deposit. It appears, therefore, to be necessary to apply special legislation to them (as has been done in most of the States of the Union), and the present Bill proposes in effect to exempt them from the operation of the Life Insurance Act under certain conditions, and thus to legalize the action of the numerous benevolent associations which are at present under the ban of the law.

"Although the origin of these associations was as above stated, numerous companies have been started on the same system for the purposes of profit, and come into competition with the regular life companies, asserting that they can give insurance at a cheaper rate and thus appealing successfully to a large class of the population. Whether such a system can be permanently carried on or not (which need not be discussed) it is clear that it opens a road for an immense amount of fraud; because, as the profits and charges for commissions and expenses are made on each assessment, the more numerous the deaths the greater will be the returns, and hence arises a temptation to increase the number of deaths by insuring bad lives and by other fraudulent artifices. This has been repeatedly done as in the notorious 'graveyard' insurances in the State of Pennsylvania and elsewhere, immense gains having accrued to the managers before the inevitable collapse came. There seems no safeguards against this except

"(1.) A directorate which shall be known to the people and whose characters may be judged of. This is attempted to be secured by requiring the Company to be incorporated within Canada.

"(2.) By requiring a full statement of their business and accounts annually or oftener. If these accounts are satisfactory, the Minister of Finance is empowered to exempt the Company from the operation of the Insurance Act, and to continue such exemption so long as the Company appears to be honestly and satisfactorily managed.

"The publication of these accounts in the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Insurance will insure all the publicity necessary to enable the public to judge the quality of the Company.

"The Government herein accept no responsibility except that of refusing the exemption when a Company appears to be badly mismanaged or tainted with fraud; and the necessity of retaining this power of refusal may be illustrated by the fact stated by the Commissioner of Pennsylvania, that out of 236 such companies organized under a Statute of 1876 it was found in 1881 that 171 of these had been dissolved by the courts; 7 had voluntarily ceased business; 21 had failed to report to him, having probably become disorganized, and only 37 had reported to his Department.

"With regard to foreign companies, the Bill does not affect them, but leaves them as at present to enter Canada by complying with the Life Assurance Act. This is no hardship upon them, because if they are really benevolent or fraternal associations they can readily obtain incorporation for their Canadian branches; and if they are companies worked merely for the sake of profit, it is not too much to require that they shall make the deposit of \$50,000 as a guarantee of good faith, and be otherwise subjected to the same stringent rule of supervision as the regular life companies with whom they are competing."

As stated here, it has been decided that these companies are operating contrary to law. No action has been taken in any of the Provinces that I know of, but communication has been had with the Government, urging that some step should be taken to authorize them to do business, and this measure is proposed for that purpose. It requires from these benevolent societies no deposit, but it requires that they should be incorporated, that they should have offices for the transaction of business, and that they should transmit to the inspector of insurance, once a year, or as often as the Government requires, a statement of their business and organization.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does it cover both American and Canadian companies?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It covers American companies, if by their branches they are incorporated—not otherwise.

Motion agreed to; Resolution considered in Committee, reported, and read the first and second times, and concurred in.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 118) to modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act 1877.

Bill read the first time.

#### SALE AND DELIVERY OF COAL.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that all contracts for the sale and delivery of coal shall be made for such sale and delivery by weight, and that all sales of coal shall be by weight.

He said: The object was to make the sale of coal uniform throughout the Dominion. In the Western Provinces it was sold by weight, but in some places in the Lower Provinces it was sold by measure. If necessary the Act could be amended and power given to inspect these measures; the representatives of the trade generally were of opinion that the weight system was the most acceptable and just. A man was surer of getting his money's value by weight than by measure. The ton would be the short ton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What penalty, if any, for infraction of the Act do you propose?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will propose that in the Bill.

Motion agreed to; Resolution considered in Committee, reported, and read the first and second times, and concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN introduced Bill (No. 119) respecting the sale of Coal.

Bill read the first time.

#### OFFENCES AGAINST WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend "The Weights and Measures Act of 1879," so as to provide better for the prevention and punishment of offences against it.

He said this amendment was intended to provide for the better enforcement of the Act by extending the penalties to the amendments of the original Act.

Motion agreed to; Resolution considered in Committee, reported, and read the first and second times, and concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN introduced Bill (No. 120) to amend the Weights and Measures Act of 1879.

Bill read the first time.

#### STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, by reducing the fees payable on the renewal of Engineers' Licenses.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to a matter which may as well be treated of in this connection with this proposition of his as at any other time. If my memory serves me right, the Inspection Act does provide that the Minister of Marine or officers appointed by him should see that steam vessels, particularly those which are in the habit of taking passengers on excursions, are not overloaded. The law, I believe, is good enough, but I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that that law is habitually violated in almost every port in our inland waters. Every gentleman who has any experience in these matters, will, I think, bear me out in saying that it is a very frequent thing indeed to see steamers going out of port very seriously overloaded, so overloaded that, if any accident, either by fire or otherwise, should occur, an enormous proportion of the excursionists must perish. Now, I desire, without impeding the progress of the measure, to take the opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister to that notorious fact. This is the proper time for precautions to be taken to prevent any accident occurring during the summer. On the whole, we have been free from such accidents in Canada, but the hon. gentleman will know that, in England and other places, an enormous loss of life has over and over again resulted from the carelessness or greediness of owners of steamboats in over-crowding their vessels; and as our vessels are usually made of wood, not of iron, any accident, and particularly any accident from fire, would be exceedingly difficult to guard against. I have seen vessels so overloaded that, when a slight accident caused the people to go to one side, the vessel would almost roll over on her beam ends; and I can answer, from my own experience, for this fact, that the number of boats and life-preservers kept on those vessels was utterly and entirely inadequate to give the passengers the least chance of safety. I do not want, as I have said, to delay the progress of the measure, but I take the opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister to the facts of the case, and to the necessity for greater vigilance on the part of the officers whose duty it should be to guard against such danger to human life.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). I am very happy that the member for South Huron has called the attention of the Minister to this important matter; but, when the hon. gentleman says that accidents of that kind do not occur in the inland waters of Canada, he must have forgotten the melancholy fact of the accident which occurred two or three years ago in the neighbourhood of the city of London.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I said only a few.

Mr. MACMILLAN. When, on a small stream, a rivulet you might almost say, from 160 to 180 people were drowned, in consequence of the unfortunate circumstance of the vessel being overloaded. I am not aware of the contents of the hon. Minister's Bill, but I would strongly urge that the greatest care should be taken in this way, and that it should be made criminal, not only for the owners, but for all parties connected with it, that anything of the kind should be allowed as the overloading of these vessels.

Mr. McLELAN. Since the accident to which the hon. gentleman refers, I have had passed through the House a Bill providing for the inspection of the hulls of steamboats as well as the boilers and engines, and the inspectors of the hulls and the inspectors of the boilers and engines have to come together and to decide the number of passengers which a vessel should be entitled to carry. The law is, perhaps, stringent enough, and I am aware of the necessity for having it carried out. The law has only been in operation a year, and perhaps we have not quite got up to the stand-

ard of vigilance, but we have been impressing on the inspectors the necessity of vigilance in this matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say the law is quite sufficient, if it were enforced. As I mentioned in my remarks, it is not the law itself that I think is defective, but the enforcement of the law, and my object in calling the hon. Minister's attention to it, was that further pains should be taken in enforcing the law.

Mr. DAWSON. There have been a great many accidents in the waters of Lake Huron and Lake Superior. I think it would be very desirable that some Government officer should have authority to prevent vessels that were overloaded from going out, and that vessels should have certain marks upon them for good weather and for the fall. A good many of these losses which occurred on Lake Huron and Lake Superior, arose from overloading in the fall of the year, and I think, if the Custom House officers, for instance, at the ports had authority to prevent the vessels going out overloaded, that would be a step in the right direction, at all events.

Mr. BERGIN. I am not aware to what extent the Minister proposes to reduce the fees payable by engineers. Perhaps he will be good enough to let us know.

Mr. McLELAN. The Act passed in 1882, provided that engineers having obtained a first-class, should be exempt from fees, and that engineers holding second class certificates should be examined annually, and should pay annually a fee of \$5. It was supposed that the second-class engineers would not remain in that class very long, but would pass up into first-class engineers as rapidly as possible, and the law was so framed to induce them to pass from the second to the first-class and become first-class engineers, and the fee was kept at \$5. It is found in practice that there are not many boats of sufficient capacity and power of engines to afford facilities to many of the second-class engineers to qualify for first, and become exempt from payment of the annual \$5 charge. It is proposed to reduce the fee for second-class engineers from \$5 to \$2.

Mr. BERGIN. So far as the explanation of the Minister goes, as to the position of those who have not been able to obtain certificates as first-class engineers, it is very satisfactory, but I regret that he has not seen his way—and I would press him now—to reduce the fee from \$2 to \$1. At first sight, it may appear that \$2 is not a very large sum for these men to pay, but it means a day's pay for each one of them. We know that, each year, owing to the competition with railways and other causes, the number of men employed as second-class engineers is diminishing, and the majority of these men are obliged to go to an additional expense in presenting themselves before the Board of Examiners. These men, as a rule, are subjected to great expense in going up for examination to Toronto and Montreal, and this is a matter of serious consequence to them and their families. The men employed as engineers have no other means of livelihood, as a rule. They are employed only about seven months of the year, and during the other five months they are idle; in other words, they consume during the winter what they earn during the summer. I think the Minister would be doing an act of justice to these men in reducing the fee from \$2 to \$1.

Mr. COCKBURN. I think, also, it ought to be reduced to \$1. That was the old rate charged.

Mr. McLELAN. I would suggest that this matter would be more conveniently considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COCKBURN. When that time comes, I hope the Minister will have his mind made up to reduce the fee to \$1. With reference to the unsafety of a class of vessels, I may say that this trouble will be much obviated by a  
Mr. McLELAN.

system of hull inspection. Unless a boat is properly constructed, it is very easy to keel it over when it is loaded in a certain way. That was the cause of the accident at London. That vessel was not a steamer, and if there had then been a hull inspector to supervise the construction of steamers, I am satisfied no such craft would ever have passed. It is the shape of a boat rather than its size that makes it unsteady, and the danger arising from bad construction of vessels will be obviated by the hull inspector.

Resolution reported, and read the first and second times and concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No 121) to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882," by reducing the fees payable on renewal of Engineers' Licenses.

Bill read the first time.

#### NORTH-WEST GRIEVANCES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman brought down the information asked for regarding the North-West grievances?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yesterday.

#### THE CENSUS.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. Minister of Agriculture is in his place perhaps he can answer when the second volume of the Census is to be ready, and when his report is coming down.

Mr. POPE. I hope the report will be down this week. I promised the second volume of the Census before this time, and expected it would have been ready, but I could not get it sooner.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose it is the printers' fault.

Mr. POPE. It is the same old story. It has been in the printers' hands for a long time, but it is a kind of work that printers cannot do very fast. A great deal of the time they have only been able to get out 16 pages a day, and that means 16 pages a week. I mean to say that we get from them the proof of 16 pages, and these have to be revised by us and sent back. As a rule we only get one of those proofs a week. That rate has continued for three or four months, and now they have promised that we will get two or three proofs per week for the rest of the time. If we get three proofs, two weeks will carry us through; if we do not get more than two, it will take three weeks.

#### IMPERFECT RETURNS.

Mr. CHARLTON. When a return in reference to timber leases was laid on the Table yesterday, I thought I would have the pleasure of complimenting my right hon. friend for great promptitude; but I find in looking it over that it is a return to a motion made last year, an Order of the House of the 15th March, 1883. I begin to fear that the return to the motion made on the 24th of January, this Session, will not be laid upon the Table of the House in time to be available this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have got a great many extra hands in the Departments for the purpose of making all these innumerable returns that were ordered. The inquiring mind of the House is so great that it is almost impossible to satisfy it. We are putting forth the most active exertions.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may also remind the right hon. gentleman that notwithstanding the ample time that has been taken, this return that is laid on the Table is quite worthless. It gives the names of the applicants, but the most essential information called for, the names of the

lessees, is not given at all. We have a list of leases and the numbers given, but not one name.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose the return is prepared to meet what was asked for.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; the return asked for the names of the lessees, and for the places where the limits granted were situated. It does not give either of these items.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Give me a little slip of what you want and I will send for it.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—CONCURRENCE.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the Resolutions adopted in Committee on Ways and Means (p. 735) be reported and read the first time.

Motion agreed to; and Resolution reported and read the first time.

On motion for second reading,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before these Resolutions are read the second time and concurred in, I desire to say a few words in respect to them. Up to the present time we have hardly had any opportunity of discussing them collectively; we have not had the information which was necessary to enable us to discuss them intelligently, and it was only after the discussion which took place in Committee, that we have been at all able to understand the whole drift and bearing of these Resolutions. Now, I do not think that we have had sufficient information on various important points; but at the same time I propose to deal with these on the information that the hon. Minister of Finance has supplied to us. I will deal with them, as far as it is possible to deal with them in accordance with the statements he made in Committee. The first statement the Minister made, if I understood him correctly, is that we need expect no additional revenue, or no additional revenue of any moment, from these alterations in the Tariff. He also said, which in a sense was correct enough, that the changes in themselves were not of any very great importance. No doubt they are not of any very great importance as compared with those sweeping changes which the hon. gentleman made in the Tariff a few years ago, or indeed with the changes he made on several subsequent occasions. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, it is rather noteworthy that these changes so trifling and so insignificant do nevertheless, when they come to be added together, appear to involve the addition of considerable burdens on the people of this country. No revenue, I presume, will go into the Treasury, therein, no doubt, the Minister was correct; but it by no means follows that no additional burdens are going to be placed on the people. I cannot pledge myself at all to the accuracy of the results which I have deduced from the Minister's statement. I am obliged to take these as he gave them, and presume, for the sake of argument, that they are approximately correct; but, as I have said, they do not give us the full information which I desire on these points. I believe that if we choose fairly to compute the additional burdens imposed on the people by these Resolutions, they will be found not to be less than \$300,000 a year; they may amount to a considerably larger sum. That will depend almost entirely on the extent to which the various manufacturers whom the hon. gentleman desires to encourage, avail themselves of the provisions of this measure. Well, Sir, I cannot agree with the Minister in thinking that a measure which will involve at least an additional \$300,000 to the burdens of the people, and that may possibly involve a considerably larger sum, is altogether a trifling addition just now. Moreover, I find that the number of hands likely to receive employment in those various industries, if I may judge from the hon. gentleman's statements and from such information as I have been able to

obtain, is likely to be very small. I shall give the House briefly, but in detail, the results that I have worked out; but I beg to state that I do not hold myself at all responsible for them because they are based on the statements of the hon. Minister himself, so far as I understand them. First of all, let us take the duties on steel. The hon. Minister of Finance said those duties were about \$5 per ton, and he is so reported. If I understand correctly the bearing of his measure, he is going to add \$3 per ton or thereabouts on the average to these duties, so that the duties on steel from being \$5 per ton, are going to become \$8 per ton. And as we imported last year, according to his own statement, about 16,000 tons of steel of the classes affected by this measure, it is clear that we shall pay directly about \$48,000 more for the steel consumed in this country; although it is true that no part of this will go into the Treasury, because, as the hon. Minister explained, the additional duty will just about equal the amount which will be lost by the manufacture of 8,000 tons, that being the quantity that he expects will be manufactured in future under the operation of this Tariff. \$48,000 increase on an article like steel, which is a raw material for many other manufactures, does not represent the whole loss to the consumer. At least 25 per cent. must be added to represent the true loss to the consumer. Therefore, we would get on this one article an addition to the burdens of the people, without paying anything into the Treasury, amounting to about \$60,000. In return for that burden the hon. Minister computes, and his estimate was corroborated by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), that he will be able to give employment to about 150 hands; another hon. gentleman named a larger number, but 160 hands appears, from what little enquiry I have been able to make, a sufficient number to produce the quantity of steel to which the Minister referred. So, Sir, we arrive as to the duties on steel at this result: that the consumer will be charged \$60,000 a year, and 160 hands will receive employment. Then we come to the duties on prints of various kinds. The hon. Minister proposes, with an exception in favour of the corset makers, to alter the duty from 20 per cent. to 27½ per cent. Here again, if I understand him correctly, he is of opinion that no loss will accrue to the revenue and no gain. Now, if that be the case, it is clear that the print makers will be obliged to manufacture about one-fourth of the print import. The print import last year was of the value of \$1,645,000, and therefore it follows that we would have a production of about \$400,000 worth per year. That may be increased; if it be increased, of course the calculations would require correction; but I will suppose, for the sake of argument, that the hon. Minister is correct, that the increased production will not interfere with the revenue, but only that amount will be produced which will be compensated for by adding 7½ per cent. Now here, Sir, is the position in which the consumer would be placed: 7½ per cent. on \$1,645,000 worth would give about \$128,000, and adding as before, as we ought to add, I think, \$32,000, which is equivalent to 25 per cent, the ultimate cost to the consumer would hardly be less than \$160,000 a year. I do not exactly know how many hands will be employed in producing this quantity of goods, and the Minister could not tell us; but on looking at the United States Census returns, I find that about 250 people will be quite able, if the production be as much per head here as there, to produce this \$400,000 worth of goods; and, consequently it will follow that under this apparently trifling addition we will give employment to about 250 hands, and the people will be taxed or burdened, which ever term the Minister chooses to employ, to the extent of \$160,000 a year. Then we come to a third rather curious proposition, to which I will call the attention of the House; that is, clauses 10 and 11, by which the hon. Minister provided that knife and fork

handles, and knife-blades and forks unpolished, may be brought into this country at a nominal duty of 10 per cent. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that this can hardly be called a manufacture. Here we have the articles already practically manufactured; they are brought into this country; the forks, and perhaps the knife-blades may receive some polishing and they will then be fastened together. A very small number of hands, indeed, are able to produce an enormous value under such a system as this. I have not been able, nor apparently was the Minister able, to obtain accurate statistics as to the quantity which might be imported, but I took occasion to obtain such information as I could from gentlemen connected with the trade, and they are of the opinion that, looking at the fact that those articles are very largely used, it will be quite possible, even within a year or two, for the manufacturers (so-called) who are going to indulge in this particular occupation, to import over \$100,000 worth of these goods. They also pointed out, which is clear enough, that a tax of 10 per cent. on separate portions is by no means equal to a tax of 10 per cent. on the finished article; that if you bring in knife handles and forks and unfinished blades, at a duty of 10 per cent., it will in all probability only represent 3 or 4 per cent. on the finished article, so that there would be a much more considerable loss to the revenue than would appear at first sight. Now, here, as I say, the Minister did not appear to have the information, and I cannot pledge myself as to the accuracy of the statement made, but the parties whom I consulted were of opinion that a comparatively small number of hands, probably not more than thirty or forty, perhaps not so many, could do all the work which would remain to be done when these articles were brought in in this particular fashion, and that the probable loss to the revenue, which now receives about 30 per cent. on the amount imported, if I remember rightly, would amount to a considerable sum—scarcely less, perhaps, than \$25,000 a year. Then, in the fourth place, we have a provision for encouraging the manufacture of steel wire and certain minor articles. Here we have the same peculiarity again to a certain extent. A tax of 5 per cent. on the steel rods which are to be made into wire, does not by any means represent 5 per cent. on the finished article; I doubt if it represents 2 per cent., and it is quite possible that a large sum will be lost *in futuro* to the revenue of the country. Everyone knows that in many parts of Ontario at least, and perhaps also in the other older Provinces, there is a growing disposition to use this article for agricultural purposes, and that in Manitoba and the North-West it is almost an article of necessity for the farmer. It is not easy to estimate what the revenue will lose, but everyone knows that in a very short time wooden fences all over the country will become so expensive that people will be obliged to have recourse to steel wire, and I doubt whether the loss to the revenue, supposing the hon. gentleman has allowed for the increased importation, could be put down at much less than \$50,000 a year. And after all is said and done, it appears very doubtful whether this particular industry is likely to give employment to more than from 120 to 150 hands. Now, Sir, if the revenue has to be reduced, if the hon. gentleman is going to lose *in presenti* or *in futuro*, it seems to me it would be better to do it for the benefit of the agriculturists by reducing the duty on wire, than to keep it up to the present standard, and compel the agriculturist to pay a duty which will not go into the Treasury of the country at all, but into the pockets of two or three manufacturers. But it is in connection with the duty on steel that I wish particularly to call the attention of the Minister and the attention of the House to the injury which will be inflicted on a great number of other manufacturers. As everybody knows this steel is a raw material used very largely

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

by important classes of manufacturers. The agriculture implement manufacturers use it very largely, the sewing machine manufacturers also use it, so do cabinet-makers, and carriage-makers, and I might go on with a great variety of trades all of whom will be more or less affected by the additional duty on steel imposed in the way the hon. gentleman means to impose it. Now, it is clear that if he is going to help one class he is also going to injure others, and if he puts an additional duty on steel, which, as he admits, and as I contend, will bring no revenue into the Treasury, one of three things must inevitably happen, either the manufacturers must reduce their profits, or they must reduce the wages of their workmen, or they must raise the price of the goods they have to sell. One of these three things must occur, and I do not see that the hon. gentleman can possible escape from that result. Now, Sir, I am taking his own arguments, and his own figures, and I find that there is likely to be imposed on the people an additional burthen of about \$300,000 at least, under these alterations in the Tariff of Ways and Means. I find that apparently we will not be able to employ more than 560 to 600 hands in return for that additional burthen of \$300,000. That means that everyone of these hands will cost this country, will cost the consumers of this country, to all intents and purposes, \$520 a year. Supposing this kind of thing goes on for ten years, the hon. gentleman will see that by attempting to found these special industries the sum of \$3,000,000 will be lost to the country; and I invite him to carry that calculation out on a little larger scale. What he does for one he will be expected to do for the others; and if it costs \$300,000 a year to create industries which employ 500 to 600 hands, it follows *ex necessitate* that if he adds 15,000 or 16,000 hands to our population by employing them in similar manufactures, it would involve a loss to the country of about \$8,000,000. I think, Sir, that is paying altogether too dear for the establishment of these small industries. I am not now discussing the abstract idea of protection, but I am pointing out the cost which would probably be involved in establishing these small industries to which I have referred, and which the hon. gentleman expects to encourage by this Tariff. I will not point out to him, though I might do so, what would be the result of attempting to encourage the 600,000 agriculturists of this Dominion in a similar fashion—I say I will not deal with this matter, though it is a question which might profitably be worked out by some other gentleman. I think it is time the hon. gentleman should stay his fostering hand. I think he should give us some idea of what the policy of the Government is going to be in respect to this matter. So far as I can understand from his explanation the other evening, the hon. gentleman has practically come to this conclusion, that whenever any man—I will not say any friend of his—proposes to spend a certain amount of money—\$100,000 or \$200,000—or even \$10,000 or \$20,000 in establishing a particular industry, the hon. gentleman appears quite ready to give him the protection he asks without much further enquiry. We could not find, though we cross-examined him in some detail, that he had made any careful estimate in most of these cases of what the cost would be. We could not find that he had gone into any very careful calculations as to the effects upon other trades, and that is a point which I call attention to, as he desires to protect all other manufacturers. In the case, for instance, of the duties on steel, he cannot give these gentlemen what they desire without imposing an additional burthen on a number of other trades, which, I have no doubt, he desires to protect and foster. It was said by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the other night, that this was protection being run into the ground, and I think myself it is. I think that if the hon. gentleman goes on much further in this way he will protect everybody to such an extent that it will be

impossible for a great number of people to stay in this country; and I repeat, that one of the causes, and a very important cause of the emigration from this country, which we all deplore, is the extent to which Canada is being constantly, by just such acts as these, made a dear country to live in, by which the price of all necessary articles are being raised to all classes of the community. If I have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, if I have misquoted him, if I have made any mistake in these calculations, the hon. gentleman can take this opportunity of setting me right. I do not pretend to say that all these calculations are correct, but I say that they are the result which appear to me to follow from the position taken by the hon. gentleman, that he was not going to increase our taxes, but that this arrangement was only made by him for the purpose of fostering these particular manufactures. If he does not add to our revenue, and does not take from our revenue, then I say that apparently these results will follow. I think the hon. Minister would do well to point out if I have been in error, and if I have not, I think he would do well to point out how it can be worth while for the people of this country to submit to an additional taxation of \$300,000 a year for the purpose of getting, at the outside, five or six hundred additional hands.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). I think, Mr. Speaker, that the narrow style of criticism in which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is wont to indulge, is best evidenced by the fact which we have seen to-day, that when alluding to the discussion which took place in Committee a few nights ago, he based part of his argument against the steel duties upon my statement that 160 men would be the number which the steel works at New Glasgow, in the County of Pictou, would be able to employ when working at their full capacity. Now, the hon. gentleman, if he listened attentively to the discussion brought out by the cross examination, as he styles it, of the hon. Finance Minister, ought to have remembered, and ought to have stated to this House, that my colleague, the senior member for Pictou, corrected the statement I made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I did.

Mr. TUPPER. Not to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I did to-day.

Mr. TUPPER. Well, I failed to hear it, and I do not think the hon. gentleman went so far as to state accurately the number which that hon. gentleman gave to the House, upon the information of the manager of the steel works, that would be employed by that company, if it were fully occupied, because that number, instead of being 160, which was the only number that came across the House to my ears to-day, was 300. I only state that to show that the desire of the hon. gentleman is not to fairly discuss this subject, but simply out of pure party spirit—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. TUPPER. I think this is not unparliamentary language; but if it is, I have no intention of infringing the rules of the House. What I mean is that the spirit which actuates the hon. gentleman is a very narrow spirit, and not such as ought to actuate an hon. member of this House; because, in criticising a matter of this kind, all the facts should be placed before the House. Now, I do not suppose that any person in this country, or any member of this House, believed that when the hon. Finance Minister brought this matter before the House it would be possible to please the hon. gentleman or any of his friends. I do not for one suppose that the hon. Finance Minister, in carrying forward the National Policy and suiting it more and more to the requirements of the people, is ever to reach that happy state when he will command the confidence and support of hon. gentlemen opposite. I should be sorry if the hon. Minister's

policy ever tended in that direction, for the simple reason that I would fear that he was retrograding and going back to the views which these hon. gentlemen wish to have enforced. Now, this change is entirely consistent with the policy announced by this Government at the polls and in this House. That policy is well and thoroughly understood in this country; and the whole case of the hon. gentleman opposite depends upon setting class against class, and interest against interest; and this is evidenced to-day by the fact that the hon. gentleman now seeks to show that when the steel industries are assisted and encouraged, some other industry must suffer. That is nothing new. We have heard that argument over and over again from these hon. gentlemen, in regard to every feature of the National Policy; but the people of this country did not believe that that criticism was correct. The people of this country are willing that every industry that is undertaken in this country and which will benefit the country, and is calculated to thrive under a fostering protection, should receive that protection; and I believe that the Liberal-Conservative party to-day, have shown that the people of this country from one end to the other, are not bound down by sectional views to ask protection only for an interest which may be peculiar to their section of the country. We have had an evidence of that fact with regard to the flour and coal duties. That matter was discussed everywhere in this country on the same line upon which the hon. gentleman has discussed the question of the steel duties to-day; but the people of this country do not approve of that kind of reasoning. Now, the hon. gentleman endeavoured to show that the consumers were to suffer by the change proposed to be made, and that other manufacturers would suffer by having the price of an article increased when it entered largely into their industries. Well, the same argument applied to coal; but why did the hon. gentleman not candidly confess that in the United States, where the same argument was urged against the steel and iron duties, time has shown that the theory of the hon. gentleman is not borne out by the facts?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. Time has shown that the protection afforded to the steel and iron industries of the United States not only caused them to expand and grow, not only increased the number of people who obtained constant and remunerative employment, not only developed the coal mines of that country to an extraordinary extent, but went hand in hand with the reduction in the price of the articles manufactured.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen do not seem to acquiesce in the statement I have made. I would turn their attention, then, for a few moments, to some figures; because, although we have had figures *ad nauseum* for several days past, I cannot forbear troubling the House with a few on this question. The hon. gentlemen will remember that Great Britain had complete control of the American iron market in 1796; and it was after that that legislation was adopted with the view of encouraging that industry in the United States. Changes were frequently made, and I would refer to the effect these changes had on the price of the article in question. In considering the iron and steel industries, we must remember that they are so identified with each other that the same argument applies to both—that the protection given to iron should also be given to steel. In 1832 the tariff on iron was reduced in the United States, and in 1842 it was very low indeed; and the hon. gentlemen will find that the price during that time increased with every reduction made. In 1832, for instance, bar iron cost £5, while in 1841 it cost £6 10s. Railway iron increased from £6 15s to £8. In 1828 the duty on bar iron was increased, and the result was that bar iron

which was sold at \$118 in 1821, sold at \$114 in 1829, and ultimately sold as low as \$96 $\frac{2}{3}$ , though no corresponding decrease took place in the other iron markets of the world. Again we find that in 1824, the duties were increased on hammered iron, yet the price was not increased one farthing. In 1840-41, however, the duties on iron were reduced, and then nearly all the factories connected with that great industry throughout the Union were closed, nearly 300,000 men thrown out of employment, and great suffering ensued. We know that in consequence of that experience the duties were afterwards replaced, and the result has been that the increase in that industry in the United States has been enormous and the duties have remained. To give the House a better idea of this result, I will call their attention to the development of that trade, which, in the United States, has been extraordinary. The production in 1854, for instance, instance, of pig iron, was 736,218 tons; and in 1882 that production had risen to 5,178,122 tons. In 1882, those industries consumed coal to the value of \$2,210,000. A similar development has been experienced in Germany and France, protection having enabled these countries to give constant employment to an immense number of labourers; and it is also a fact that the prices, under the different tariffs, of the articles consumed, instead of increasing, have decreased. One item of rolled bar iron, which I will mention out of many in the United States, bears out this contention. In 1844, the average price of bar iron was \$85.62; in 1876, it was \$52; in 1877, \$45; in 1878, \$44; in 1879, \$51; in 1880, \$60; in 1881, \$58; in 1882, \$61. I think, therefore, if the hon. gentlemen will take, not only these articles to which I have alluded, but the other articles in reference to which similar prophecies were made—the articles of cotton and the others that we discussed during the last few days—he will find that in every case, so far from the prophecies of the hon. gentlemen opposite having turned out to be correct, the very reverse has been the case. I say therefore, that this industry is one that is likely to thrive; it is one which nature points out as peculiar to Canada, and which is peculiarly suitable to the county and Province from which I come. It is an industry which trusts to the Liberal Conservative party, at least, to which it is now appealing, and which deserves at their hands the same encouragement that other industries have obtained.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Before the motion is adopted I desire to make a few remarks in reply to the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Richard Cartwright). He carried us back, in his speech, to 1879. Hon. gentlemen who were in the House at that time will recollect that not only in the House but out of it, it was stated with reference especially to the duty that was to be imposed on sugar to encourage the refiner in the country that this industry would employ only a certain number of men, that this Tariff would only give employment to a certain number, and that the cost to the country would be equal to about \$400 or \$500 a year to each of the men employed; and they went so far as to assert that it would be better to send those people to a hotel and pay their expenses there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So it would.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. What is the position to-day? Does the sugar cost the people anything more?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT and other hon. members. Yes.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We know well that the sugar to-day, upon the very basis taken the other day by the hon. member, is not only cheaper than it ever was before, but than it would have been if the Tariff of 1877-78 were in operation. That has been clearly established. The hon. gentleman argues on the basis, that if you impose 10 per cent. additional duty on an article, that article will

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

necessarily cost the consumer that much more. But, the facts do not establish that to be the case. We know well that there is scarcely a manufacturer in the country to-day who will not, in order to get his goods into the market here, place them at a lower price than the price at which they could have been imported. The same principle holds good in this case. There are exceptional cases, it is true, but wherever an article is manufactured in the country, and its manufacture produces sufficient competition among the manufacturers in the country, the price is bound to recede; and as I stated in reference to sugar and grey cottons, this has been the effect. Grey cottons to-day are purchased here for less than the price they are sold at in Massachusetts in certain lines. The hon. gentleman calls attention to one item, the item of prints or dyed cottons. I stated distinctly—so much so that the hon. gentleman put some further questions to me—that it would not have been necessary to modify the Tariff, perhaps at all, except as affecting one or two articles, if it had not been that by an omission of the Clerk of the House or in some other quarter, the article of dyed or French cotton was omitted from the Tariff Act of last Session; so that we are therefore simply putting on record what this House agreed to last Session. As it was not in the Tariff Bill, I did not refer to it in any shape or form whatever. Except as far as coutilles and jeans are concerned, there would not be an additional duty, because on those 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. more will be paid than was paid last year and the year previous, except on the portion used by the manufacturers of corsets. With reference to steel, the hon. gentleman omitted to say that the manufacturers of steel pay \$2 per ton on the raw material.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I mentioned that.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. How does he make up the amount?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Easily, by adding \$3 per ton.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In whatever way he made the calculation, the hon. gentleman based it on the supposition that the consumer pays the increased duty imposed. That may be at the outset, but I have no doubt that these two establishments, when in full force, will find that they will have to sell—in fact I understand at present they are offering to parties who require it, steel at a price more favourable than the price at which they can import it. If that be the case, and that is the natural result under similar circumstances, the hon. gentleman is not warranted in putting down the additional duty as an additional tax on the people. With reference to knife handles, we import at present knife blades for silvering and plating at 10 per cent., and the celluloid that is brought into the country is simply imported in a pressed form. It then has to be cut to form the handles; there is very little work indeed, and it is imported free of duty when used by piano manufacturers in making keys. This comes in the rough shape, shaped somewhat in the form of two handles. These are cut in two, finished and manufactured, to be placed upon the knife or the fork. The proposition made here is not for all cutlery to come in in the rough state at 10 per cent., but there is a description of cast iron forks which are not made in the country. The parties now manufacturing are making all descriptions of cutlery, and they only ask that cast iron forks, which are not made or likely to be made in the country, which require powerful machinery, which are limited in the quantity of consumption, shall come in in that form, at 10 per cent.; and it forms but a very small proportion of this industry, which has been established for the manufacture of cutlery, in all its forms. Therefore, the amount lost to the revenue in that respect will probably be made up by the additional employes in those cutlery factories, and the

duties they pay on the goods consumed. These are the three items to which the hon. gentleman referred. The cotton was not taken into account, because it is simply a renewal of the Resolution which was passed last Session, under which, right or wrong, we have been collecting that duty since the 1st January.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman expect to get revenue out of that? He stated that he expected to encourage the manufacture.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Of what?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of this kind of cottons.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I stated that last year. It was the ground given in the Resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You cannot get revenue and encourage manufacture together.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not look upon that as a change at all, because it was simply passing what we passed last year, and supposed was really in the law; but, when we came to look at it, we found it was not in the Act, and I did not refer to that as affecting the revenue in any form, because it was confirming the decision of Parliament on a previous occasion. The hon. gentleman was not here at that time, but the Resolutions were passed. The defect in the hon. gentlemen's line of argument is that they lay down the proposition that whatever duty you impose is paid by the people of the country, and over and above that, he says, are the profits to the parties engaged in the manufacture. Hundreds of illustrations have been before this House during the last five years to show that that is not the case. A gentleman waited on me the other day in reference to an industry he had started, which did not require a very large amount of capital. The Americans at once put down the price, and he had to put down his price, and they drove him to such a low figure that he had to discontinue the manufacture for a time, and then the Americans put up the price, and it cost the people of the country more than when he was carrying on his operations. And that is the case generally. There are some industries where there is not sufficient competition to reduce the price, but the feeling in the country is, and hon. members understand, and men in business understand, that manufacturers here have to sell at less than cost abroad and the duty, in order to get the market. That is the answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, as I understand the hon. gentleman, this  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. duty is merely carrying out what was intended to be done last year. He also stated that he expected to encourage manufactures. Does he expect, if the manufacture starts, to gain or lose revenue by this operation?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The manufacture is in operation, employing 800 or 900 hands, and I think the increase probably will make up for the manufacture in the country, and the parties who are manufacturing will sell for less, I am satisfied, than it will be imported for, as far as their manufactures are concerned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you do not expect any revenue?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; I stated that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the print factories of this country are employing 500 to 600 hands?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He said 800 or 900.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I understood so. I understood that at the factory at Valleyfield, I think it is, they are employing 800 or 900 hands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not in that one article surely?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are engaged in dyed cottons almost exclusively.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unless they produce much less than the average in the United States, that number of hands would produce probably \$1,200,000 worth of these articles.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think that is what they told me.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman's argument proceeds on the assumption that the imposition of a duty on goods will not raise the price of the domestic production. I think he is not warranted in making that assertion. I think, on the contrary, the operation of a protective Tariff is invariably to raise the price of the goods upon which the duty is levied, to raise the price of the articles to within a fraction of the cost of the article imported with the duty paid. That is the object of the duty.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The object is to give them the manufacture in the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. If it does not raise the price in that way, it does not effect the object. The hon. gentleman says grey cottons are sold here as cheaply as they are sold in Massachusetts. We have heard that before, and I should have been glad if it had been backed up by proof. I do not believe it. I think the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I am told by importers that the difference is nearly the amount of duty, that there is a difference of at least 20 per cent. between the cost of the American grey cotton and the cost of the product of the Canadian mill. That, in my belief, is true, and I believe his references to other matters in connection with this question are equally erroneous. I believe, when proof is sought for, and when proof is laid upon the Table of this House, it will be seen that the cost of goods is in every instance very essentially increased by the duty. The hon. gentleman from Pictou gave us some statistics with reference to American manufacturers, with regard to the American iron interest. He gave statistics claiming that, during periods of protection, the price of iron had been reduced in that country. I would ask why the importation of iron increased from \$3,621,000, in 1882, to \$51,000,000, in 1883. I would ask why the importation of cotton the importation of silks, the importation of flax and linen goods, the importation of woollens, have largely increased, have almost quadrupled under the operation of a protective tariff during the last twenty years. The fact that these goods are brought in in largely increased volume from year to year is a sufficient answer to the statement of the hon. gentleman that the price has been reduced under the operation of protection. The experience of the United States demonstrates, from the very commencement, that protection does not protect, and the healthiest advance which has been made by the manufacturers of the United States was made during the period from 1846 to 1860. The woollen interest and the cotton interest made more rapid advances than at any time since, and, when the protective tariff policy came into operation in 1861, the United States almost ceased to be a nation exporting manufactured goods. The year previous to that tariff, the United States exported over \$10,000,000 of domestic cottons. That fell almost immediately to a mere bagatelle, and it did not again reach the figure at which it was in 1860 until a year or two ago. The hon. gentleman from Pictou tells us that the number of hands required to produce 7,500 tons of steel will be 300. I find, in the report of the *Hansard*, he claimed that 160 would be the number required to produce that amount. Well, Sir, if it requires 160 men to produce 7,500 tons of steel at New Glasgow, the production of those works will be only half as great as the production per man in the United States. I

find by the Census returns of the United States, that the average production per hand is 90 tons per annum, and that the average value of the production per hand is \$5,000 per annum, and the hon. gentleman, in placing the number of hands employed in producing 7,500 tons of steel at 160, is probably placing it 100 per cent. greater than it is.

Mr. TUPPER. I said the manager. I said I was corrected by the managers' statement which my colleague gave to the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. At all events the impression conveyed to the House was that the production of 7,500 tons of steel would require at least 160 hands. On the basis of production in the United States, it would not require any more than 80. He also accused my hon. friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) of a desire to set class against class. There is no desire of that kind manifested on this side of the House. There is, however, on the other side of the House, a desire manifested to create a favoured class, and a policy of that kind is a policy designed to set class against class. Where undue and unjust favours are bestowed on any class of the community, that is a policy calculated to incense the other classes of the community, and to set class against class. It is for that reason, among others, that the policy advocated by the hon. gentlemen opposite, is opposed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—because it is an unjust policy of taxing the great mass of the people of this country for the benefit of a few favoured rings; because it is a policy calculated, as my hon. friend has shown, to increase the burdens upon this country of \$300,000, without adding anything to the revenue; because it is calculated to increase the burdens of the people by \$300,000, for the benefit of a few pet interests, for two or three steel works in the Province of Nova Scotia, perhaps; for the benefit of a few men engaged in the importation of cutlery; for the benefit of one or two print works. That is the essential principle, the essential animus, of the protective policy—a policy designed to benefit the few at the expense of the many. The proposed changes are not of a very serious character it is true, but if they do not largely increase the burdens of the people, they are as objectionable in character, if not in degree, as were the more radical changes formerly made by the Finance Minister. Sir, I think the hon. Finance Minister utterly failed to establish the principles he laid down. He failed utterly to show that the price of goods was not increased by the imposition of a duty. I hold that in order to induce this House to believe that assertion, it would require something more than the mere assertion of a gentleman which is opposed by common sense and by the experience of all who have had anything to do with this matter; and I believe my hon. friend at my right was perfectly correct in the position he took that a duty of \$3 upon steel would diminish the importations by 8,000 tons and diminish the revenue by \$24,000. And, I believe he was warranted in saying that it would increase the cost of the article produced here to the extent of \$3 above the cost of the imported article; and it is fair to add to this increased cost, as it always is, the profit of the wholesale dealer and of the retail dealer, and that would increase the cost by at least 25 per cent. It is fair to say that a duty of 7½ per cent. additional on printed cloths resulted in reducing the importation of that article by one-fourth; and the effect would be that the country would lose the enhanced cost upon one-fourth the quantity of goods manufactured here, while the revenue would be maintained at the expense of increasing the duties 7½ per cent. I believe it was a perfectly fair argument for my hon. friend to say that the total number of hands afforded employment by the operation of these Resolutions would not exceed, at the outset, 600; and their wages at \$200 each would amount to \$120,000 per annum. In order

Mr. CHARLTON.

to secure the disbursement of \$120,000 per annum in wages, these Resolutions proposed that the country should suffer to the extent of \$300,000. Certainly this is very wasteful process, a very wasteful mode of securing employment for the labour of this country. It would be better to take \$120,000 and pay it to these men out of some other source, or tax the people to the extent of that sum for the purpose of giving that amount of employment, than to tax the people \$300,000 in order that the labourers of the country might receive \$120,000 of that sum. I believe, I repeat, that the position taken by my hon. friend at my right is a perfectly correct one. I believe that his position was not impugned in the slightest degree by the remarks made by either of the gentlemen who followed him. I believe that the reasons advanced by him are unanswerable—certainly they have not been answered in the course of this debate so far.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). We have heard much said about grinding monopolies, about giving advantages to the few at the expense of the many, it would not, therefore, be out of place for me to make a few remarks on these points. I am told that the hon. member for North Norfolk the other day, in addressing this House, said that the manufacturers of the country were producing inferior articles to those produced under the old Tariff and sell them at a greater price. Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? Frost & Wood, of Smith's Falls, in 1875-76, manufactured, if I mistake not, 200 reapers, 500 mowers, 600 or 700 rakes, and about 1,000 or 2,000 ploughs. They are now manufacturing 1,000 reapers, 2,000 mowers, 3,000 horse rakes, and 6,000 plows. It is so with Cosset & Co, of Brockville; with Glen, of Oshawa; with Massey, of Toronto, and with the manufacturing establishments at Brantford. Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that reaping machines, mowing machines, horse rakes and ploughs are all of a superior character. As regards the reaping machines, they are from 100 to 400 lbs. lighter than they were manufactured then. They were manufactured out of wrought iron, out of cast iron, but now out of malleable steel, and the best of Swedish iron. I defy the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to contradict this statement—that these machines are 300 pounds lighter than they were, that they are manufactured out of superior material, and that they are sold from \$10 to \$15 cheaper than they were under the Tariff of the late Government. He cannot contradict that statement. Then are we not getting a superior article, and are we not getting a cheaper article? An hon. gentleman beside me, a farmer, says "Hear, hear!" because he knows the statement I make is correct. If the farmer gets a better machine, a lighter machine, manufactured out of better material, and gets it \$10 or \$15 cheaper, I ask this House if this policy is injurious to the agricultural community? The hon. gentleman will not contradict my statement that the machines are of a superior quality and are at the same time cheaper. Mr. Speaker, I have just told the House that the number of machines manufactured in this country is five times greater than it was under the old Tariff, and under the old Administration. Now, Sir, where are these machines going? Thousands of them are going to the Province of Quebec, and thousands to the Lower Provinces—to markets that we did not have then and that we have now. Mr. Watson of Ayr, is manufacturing machines this year which he sells at from 5 to 10 per cent. less than last year, and he has shipped a large quantity this year to Russia and different parts of Europe, to British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces, and I am proud to say that when he gets his present establishment now under construction completed, he will have one of the finest agricultural implement establishments in the Dominion. Our machines are going to Russia, Australia, France and even England, and our manufacturers are competing with the manufacturers of the world, and they are prepared to

do it. All they ask is encouragement under the Tariff, and to have the home market. What is the duty paid by manufacturers to the Government on different machines? Respers mowers, ploughs and rakes would average about \$1 each. Why is there to-day an increased demand, and why are the machines so much superior? Because the material entering into their manufacture is of much higher quality than before. Why can they afford to sell the machines cheaper? Because the manufacturers have better buildings, better machinery, better mechanics and have the home market. These are the reasons, and they are sufficient reasons for the success of the policy. The hon. member for South Huron will not contradict these statements.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly, I do.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Certainly, you cannot contradict them successfully. Will the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) deny that the machines manufactured in his own town are not of a much superior character to what they were in 1876, and that there are two to one manufactured now to one there was then?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They are the best machines made.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes, they are better than were manufactured then. Why do hon. gentlemen opposite continually maintain that those machines are sold dearer to day than under the old Tariff. I can tell the House that they are sold at from \$10 to \$15 cheaper. I contend that Mr. Glen, of Oshawa, is manufacturing a better machine and selling it at from \$10 to \$15 cheaper than in 1876; that Mr. Massey of Toronto, is doing the same; that Frost & Wood, Smith's are doing the same, that Mr. Cosset, of Brockville, is doing the same; that manufacturers in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Paterson) own constituency are doing the same thing. I contend, moreover, that we are making, to-day, in this country, five machines to one manufactured under the old policy that we are successfully competing with manufactures the world over; that we are putting better material into our machines, and under these circumstances it is imprudent and unjust of hon. gentlemen opposite to rise in this House and say the agricultural community are suffering. They are not suffering. They are not suffering in regard to the price they pay for their sugar. Sugar is cheaper now than it was 10 years ago. The cheese manufacturer is not suffering on his bandage-cloth, which is cheaper now than formerly. I wish hon. gentlemen opposite would endeavour to contradict these facts I have stated. Before the debate closes, I shall be able to submit statements under the signature of these parties, showing that my statements are correct. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will take into consideration the amount of benefit and advantage which the different places derive where manufactures are established. They are the means of paying out \$2,000 to \$5,000 per week to the labouring classes. Does not this money pass into the hands of the merchants, go to pay the taxes and contribute to the support of the country generally; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite are continually saying that we are building up a few at the expense of the many. I say we are benefitting the many and injuring none. We have no desire to injure anyone; we are anxious to do our duty to the country, and we are going to do it no matter whether hon. gentlemen opposite object or not. They say we are going into debt and excessively increasing the burdens of the country. If we are increasing the public debt, we are doing it to build railways, canals and public buildings for the benefit of the country generally. I hope our manufacturers will still continue to grow and prosper, and will still go on and improve their machinery, increase the number of their sales and successfully compete with manufacturers over the wide world.

Mr. WIGLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I would say anything on this occasion if it were not that hon. gentlemen opposite constantly run down the National Policy, and claim that the manufactured products of this country are not cheaper than they were before the National Policy was introduced. This is the second time we have heard from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on this subject, and he has challenged any hon. member to show that goods are cheaper now than before the introduction of the National Policy.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. WIGLE. And the hon. gentleman always quotes the trade policy of the United States. What produced the National Policy of the United States? We find that in 1789, they started with a revenue tariff of 8½ per cent.; a year or two afterwards it was increased to 11½ per cent.; in 1792 it was further advanced to 13½ per cent., and in 1816 they commenced their National Policy. What caused them to inaugurate that policy in 1816? It was the war of 1812. They found they were depending on England for the guns with which to fight her, for the powder and shot for the army, for cloth for the clothing of the soldiers, for blankets to cover the troops; and so they settled the war question, and immediately afterwards they inaugurated the National Policy, which averaged 21 per cent. That continued for four years. After the next presidential election in 1820, what did the manufacturers of England do? They rented warehouses at the seat of Government in the United States and brought manufactured goods there to prove that they could not be manufactured cheaper in the United States. What did the people of the United States say? They said if we ever intend to be a great prosperous and independent nation we must bring manufactures to this country. So that our people shall, be benefitted by having the factories established here. They said we do not object to English manufacturers selling goods here, but to our people being compelled to take their farm produce to England, leave the money there and bring back manufactured goods. We have no objection to English manufacturers selling goods to people of the United States, they said, but we intend to impose such high protective duties as shall compel English manufacturers to come to the United States and manufacture their goods and thus our people will spend their money at home. In 1820 the tariff was advanced to 36 per cent. Four years afterwards it was increased to 38 per cent; in 1828 to 42 per cent; 1832 the compromise tariff was introduced, which was on a sliding scale for 10 years, reducing 2 per cent. per annum, which had the effect of diminishing the duties from 42 per cent. to 20 per cent. After the ten years the tariff was increased to 33 per cent, then it was reduced to 24 per cent., and in 1857 it was reduced to a revenue tariff of 19 per cent. In 1861 it was decreased, and in 1872 it was increased, averaging 42 per cent. What is it to day? It averages 40 per cent. on cottons, over 61 per cent. on cloths, over 53 per cent. on carpets, and on leaf tobacco grown in any other country, 35 cents per pound. If the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite be correct, the consumers of leaf tobacco in the United States must pay 35 cents per pound additional. What is the Tariff to-day in this country? On woollen blankets and cloths, 7½ cents per pound and 20 per cent.; cottons, 35 per cent., and hats, 25 per cent. What produced the National Policy in this country? We had a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States for a period of ten years, from 1856 to 1866. At the time of its abrogation, what did the Americans say? They said we are establishing a protective policy; we think the best course to pursue is not to renew the Reciprocity Treaty, and they would not renew it. Then we had to do that which we thought best for ourselves. What did hon. gentlemen opposite do when they were in power? They sent Hon.

George Brown to Washington at an expense of \$6,000 to see if he could not bring about another Reciprocity Treaty. The Americans, however, said to him that he had better return to Canada, that they had a Reciprocity Treaty for ten years and did not want another, that they were very well satisfied with their trade policy, and when they wanted reciprocity with Canada they would let the Dominion know. It was when the hon. gentleman came back that the leader of the Conservative party, though he was in Opposition, asked hon. gentlemen to bring down a protective Tariff, and the Conservative party would assist them in carrying it out. When the ex-Finance Minister was urged to adopt this policy, he stood up in the House and said they were nothing but flies on the wheel of this great nation, and that it would be useless to attempt to do anything of this kind. As I said on a former occasion, they are nothing but flies on the wheel, and they are like all other flies. If you have a sore on your hand, first one fly comes, then another, and another, until it is covered with flies, not for the purpose of trying to heal the sore, but to make it worse. If we have any little sore in the National Policy these gentlemen light upon it, not for the benefit of the country, but to run it down. They told the people of this country that if this National Policy were brought in the people of the United States would retaliate, and that it would be disloyal to the mother country to bring down a Tariff which would put a duty on English goods the same as the duty on American goods. Have the people of the United States retaliated? Why did we bring down this policy? Because the United States had a protective policy averaging about 40 per cent. They had a ten rail fence all around the country in the way of a 40 per cent. tariff; we had a four rail fence in the way of a 17½ per cent. tariff. Their manufacturers could jump over the four rail fence with their shoddy goods and jump back again. But when our manufacturers tried to get over, they found the fence so high that they could not jump. We said, pull down your ten rail fence to our four, or else we will make ours a ten rail fence too. Is not that the way every farmer would act, and yet hon. gentlemen said they would retaliate. Yes, they are retaliating by saying: If you take the duty off our coal we will take the duty off yours. So far as the loyalty of this policy is concerned, protection has been tried over five years, and I will guarantee that the mother country consider us as loyal as hon. gentlemen opposite, and we can stand on the great Liberal Conservative platform, and sing, "God Save the Queen" with as much grace as they can, yes, even a little more, because we are talking in favour of Canada, and these hon. gentlemen are wound up to sing "Yankee Doodle" about half the time. Now, Sir, you will remember that on the 29th of January of this year, there was an election in West Kent. It happened at the same time that election trials were going on in Bothwell and in West Kent. In the town of Wallaceburg, there was a Young Men's Liberal Association, and about four weeks before the election in West Kent, the hon. leader of the Opposition went there in order that the people might be educated as to the bad effects of the National Policy. I have his speech here, and I say it cannot be borne out by the facts, for I have the goods to prove that they are as cheap in Canada to-day, as they are in the United States. I wish to read an extract or two from the hon. gentleman's speech. I shall not take it out of *Hansard*, but out of the *Hansard* of West Kent, that is, the *Chatham Banner*. He said:

"I am told that it is a very different matter to go to a Conservative farmer, if he is an intelligent man, and discuss the beauties of the National Policy. There was a time when he was eager to boast of its achievements and to dilate on the benefits accruing therefrom. But now his ardor is somewhat cooled and he is glad to whip up his horses and get away from the vicinity of his interrogator as speedily as possible. This is a good sign, and shows that men are beginning to see for themselves what they do not like to say—the falsity of the National Policy, the jugglery of

Mr. WIGLE.

the men who promised a period of undisturbed prosperity, and who, having attained to power, fail to red-~~em~~ that pledge, and set about paying the way to retaining it contrary to the expressed will of a majority of the people."

This speech was reported on the 2nd of January, 1884. It happened to be in West Kent on the 29th of January, election day, and I saw the farmers of West Kent whipping up their horses to bring the voters to the polls for Henry Smith, the Conservative candidate, and they put him in by a larger majority than before. That, however, is not the point I wish to refer to. The hon. gentleman was discussing the duties on different goods, and endeavouring to prove to the Young Men's Liberal Association of Wallaceburg that the poor man is paying the burthen of duty, and the rich man is getting off scot free, or nearly so. What does he say:

"We have the item of blankets. A good article costing 6½ cents per pound, is taxed 35 per cent., so that in order to get three you have to pay the price of four, or, if you brought in four it cost you more than the price of the fourth blanket for the duty. Those at 17 pence, 40 per cent.; and the cheaper article in more common use, 70 per cent. The goods in demand by the wealthy pay 35 per cent.; those used by the working classes pay 70 per cent.—a most unrighteous discrimination. Who is it that pays the 70 per cent.? The man who is the least able and who is obliged to buy the poorer classes of goods. Who pays the least? The man whose circumstances enable him to pay the most. In ladies' jackets and mantles, too, they have a kind of sliding scale, illustrated by the following: Goods at 3s. 11d., 5½ per cent.; 4s. 8½., 48 per cent.; 5s. 11d., 42 per cent.; 7s. 3d., 40 per cent.; 9s. 11d., 37 per cent.; 9s. 9d., 30 per cent.; 29s. 9d., 28 per cent. This is the Tariff as it affects woollens. I could go on and give you the cotton instances too, if time permitted. Now, if your Government had put on the Statute Book in words to this effect: Whereas it is desirable that an Act should be passed putting the burden of the taxes upon the poor to the exemption of the rich, therefore be it enacted that the cheaper classes of blankets be taxed 70 per cent. and the best blankets only pay 35 per cent.; and the cheaper classes of cloths pay 50 per cent., and the fine cloths only pay 23 per cent.; that the poorest carpets pay 33 per cent., and the rich goods only 20 per cent.; also that the poorer mantle cloths pay 54 per cent., and the high class cloths only 28 per cent. Suppose that if either Mr. Hawkins or Mr. Smith had voted for such a Bill you would have condemned him when he returned for re-election, for having sanctioned such an unjust and iniquitous measure. And because they knew you would, that is not the way they did it. They say the rich man shall buy a pound of cloth and pay so much; a poor man shall buy a pound and pay the same. But, gentlemen, it is kept in the back ground that the rich man's pound is light and costly goods, while the poor man's is heavier and cheap."

We had the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mill-) there too. I had the pleasure of listening to him, and I think he spoke a great deal better in the country than he does here. It seemed to me the other night that he was not really sure whether he was here representing the views of the majority of the people of Bothwell or not. I have heard the hon. gentleman illustrating this Protective Policy with his hat. He would say, "Gentlemen there is a hat. Suppose we had not the National Policy and I went into the United States, I would have paid \$1 for the hat; I would come over from Detroit to Windsor, and pay 17½ per cent., so that it would cost me \$1.17½. Under this policy, however, I pay \$1 for the hat in the States, I would come over to Windsor and pay 25 per cent. duty, so that the hat would cost \$1.25." Then his friends would cheer the hon. gentleman and say "that is splendid." But the 25 per cent. was not put there to burthen the poor man, but to give our manufacturers the home market for all kinds of goods they manufacture. Now, supposing that hat is made in Canada, and the Canadian maker sells it for \$1.20; another man comes, and makes the same kind for \$1.15; then, No. 3 brings the price down to a dollar; and another man still comes along and says, I will not allow the Americans to get this trade, and I will sell the hat for 90 cts. So home competition brings down the price. But that is not the best of it. Without this National Policy, we would be compelled to get these hats in the United States, from the manufacturers of hats, because they would have all that country to sell their hats in, and would bring the surplus here. Now, without this policy, we would have to pay that dollar. Where would it go to? Every man knows that it would go to

the United States. The hatter would pay the dollar to the wholesale man, the wholesale man would pay it to the retail man, the retail man to the laborer, the labourer to the butcher, the butcher to the farmer, the farmer to the blacksmith, and the blacksmith to someone else, and every man whose hands that dollar went through would make from 10 to 25 per cent. and it would benefit thousands of people in the United States. Where would the hat be? In Canada, and in six months it would be worn out, and then we would have neither hat nor money. I have a hat that was bought in London at the rate of \$4.50 a dozen, or three York shillings a piece. That hat can be sold for 50 cents, giving a profit of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent; and the result is than when that hat is worn out, the money is in the country, and the poor man can buy another with it. But the argument of hon. gentlemen is that the poor man has to pay this duty. Now, how is it? The poor man comes into a store where there is a hat for 50 cents, another for 75 cents, another for a dollar, another for \$1.25, all manufactured in Canada. But if he wants a finer hat, he takes a fine wool hat, and pays the duty on it; and I say that if he buys a \$4.00 hat, that is his business, and not the business of the Reform party of this country. The poor man is not compelled to buy that kind of a hat, but if he wants a hat like the one the leader of the Opposition wears, and he pays his three or four dollars for it, that is his business, and not the business of the Reform party. Now, Sir, we will come to the question of a particular kind of cloth. The hon. gentleman, when talking to the people of West Kent, told them that the poor class of people paid 50 per cent. on their cloths, while the rich man paid only 23 per cent. Well, I had occasion to go to a factory in West Kent and I said: "I want a part of a yard of your heaviest cloth." There is the piece of cloth I got (holding it up). It has a pound of wool in it, and I paid 50 cents a yard for it. It cost 30 cents to manufacture it. Now, I would like to know where is the 50 per cent. is paid on that piece of cloth. I will promise the hon. gentleman that if he or any of his supporters behind him—and there are a lot of merchants there—can stand up and show the House that there is 50 per cent. of duty paid on this kind of cloth, I will leave this side of the House and go and support the hon. gentleman. Well, I explained this at a meeting in West Kent. After I got through, an old French gentleman came up to me and said: "Do you see that cloth in these pants?" slapping his hand on his leg; "I grow that sheep, I cut the wool off his back, my wife spins it, and my girl weaves it, and I would like to know how I pay 50 per cent. on that?—What is the difference whether my wife spins it and my girl weaves it, or whether Mr. Taylor spins it and weaves it in his factory? It is all done in West Kent, and I would like these hon. gentlemen to show me how there is a cent of duty paid on it." But it is just like the case of the hat. A poor man goes into a store, and he sees different kinds of cloth there at from 60 cents a yard to a dollar or \$1.25, all manufactured in Canada, but if he must have Scotch goods or goods imported from other countries, then he pays the 23 per cent. the hon. gentleman spoke of. So that it is the rich man that pays 23 per cent. or 5 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. more than he paid under the Cartwright Tariff of 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ , which is about 35 cents more on a suit of clothes, and the poor man does not pay anything at all. Now, we will carry this argument a little further. If hon. gentlemen's arguments were correct, then if the duty was 75 per cent., the poor man would have to pay 75 per cent. more for his cloth; if the duty was a dollar, the poor man would have to pay a dollar more; and if the cloth were prohibited altogether, then the hon. gentleman would have to go back to Wallaceburg and tell the boys there, "Unless you put us back in power before your last pair of breeches are worn out, you cannot get another pair." Then, of course, he would have to say: "Gentlemen, if I was wrong

when I said in Nova Scotia that it took 9 yards to make a shirt, am I wrong now in telling you that it will take 9 yards for a shirt after your pants are all worn out." Well, Sir, when we went to West Kent, we found that the Reform candidate and all the speakers for the Reform party were attacking the National Policy, just as it was attacked here by the leader of the Opposition. They all say the same thing. It puts me in mind of the two little boys who were quarrelling. One says it is so, and the other says it is not so, "Well, I tell you it is so," says the first boy, "because mother says it is so, and when she says it is so, it is so, if it is not so." That is just the way with hon. gentlemen opposite. They say it is so if Mr. Blake says it is so, because when he says it is so, it is so, if it is not so. It happens that West Kent sent to the Ontario Legislature a supporter of the Reform Government, from 1879 to 1883, with a majority of 140. But the party were not satisfied with that majority, and at the general election they sent Attorney-General Mowat, to Chatham to have a grand mass meeting the night before the election. Well, they had a grand mass meeting; the Attorney-General was there, and Mr. Meredith was there to meet him; and the result was that the people of West Kent decided to send to the Ontario House a supporter of Mr. Meredith, with 400 majority. At the last general election for this House, Mr. Smith was elected by only 156 majority. His opponent, Mr. Sampson, was sick in bed, and it was said that if he had been up, he would have been elected. Well, there has since been another election, when the leader of the Opposition went to Wallaceburg, and the hon. member for Bothwell also went into the Riding to educate the people, so that they would be sure to send Mr. Sampson here with a large majority. Instead of Smith coming back with 156 of a majority, after the people heard from all these gentlemen, they sent him back with 283 of a majority. I do not pretend to say that I can argue constitutional law with the leader of the Opposition; I do not pretend to say that I can argue Chancery law with the hon. gentleman; I do not pretend that I have had the experience in public speaking, or the education he has had; but I say that when I am talking about hats, cloths and cottons, I know as much of what I am talking about, as he knows when he is arguing a question of chancery law. In the matter of law, I only have the theory where he has the practice, but in the matter of these goods, he has the theory and I have the practice. Now, he puts me in mind of Henry Ward Beecher. Henry Ward Beecher was a great preacher and a great theorist. He found out by reading and observation—he had read a great many books on farming and he made up his mind he would try the farming business—he found out by reading and observation that dried apples were worth more than green ones, so the first year he planted \$1,500 worth of dried apples. It was a dry summer and the apples did not come up. The next thing he tried was pork. He bought a pig for \$3, fed it with \$25 worth of corn and sold it for \$9; and then he said: I did not mind that so much, for though I lost a little on the corn, but I made on the pig. The hon. gentleman argues the National Policy upon theory, as Mr. Beecher argued farming. I say he cannot show, nor can one of his supporters show, where the poor man pays a single cent of duty on the mass of goods worn by him. The hon. member for North Norfolk said the Finance Minister has stated in this House that grey cottons were as cheap in Canada to-day as in Massachusetts, but he would like someone to show him that they are as cheap. I will give the hon. gentleman practical proof. Here is a piece of cotton (holding it up) manufactured in Canada, a yard wide. It does not take 9 yards of that to make a shirt either. That cotton costs 6 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents a yard, and I defy anyone to show where he can get goods cheaper in the United States. Why cannot cotton be manufactured here as cheap as in the United States? The raw cotton is brought from the United States

into Canada free, it is taken into the manufactories and there worked up; it is sold to the wholesale dealer who sells it to the retailer, and why should it not be sold here as cheap as in the United States? Competition is bringing it to a figure as cheap to-day as in the United States. These gentlemen say that the competition would bring the prices down, but did they not also say that the manufacturer makes 40 per cent.? That the rich would get richer and the poor man poorer? Their policy was to make the rich man poorer and then starve the poor man to death. They told us that goods would be dearer. Did they not tell us that when we put 35 per cent. on cotton, that cotton would cost the poor man 2 or 3 cents a yard more? Did they not tell us that nails, that sugar, that everything on which a duty was put, would cost the people more? Did they not tell us that people would have to pay more for agricultural implements? Now the ex-Minister of Finance himself says: You are right when you say they are cheaper than ever before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not.

Mr. WIGLE. The hon. gentleman said "hear, hear, when I said they were cheaper to-day than ever before. He said "hear, hear," when I said competition among the manufacturers brought the prices down. He cannot deny that. If he did not say it, he ought to say it. When the Conservative party were in Opposition, did they stand up here and whine at the Government and say your policy is wrong but we have nothing to propose? No; they stood up and said your revenue Tariff of 17½ per cent., under the circumstances, is not what we want. We want a Protective Policy, and if you do not give it to us, we will go the people, and we went to the people with a platform. But when we ask these gentlemen what their platform is, what their principles are, what do they say? Principles—we have no principles; we are not in power. That is their whole action. When the hon. member for North Norfolk stated that the manufacturers were making 37 per cent., another hon. gentleman on that side said the competition among manufacturers was breaking them all down. I would be glad to know the manufacturers are making a fair profit. I would much rather they made a good profit than see ourselves keeping up manufacturers in other countries. These people do not manufacture goods for nothing for Canada, and why should we ask ours to do so. These gentlemen would rather read from the Blue Books of the United States that manufacturers there were making from 10 to 15 per cent., than read in our Blue Books that our own manufacturers were making a good profit. That is their policy. Our policy is to build up our manufactures, and we hope they will make good profits. Hon. gentlemen opposite, all through their speeches, have said this National Policy has caused so many manufacturers to extend their capital that it is ruining them. But that is their own business, if they choose to put their money into enterprises of this kind. We all take our risk. They go into the business with their eyes open, and if they come out unsuccessful, they cannot blame the Government. We all have the liberty to put our money into manufactures or to keep it out.

It being Six o'clock, the House adjourned.

#### After Recess.

Mr. WIGLE. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was discussing the National Policy. I was discussing some of the points that were made by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and published in a newspaper printed in the town of Chatham, in West Kent, known as the *Chatham Banner*, a Reform paper. I find in one portion of the hon. gentleman's speech before the Young Men's Liberal Association in Wallaceburg, he pointed to the Finance Minister of the present Conservative Government, and said: "Gentle-

Mr. WIGLE.

men, what would you think if a Reeve of your township would come before you for re-election, and would claim your support on the ground that he had a surplus of \$5,000 from the last year?" He was arguing that the surplus of this Government was a wrong thing, and not a good thing for the country. He asked them what they would do if this Reeve, claiming he had a surplus of \$5,000, asked them to elect him on that account. "You would ask him where he got his \$5,000, and he would reply that he took it from the pockets of the people. Would you send a man like that back again as your representative in the County Council?" That was not a fair argument. The hon. gentleman ought to have told the young men of that association the truth of the case. He did not tell them that there was a great difference in the way municipal affairs were carried on, and the way Government affairs were carried on. He did not tell them that municipal affairs were carried on by direct taxation. Every man in this country knows that municipal affairs are not carried on in the way the affairs of Government are carried on. They know that applications are put in for money for different parts of the municipality, and on a certain day the assessor has the assessment roll completed, and all the municipal Reeve has to do is to figure up how much is appropriated and see how much the assessment is, and figure out so much on the dollar on the amount the township is assessed, and he need not have a surplus at all. On the other side, the Government have to look to the future, and guess as to imports and exports, and so on; so it is very different. But, when he was putting this as he did, why did he not put it as it was, and say: "Gentlemen, this Finance Minister, the Finance Minister of the Conservative Government, left us this last year with a surplus of \$6,000,000; the ex Finance Minister left you with a deficit of \$11,000,000 in five years; which would you rather have to represent you, the one who left you with a surplus of \$6,000,000, or the other who left you with a deficit of \$11,000,000?" That would be the way to put it, if his argument was correct. That is one part of the hon. gentleman's speech. I was just thinking it would be a fine thing for him to go over and make a speech to the American young Liberals against the National Policy there. Would it not be a nice thing for the hon. gentleman to stand up there, and say to the young Liberals in the United States: "Boys, see here, the Government of the United States have put 35 cents a pound duty on leaf tobacco coming from Canada, and so you will have to pay 35 cents a pound more for your tobacco." Why, every little boy would say: "That is not so; I can buy leaf tobacco here for 5 cents a pound ground in the States." Suppose he said the poor man's clothing cost 60 per cent. more because of the tariff on coarse goods from Canada or England, they would say: "No; we have no Canadian or English goods here for the poor man; we manufacture our own goods, we grow our own wool and make our own clothes, and we do not pay a single cent duty." This speech of the hon. gentleman, where he tells the people that the poor man has to pay 50 per cent. on cloth, and 70 per cent. on other goods, 54 per cent. on mantle cloth, and so on, would be a fine pamphlet for an American emigration agent in foreign countries? I imagine I see an American emigration agent in a foreign country saying: "The United States is the place to go to. It is true that we have protection and that they have protection in Canada, but the protection that we have is not the same kind as they have in Canada. In the United States we protect the poor man. He pays nothing for his coarse cloths in the way of duty, but here is the hon. Edward Blake's speech, the leader of the Reform party in Canada, and he says it is the poor man who pays for the protection in Canada. Go to the United States, where the poor man is protected and the rich man has to pay the duty, and not to Canada, where the poor man has to pay all the burdens." Would not that be a nice pamphlet

for a Yankee emigration agent? What do we find in the *Boston Herald*? The *Boston Herald* says Canada is over-protected, that the high protection has made agricultural implements dearer than before the National Policy; and what do they give? They give the *Globe* for their authority. There would be another nice little sheet to put in the American emigration pamphlet, to read in foreign countries. Why is it the Americans always copy from the Reform papers? It is because they are always running Canada down, and the average American editor would rather that his people should read that Canada was lagging behind the United States than that she was coming even with the United States, under her policy. It would not do for us all to see alike; I admit that. It is necessary to have an Opposition. There were some ministers of the Gospel once discussing this question, and one said: "It would not do for us all to see alike; if we had all seen alike, if every one had seen with my eyes, every person would have been after my wife." Another said: "Yes, that is so; but, if everyone had seen as I see, no one would have been after her." That is just the same with the Reform party. If everyone saw as hon. gentlemen opposite see, everyone would have gone for a 17½ per cent. revenue Tariff, and we would have had a deficit every year; but, if everyone had seen as the vast majority of the people have seen during the last two general elections, there would not be an hon. gentleman on that side of the House opposing this Government. That would not be right. We want them there. It makes the people in the country feel better, to think there are a few here as an Opposition to any Government. I will tell you what I believe put those gentlemen out of power. It was their Finance Minister, now the ex-Finance Minister; and that puts me in mind of another comparison. A lady applied to a child for something for charitable purposes. "No," she said, "we cannot afford it, our father is poor, he is a merchant, but he took a bad two dollar bill and burst." So with these gentlemen; they took a bad two dollar bill, in the person of the member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), and burst them, and I am afraid they will never get back to power as long as he is their cashier. Under this policy, over 600 organs, made by Bell & Co., have been sold in Europe during last year; and in West Kent we find there was a capital stock of \$100,000 taken, and that was on condition that there was to be waggon works started there if the National Policy was adopted and the Conservative party returned to power in 1882. They were returned on the 20th of June, 1882, and on the next day the company commenced hauling the bricks, and in less than four months from that time they were building 70 waggons per week; and while the farmers in that part of the country were paying \$60 to \$65 before this shop commenced, they are now paying from \$49.50 in cash up to \$55, on a year's time. That shows the benefit of the National Policy.

Mr. MILLS. But it is closed up.

Mr. WIGLE. Yes; and I will tell you the reason why. They were making seventy waggons per week. The hon. gentleman said the other day that times were not as good in the western part of this Province as they were before the National Policy, and that is true; but he did not tell the reason. In the first place, our wheat was not half a crop in that country; the frost last year killed the wheat. In the next place, that country depends mostly on the corn crop, more especially in Kent and Essex, and the early frost killed the corn, and the result was that we did not have corn to fatten pork, and that is the reason why times were hard there. When corn is killed, that touches the farmer, and as the farmer is the man who buys these waggons, you now have the reason why that factory closed down. We all know that we are in a depressed state at the present time, but we all know this, that we will get out of it with the National Policy a great deal sooner than we would

without it. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite have said that the manufacturers of this country had formed a ring, that the manufacturers of cotton had formed a ring, and that after the surplus that they had on hand was worked off, they would run up the price, and we would have to pay whatever they charged. Well, would not that apply to any country? Would it not apply to this country, if we had Free Trade? Do they not form rings in the United States, and do they not form rings in Free Trade England, where there are more factories in any industry than are needed? That is no argument at all. Now, Sir, as I said before six o'clock, we find that the cheap goods are those that the poor man uses. Why has the poor man been able to increase his earnings in the savings bank? It is because, instead of having to pay 17½ per cent. on his shoddy cloths from the United States, he gets them without paying any duty; instead of paying 17½ per cent. on his boots and shoes, he gets them here at home without paying any duty, and so with everything else. He gets his tea free of duty, his coffee free of duty, and the result is that he saves more money and puts more into the Savings Bank than he did before. Now, if these hon. gentlemen say that the National Policy has not cheapened goods, that the poor man has to pay as high as 50 and 75 per cent. for many of the goods he buys, why do not they propose their remedy? Why do they not stand up and say: "Here is a piece of cloth, and we intend to reduce the duty on it. Here is a piece of grey cotton, here is a blanket, and we want the duty taken off." They are not ready to do so. Why do they not bring these things up and then we can discuss them? The hon. gentleman, in talking about blankets, said the poor man paid 70 per cent. on his blankets. I have a letter here from a manufacturer where he says that he will make blankets 60 by 80, with a pound of good pure wool in it, and sell that blanket for 50 cents a pound and a grey blanket for 45 cents a pound. Now here is a pound of good, pure wool in that blanket, 20 cents for the wool and 30 for the manufacturer. Now let the hon. gentleman say where the poor man pays 70 per cent. on that blanket. It applies to every thing else in the same way. Of course, I admit, if we sent to the United States and bought blankets, we would have to pay 70 per cent. on them, but we don't do that. We first find out the price of the article in the foreign country, and then the price in our own country, and if we find it cheaper in our own country, we will not go into the foreign country to buy it. The hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) said in his speech, that goods were dearer now than before the National Policy. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman certainly don't know what he is talking about when he says that. Every man in this House knows that he can buy boots and shoes cheaper now than at any time since Confederation. Every man knows that he can buy sugars, teas, ready-made clothing, and every thing cheaper than he could before the National Policy. Now, Sir, one of the Reeves in the county I have the honour to represent, who is one of the strongest Reformers in that county, said to me a while ago: "How is it that times are so hard now? We haven't so much money as before. You told us the National Policy would be a good thing for us." I said, well, let me ask you this: "Have you any wheat to sell? It is worth \$1 per bushel." He said, no. This gentleman is a farmer, he has 100 acres, and is worth \$6,000 or \$7,000. He said he had no wheat to sell. I said: "Have you any dressed pork to sell? It is worth \$7.50 per hundred." He said, no. I asked him: "Have you any dressed beef to sell? It is worth \$8 a hundred." He said, no. I said: "Have you any beans to sell? They are worth \$1.75 per bushel." He said, no. "Have you any potatoes to sell? They are worth 60 cents. per bushel." He said, no. "Have you any peas?" No. "Well," I said, "What are you blaming the National Policy for, if you have nothing to sell?" Now, I said to him, I will take you in another way. "Do you want to buy any cotton? It is

cheaper than it ever was before." He said, no. I said: "Do you want to buy a suit of clothes cheaper than you could ever buy them before?" He said, no. I said: "What is the reason?" Why, he said, I have no money to buy with. He had nothing to sell, and consequently he had nothing to buy with. When they have poor crops and have no money, some people blame the National Policy for it. But if we have a good crop another year, I guarantee that you will see the National Policy come out on top, and that everything will be all right. Now, Sir, I cannot understand how it is that hon. gentlemen who pretend to have good common sense should stand up here and denounce the National Policy, and say that it makes prices of manufactured goods that the poor man has to buy higher. I say the high duty was put on, not for the purpose of making the poor man pay higher for the goods he buys, but to keep the American shoddy out of this country, and to give our own manufacturers a chance to make their living. Any man ought to see that who has got good common sense. I am surprised to hear these gentlemen talk such nonsense. A gentleman who is well known up west was asking why so many people left this country, and he instanced a man named John Hardy. He said that John Hardy went to the North-West and bought a farm, and stayed there a short time, but he found that he had to pay such a high duty on agricultural implements that he would not stay there any longer, and so he went over into the United States, where he could buy these things cheaper than in Canada. Well, this story was told at an election meeting in favour of the candidate, who was a friend of the hon. gentlemen from Bothwell, and a gentleman came up and told me that he knew all about this poor John Hardy. He said John Hardy did go into the United States and he told him he made the greatest mistake he ever made in his life. He said the reason why he went into the United States was because the Reform papers and the Reform party in this country said that they would never get the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that his land in the North-West would not be worth 5 cents an acre without a Railway. But now, he said, after they had built the railway, he was satisfied that he had made the greatest mistake he ever made in his life, and while he was telling that another gentleman stepped up and said: "Yes, and this same John Hardy is one of the 11,000 Canadians who have returned to live under the old flag once more." It is not necessary for me to say more on this subject. I could bring forward many more facts to strengthen my case; but before I sit down, I desire to read what the American Consul at Port Sarnia said about the protective policy. Consul Pace, in November, 1883, said:

"To say that Canada has not been benefitted by the policy of Protection would be to ignore facts in the outset. At this point is shipped, by a tri-weekly line of steamers, the implements of agriculture and tools of trade which are destined to play an important part in the development of Canada's great north-western possessions. These products of the loom, the anvil, the furnace, the field, the workshop, and the factory are all the products of Canadian industry. Take away the Tariff, and a more convenient market would doubtless be found for the pioneers of the British territory; but the factories and workshops of Ontario, which are now crowded to their fullest capacity, would have to close their doors and discharge their artisans."

That is the report he made to the American Government. No wonder the Americans keep up their National Policy. I have shown different articles manufactured in Canada which I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to say were manufactured cheaper before the National Policy was adopted. I would like them to take cloth, and demonstrate to the people that the poor man really pays 50 per cent. duty on it.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have listened with a good deal of attention and interest to the speech delivered by the hon. member who has just taken his seat. He has been trying, by his remarks, to show that under the operation of the National Policy the people of this country, and especially the poorer classes, practically buy goods cheaper than they

Mr. WIGLE.

could do if we had no National Policy. I have been thinking, while listening to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that there is no necessity why we should continue in existence that policy, when he maintains it is not owing to its existence that the poorer classes obtain goods cheaper, but simply owing to the fact that goods are manufactured here, and have to meet with such keen competition that they are placed in the hands of consumers as low as they would be in the absence of any such policy. If our manufacturers are producing these goods and placing them in the hands of the consumer as low as the hon. gentleman makes out, very much lower than they could be imported for and sold under the operation of the present Tariff, where is the necessity for Protection? What is the use of having it longer continued in force when it is a dead letter? According to his showing, it is impossible to import goods from England or the United States and sell them in competition with goods manufactured here, simply because the goods manufactured here are sold so cheap that imported goods cannot be successfully sold in competition with them. If that be the case, we do not want the National Policy any longer. It has had its day; it is claimed that it has done a great deal of good in creating competition in goods, so that all classes are now getting them as low as they could possibly be purchased in any part of the world. Let us then do away with this thing, and with all the fuss and argument in connection with the matter. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle) exhibited a hat, in order to demonstrate that such an article might be bought at retail for 50 cents each, or \$4.50 a dozen. In order to prove that the hat is really good value at that price, the hon. member should have exhibited, also, an imported hat, and allowed a comparison to be made.

Mr. WIGLE. I cannot buy an imported hat at that price.

Mr. McMULLEN. That very hat is manufactured in this country to compete with a hat of the same kind which is imported, and pays a duty of 25 per cent. It must, moreover, be remembered that the same class of hats was manufactured here before the National Policy came into existence. One of these hat manufacturers was at one time a strong Reformer and supported the Mackenzie Administration, and he urged very forcibly on the Government that the duty on hats should be increased. The Government refused to do so; but after the inauguration of the National Policy, the duty was raised from 17½ to 25 per cent, which is equal to 8 cents per hat, or 96 cents per dozen. If the manufacturer produces 100,000 dozen and makes a profit of 96 cents per dozen, is he not wise in his own interest to support the National Policy which is giving him \$100,000 extra profit, as compared with a 17½ per cent. Tariff. Before the inauguration of the National Policy, there was strong competition in the trade, but since the 25 per cent. Tariff, these manufacturers have been very successful and have been making lots of money. It is impossible to prove that hats are sold as cheap under the operation of the present Tariff as they would be if there were no National Policy in existence. Anyone acquainted with the trade and who is in the habit of examining stocks, is aware that the imported article and the article of home manufacture are sold in competition every day.

Mr. HESSON. Are not hats as cheap as before the duty was increased?

Mr. McMULLEN. That is an argument constantly used by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a most fallacious one. The question is not as to whether the article is as cheap as it was before the introduction of the National Policy—that is not the question before the House and the country. The question is this, is the article as cheap as it would have been were not the National Policy in full force? The hon.

gentleman also exhibited some samples of woollen goods and said they were cheaper than formerly. Were not woollen goods manufactured in this country before the National Policy, and were not those manufacturers prosperous? Such was the case. We had manufacturers who were doing a good business, in fact a large trade, before the National Policy was introduced; consequently, it is unfair to make a comparison in that particular line of goods. When the hon gentleman claims that the people of this country can get every class of goods as cheaply now as before the National Policy, I would like to ask him if coal oil has been sold as cheaply for the last two or three years as it sold before. Has there been any combination in that article, and why is it that a number of coal oil factories in this Dominion have shut down, and that year after year they have been paying a percentage. They have been receiving the same profits, while a number of their factories are standing still. How is that? Simply because an understanding has been come to, that a certain amount of oil is required throughout the Dominion, and they have agreed that they will manufacture just about that amount, and that it shall be sold at a certain price. The result is that the consumer can only get it at that price and that there is no competition. I would like to know if that is not the result of the National Policy? Every farmer in this country, every poor man, is a consumer of coal oil, and I ask the hon. gentleman if he does not know as well as I know, that the manufacturers have an understanding by which every man in this country has paid an extra price for his coal oil in years past, that he is now paying an extra price, and that he will continue to pay an extra price so long as this policy lasts. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the article of salt. Does he not know that salt is dearer than it was before, and does he not know that it is an article which every farmer in this country consumes. The Finance Minister, no doubt, was approached by the salt manufacturers of this country, and it was represented to him very strongly that there should be a duty on this particular commodity, that it should have some advantage under the National Policy, and being anxious to foster all kinds of manufactures, he gave them that protection. I believe if he was asked to afford the protection to the manufacturers of gravestones, he would give it. Some years ago you could buy salt for 65 cents per barrel at the wells; now you have to pay \$1 or \$1.10 at the wells. And why? Just because it is protected, and because the manufacturers have not to place it on the market in competition with the imported salt. That is a fact, and I do not think even the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wigle) will dare to deny that salt is dearer. I could go on to name a number of other articles which have been increased in cost in the same way. Take, for example, the article of stoves. Has there been a combination among the manufacturers in that article? If hon. gentlemen do not know it, every farmer who has to buy a stove knows it. I know that every single stove, according to the original catalogue under which stoves were sold before the introduction of the National Policy, has just been hitched up in proportion to the duty placed upon it. I would like also to refer to the article of furniture, and I would ask if it is not higher than before the National Policy was introduced.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to sit in their seats and say, no; but I can tell them that I have bought furniture myself within the last six months, and paid more for it, to the extent of \$20 on a bedroom set, more than I paid for exactly the same set five years before. I asked the parties in Toronto, from whom I purchased, why it was that they asked me so much more for the same article than I paid before. They replied that paints had gone up, that varnish

had gone up, that materials of all kinds had gone up under the National Policy; that they had to pay a little more for this and that and the other thing, and that therefore they had to get a better price now than they used to get. That is a fact which cannot be denied. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to come here with one article, such as a hat, but let them take a list of all the articles which enter into the ordinary consumption of the farmer and the mechanic, and see whether the prices have not increased. I say they have increased, though there are some articles, such as tea and coffee, from which the duty has been taken, but what is that in comparison with the numerous articles which enter into public consumption. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the United States had a protective Tariff. It is true they have, and it has been in existence some time; but what are the facts? In the first place, when the United States introduced their National Policy, as the hon. gentlemen call it, they had a population of 30,000,000 people; we have a population of 4,500,000. I say that the idea of surrounding a country like this, with its limited population, with a National Policy, for the purpose of encouraging manufactures, is a most unwise and imprudent course. I say that by increasing the cost of living in the country, you are retarding its settlement and progress. What is the great backbone of this country? What is it that is going to make it a great country? Are we not an agricultural country? We have recently heard bankers and others speaking of hard times; the Finance Minister himself admits that there is a stringency, a certain amount of bad times, and if so what is our hope of relief. Everbody talks about a good crop; but has anybody expressed the hope that the manufacturers of this country will continue to manufacture a large amount of stuff this year? Do we expect the hard times will be relieved by the large amount of cotton goods or sugar manufactured in the country? What do we expect will relieve us? A good harvest. That is what is going to relieve us, if we are going to get relief, and if that is the fact, should not we, in all our legislation, endeavour to build up the agricultural interests. But, in place of that, we are pulling it down. We are increasing its burdens, instead of settling this country and making it a great, rich agricultural country in the first place. I say that before encouraging our manufactures we should first fill up the country, and the only way to do that is to offer every inducement to the people to cultivate their lands and to induce other people to settle here, by showing them that it is the cheapest country on the earth to live in. That is the way, and the only way to do it. In place of that, we have been creating monopolies of every kind—manufacturing monopolies, land company monopolies; and in every shape and way we have been retarding the settlement and the progress of the country, by the course we have been adopting. And what is the result? We find that some of the manufacturers are shutting down, that some of them are working half time, and some are in financial embarrassment. What is the cause of all this? Simply, that we have not population enough, we have not consumers enough. We want to get consumers into the country, and the only way to do that is to offer every inducement to the agriculturists of other countries to settle among us, by showing them that everything they require for everyday use is sold here, at as low a price as in other countries. What is the trouble in the United States? There the farmers are among the poorer classes. I say that the farming community there has been groaning for years under the unjust burdens of their so-called National Policy, and they are beginning to see it at last. At the last general election they saw it, and a strong feeling was expressed in favour of the reduction of the duty, so that the Government has to come down and take less than they have been exacting heretofore from the people of that

country. The farmers have been pauperized in what should be a rich agricultural country, by the operation of that policy, and the same thing is taking place here. Now, we have no desire to crush out our manufacturing institutions; we want to see them prosper; we have no desire in the world to throw a stone at them. But we say that we want simply to impose on the people a Tariff that is sufficient to produce a sum necessary to meet the annual expenditure of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny that we are collecting some \$30,000,000 a year, instead of \$23,000,000, as we collected in 1874 or 1875; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say that the people are not now more heavily taxed than they were in 1874 or 1875. Well, if not, where does the extra money come from? Has our population increased very much? We have about the same population now that we had then—some 4,500,000 or 5,000,000. Where, then, does this extra money come from? It comes out of the pockets of the people, under the operation of this Tariff. Surely the hon. gentleman opposite will not say that the cost of the goods which we import and consume under the protective Tariff is not increased. Surely he will not say that if a man imports a dollar's worth, and has to pay 25 cents of duty on it, it does not increase the price to him more than if he imported the same dollar's worth and paid only 17½ per cent. duty on it. I think he will hardly make that contention. Well, supposing the 4,500,000 people in this country purchase goods to the extent of \$30 worth for every man, woman and child; and supposing that the duty on these goods is increased from 17½ to 25 per cent.; that is an increase of \$2.40 or \$2.50 on the \$30; that would be equal to about \$10,000,000 of an increase per year on 4,500,000 people. The hon. Finance Minister admits that he has \$6,000,000 of that as a surplus. Now, I would like to know where the other \$4,000,000 has gone to. I say that the people have been imposed on to the extent of that \$4,000,000, and that has gone into the pockets of those who have manufactured goods in the country. That is the way the Revenue has been increased. Another thing: Last year the hon. Finance Minister placed a measure on the Statute Book that provided that, after the first of January, 1884, the duty on printed goods should be increased 7½ per cent. He told us, at the time he introduced that measure, that we were going to have a print factory established in this Dominion, where prints were going to be manufactured and where the weaving and dyeing was going to be done; that this factory was going to give us a manufactured article as good in quality as the imported article, and that it was therefore highly desirable to grant the protection it asked. The hon. gentleman comes down now and tells us that the people are not going to manufacture these goods at all, but only print them, the manufacturing being done somewhere else; and in order to get them printed in this country, we have to pay an increase duty of 7½ per cent. I was enquiring of a wholesale merchant, a few few days ago, what effect this would have on the print trade of this country, and whether print goods were higher this year than they would have been but for this increase. He said that this year importers had imported largely what they required before the first of the year, and that consequently the increased price would not be felt so seriously this year; but, said he, as soon as the stocks now in are sold out, the natural result will be that we shall have to creep up to the higher figure and charge the higher price. I say that it was a most unwise and imprudent act to increase that duty. If there is any one article that is largely consumed by the poorer classes of this country, that is used for the clothing of women and children, and in many other ways, it is the article of prints; and I say it was unfair and unjust, simply because a few men were anxious to make money by establishing a print factory, that the entire working classes of this Dominion should

Mr. McMULLEN.

be subjected to pay an increased price for this article. You may go from one article to another in the same way, and you will find that you will be increasing the duty from year to year, until you will make this an exceedingly expensive country to live in, and those who would otherwise come here will find that out, and will steer their ship in another direction.

Mr. ORTON. Would the hon. gentleman take the duty off wheat to make it a cheap country to live in?

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman who last spoke would lead us to suppose that the county of Kent was carried in the last election largely by the very potent arguments that he used, with regard to the operations of the National Policy. Well, I think there were other causes why hon. gentlemen opposite secured that particular constituency at the last election. If I am rightly informed, a very short time after the hon. gentleman who now sits for that constituency was elected before, and his election was protested, immediate steps were taken by the Government to show their readiness and willingness to erect a very respectable post office in the town of Chatham, as well as to dredge out a river and a number of creeks and streams in that constituency. I think they tried to show their willingness to do anything to satisfy the people of that constituency, if they would only return that hon. gentleman. I fancy that they saw breakers ahead, and thought the best thing to do was to prepare for them; and for that reason a large amount of money was spent there, in the ways I have stated, to secure that constituency, in the event of its being re-opened by the courts. I fancy that this is the principal cause why the same gentleman was sent here to represent that constituency, and not the very potent and eloquent arguments of the hon. gentleman who preceded me. Now, there is another question which I would like to refer to. I was saying a moment ago that if there is any one interest in this country to which we should lend our aid and assistance, and which we should legislate to foster and encourage, it is the farming interest. We have often heard the question of feeding cattle spoken of, and the cost of importing corn from the United States for that purpose. Now, I hold that it is only right that the farmers of this country should be permitted to bring in corn for the purpose of feeding cattle or hogs for export, free of duty, or that they should be allowed a rebate of the duty. I hold that we should do everything in our power in the direction of building up their interest, if we are going to build up the interest of others. I do not know what the existing arrangement is between the Government and the manufacturers of spirits in this country, but I have reason to believe that those who bring in corn here are allowed, when they manufacture it into liquor, something in the way of a reduction or rebate, when that liquor is exported. Is it prudent on the part of the Government to permit men to import corn for the purpose of manufacturing it into liquor and allow them a rebate when sending it to some other part of the world, to be used for the purpose of demoralizing and killing people? Would it not be better and more prudent on the part of the Government to allow the farmer to bring in corn, for the purpose of putting it into beef or pork, and to export that without asking him to pay the duty? I trust the Government will see that it is their duty to permit the farmers of this country to bring in corn for feeding cattle, without compelling them to pay the duty they are now compelled to pay. I am sure that would be a step in the right direction. The hon. gentleman also referred to the fact that the *Globe* had been quoted by some American journal, with regard to something connected with this National Policy, or the settlement of the country, and charged us with continually decrying our country and endeavouring to injure it. Hon. gentlemen who talk in that way should think first for a moment,

They ought to go back to the year 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877. They ought to turn up the Journals of the House and the Conservative papers of those days before they make such charges. I have seen the *Mail* myself quoted by an American paper with regard to matters connected with the fiscal policy of this country; and I am sure that if hon. gentlemen would take the *Hansard* of this House and turn up the arguments then used, they would see that those hon. gentlemen spoke as strongly and as pointedly on questions connected with the policy of the then Government, with regard to this country, and did more to injure the country than has ever been done by the Reform party. The Reform party has the country's good at heart. As I said a few nights ago, the organs of that party have been showing that the Government's course in regard to the North-West has been insane, imprudent and unwise. They remonstrated against the system of monopoly introduced by this Government, and pointed out that the people would not stand it. We have been challenged with regard to that, and we have been charged with trying to create disturbance. But we simply pointed out what the result of the course adopted by the Government would be. The Government were warned by the leader of the Opposition and by several other members of the Opposition, of the result that would follow, and to-day we see the verification of our predictions. We see the North-West in a state of ferment. The hon. gentleman talked about a sore on his hand, and about the flies lighting on it and picking at the sore place; but there is a sore up there, and some of the flies that belong to the same political creed as hon. gentlemen opposite, have been lighting on it, and trying in vain to cover it up. The people there are making known the fact that they will not submit to the tyranny imposed on them; and hon. gentlemen opposite will have all they can do to settle the difficulty. The hon. gentleman referred to the waggon factory in his county. He said it was turning out seventy waggons a day, but when twitted with the fact that it is now closed, he said: Well, if that was the case, we had a frost, the wheat of the country had been injured, the people had been reduced in circumstances by matters over which the Government had no control. But before the introduction of this policy, I heard the hon. First Minister saying that the sun shone upon them, that there was always good times, that everything was pleasant, that the country was always prosperous when they were in power, that under the operation of the National Policy everything was smiling, the country would prosper and every man would make money. Last Session the hon. Finance Minister said he had no doubt of the future of this country. He said that prosperity was dawning upon us in all directions; that were he a young man, he would put out all sail and have nothing to fear, and that prosperity and success would attend his efforts in every shape and form for the next seven years. To-day, however, we find a very different state of things existing. I tell you, Sir, that hon. gentlemen in this House do not know, in many cases, the position of a very large portion of the farming community of this country. A very serious state of affairs exists in this Dominion in some sections, and a very large portion of the farming class of this Dominion is suffering very seriously. Their resources have been largely curtailed—I admit, somewhat by frost—but, on the other hand, I maintain that the greatest distress is owing to the inducements held out to them to enter into speculation. For one or two years we had a stroke of good times, no doubt. This was foolishly taken advantage of to too great an extent, and the farming community now find themselves, in many sections of the country, in a very unpleasant position; so much so, that if we should happen to have a poor crop another year, a very disastrous state of things would ensue. We have to depend entirely upon the

farming community of this country for anything to relieve the present state of things, and we should do everything in our power to build up that interest instead of, as I hold we are doing under the operation of the National Policy in this instance, crippling their resources by imposing exactions in excess of what is necessary and of what they can afford to bear. In that way, we are limiting their ability to procure those things which are necessary for themselves and their families. I notice that the hon. member for Cardwell, when speaking on the subject of cottons, said that whereas at the introduction of the National Policy we had seven cotton mills in this country, we now had over twenty, and that only three were obliged to shut down. In regard to this question, I would only say a few words. There has been for some time a monopoly in cotton, a combination was formed for the purpose of keeping up the prices of cotton, as combinations have been formed in other things. That combination lasted for the last three or four years, until quite recently. What has been the result? The result has been the keeping up of prices, and there has not been a wholesale establishment in the Dominion that is not crowded with cotton. These cottons were placed in the hands of those wholesale merchants, and a price list furnished them, below which they were prohibited selling. Within the last few days, however, a break occurred in the monopoly, simply because one of these holders got so straitened financially that he could not find means enough to meet his engagements, and he had to force a very large quantity on the market. A merchant in Toronto bought a very large quantity of this at 12½ cents below the price list, and he placed this in competition with the full priced goods, with the result, of course, of breaking the market, and putting an end to the combination. Now we are getting cheaper cotton; but will anyone say that before this occurred the consumer was getting cotton cheaper than he would have got it, had we not imposed this heavy Tariff?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; and I will prove it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, I am sorry to think that the hon. the Finance Minister appears to be so intentionally blinded to the fact, because any man that will tell me that the cotton, before the breaking of that combination, was sold over the country by the retailer as cheap as it is to-day, tells me what I have seen with my own eyes and know by experience is not the fact.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have a paper, prepared in December last, with the prices, which I am only waiting an opportunity to give to the House, to show the cost of grey cottons, and it gives the number, and the marks, and the character of the goods, in Canada and in the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And in England?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; in the United States. That is the market we are coming in contact with. It shows that per pound in the United States it was 23·36 cents, while in Canada it was 22·36 cents per pound. I will use it presently. These are the facts.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have stood behind the counter for the last quarter of a century, and have had experience in buying and selling goods. The hon. gentleman who addressed the House before me, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, said he had the theory but the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Wigle), had the practical experience. Well, the hon. Finance Minister has the theory, but I have had the practice.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Here are the figures.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have imported the goods and sold them here. I would like to have before me and lay on the Table of this House, samples of the goods sold a month ago

and sold now. I would like to have samples of the goods sold a month ago for 10 cents and sold to-day for 10 cents and 10½ cents. If the Finance Minister can show me that 11 cents is not more than 10½ cents, I will believe it, but he cannot do so. I say factory cottons to-day, owing to the breaking of that monopoly or of that combination, are sold cheaper than before it, and I say it is the result in everything else; because, wherever combination exists, the price is higher than where it does not exist; there is no doubt about it. I think I have gone over almost all the notes I made in connection with the hon. gentleman's speech. Had I an opportunity of preparing for the purpose of offering an address on this question, I possibly might have been able to submit more arguments to this House than I have submitted. I am quite sure I could have done so. I am quite sure I could have produced arguments sufficient to persuade any reasonable man that, owing to the operation of this Tariff, people here in the past paid more, are now paying more, and will continue to pay more for the goods they consume, until once the manufacture of goods in this country reaches a point that we will have competition here of a character that will secure the article at the very lowest price; but, as long as ever the manufacture is limited to such an extent as will enable those who do manufacture to enter into these combinations, we never will have the goods at such a price as we would have them, in the absence of such a policy as is now in force. It is not fair; it is unjust and it is unwise that we should in this way limit the resources and curtail the means of the great labouring classes and the farming community in this country. They are the backbone of the country, as I said before, and anything which tends to curtail their resources and to limit their means and cripple them, injures the country. Let us first get the country filled up, and then, if it is thought wise to encourage manufactures, very well; but in the meantime, it is exceedingly unwise to pursue the policy we have.

Mr. HESSON. Mr. Speaker, if I occupy the time of the House on this occasion at any length, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat will have to be charged with it. I have taken the trouble to follow him with a few notes, to which I shall refer. My hon. friend from North Wellington said he would give his reasons against the National Policy, and almost the first word he says is: Do away with that policy; it is a great injustice to the country and is doing it an injury. I have tried for the past five or six years to reason with myself whether this policy is not being, each year, more and more perfected, and more deeply impressed on the minds and hearts of the people of Canada. I have thought it was the duty of members of this House, so far as it was possible with human ingenuity, human enquiry, and human power, to devise a policy best adapted to every varied industry and interest in this country. We have men to-day who will stand up, like the member for North Wellington, and denounce this policy still, and say it is an injustice to the people, and ought to be done away with. I will follow my hon. friend for a few moments on the questions he dealt with, and I will endeavour, before I have done with my remarks, to show what I conceive to be the difficulties of the party in Opposition to-day, and what was the difficulty when they were in the Government, from 1874 to 1879. My hon. friend starts upon the proposition of the hat question, submitted by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wigle). He said that hats could be purchased in the United States or elsewhere and laid down in this country at the same price, and that was a fair test, and pay the 25c. duty. Now, I happen to be in the business as well as my hon. friend, and I have been longer behind the counter than my hon. friend, and I profess to know more about the trade than he does. He has still

Mr. McMULLEN.

something to learn. I have been more than thirty-five years engaged in the mercantile business in this country, and I know whereof I speak. I have purchased in Canada and in the United States; I have purchased in the Boston market, and in the English market, and in the Scotch market; I have bought in Glasgow, and finally I have found it to my advantage to confine my entire purchases to the Canadian trade, within last few years. We never had hats of good value at as low a price as we have to-day. If my hon. friend would attempt to prove that he can buy a soft hat, fit for the Canadian trade, as cheap in the United States, he would have to purchase the hat at \$3.60 per doz., add 25 per cent. to that, and make the cost \$4.50 laid down here. He cannot prove that he can purchase any such hats as that in the United States, or in England either. It is a fact that the Canadian hat trade to-day is successful, very largely in consequence of the patronage and the additional protection extended by the Government to encourage that trade, and it is only an illustration of all the other industries which have had some slight encouragement to induce men to put their capital into these industries, and carry them on successfully. The hon. gentleman said, in reply to my question as to the increase in the price at which they could be laid down or sold to-day, that it was not lower than it was under the previous policy. He says the price is not in question. I thought it was the price he was discussing here all the evening, and that the leader of the Opposition had been debating through the country. That hon. gentleman, the other night, said they had no particular antipathy to the manufacturers of Canada, but I have come to the conclusion that they have some hard feelings against the manufacturers of Canada, and against the capitalists who have the courage of their convictions, and who desire to build up Canadian industries in their own country by investing money in them. Well, Sir, my hon. friend finds fault in the matter of coal oil. He said we were obliged to pay a higher price for coal oil. I deny that emphatically, and I appeal to any person who has had to purchase coal oil in the past few years, whether it is not only cheaper but of a superior quality. It has to be submitted to a test now, which it did not undergo when those hon. gentlemen were in power. Coal oil to-day sells in Canada 14 cents a gallon, Imperial measure, cheaper than it was before, and it is about 25 per cent. more in bulk. My hon. friend also had to talk about salt. He could not let the salt interests of the country alone, although he lives close to a county largely interested in that industry. He says salt was originally sold from 60 cents to 65 cents per barrel at the mine. Well, that is true and I am sorry to say that producers were ever obliged to sell at such a price. But when you deduct the value of the barrel, 25 or 27 cents, you can see that it left a little enough margin of profit for the money that was invested in the salt works. Now I appeal to any hon. gentleman in this House if a trade like that is to be crushed out for the sake of getting salt for 40 or 45 cents a barrel? It may be, the farmer is obliged to use more than he formerly did, because he finds it useful as a fertilizer. Then the hon. gentleman touched upon the stove question. I do not know that stoves, as a rule, are more expensive in Canada to-day. But I wish to draw the attention of the House to this fact, that the people of Canada to-day are not satisfied with the same quality of stoves that they used ten or fifteen years ago. There is not a man in the country who does not know that stoves are being made now of a very expensive and very stylish appearance and finish, that were never dreamed of in the old days, when people bought cheap cooking stoves and plain box stoves. You can buy the same class of stoves to-day that you could ten years ago at the same price; but if you wish to buy the finer qualities, parlor and hall stoves of higher style of finish, very likely you will have to pay more for them, and I think the reason

is that we have not yet sufficient competition in that line of industry. My hon. friend also had a dig at the furniture manufacturers. He says this policy was designed in the interest of the manufacturers all over the country, and especially in the interests of the manufacturers of furniture. Well, the same remark applies to furniture that I applied to stoves. Every one knows that if you buy a stylish set of furniture, a bedroom, parlor, or drawing-room suit, you have to pay a high price for it; but the old-fashioned style of furniture made in the days when furniture was cheap, can be got to-day cheaper than it was ever made in this country before. The hon. gentleman dealt with the tea and coffee question. He said: "What if there was a little reduction in tea and coffee? That was of no great advantage to the people." Well, Sir, I remember when these hon. gentlemen opposite made a great cry of this question on the hustings. They used to impose a high rate of duty, 6 cents a pound on the poor man's tea, which was worth 40 or 50 cents; while the man who could afford to buy tea worth \$1.25 a pound, had to pay no more duty than the poor man. Those hon. gentlemen did not complain then, but they seem to think it is of no consequence now that the duty is taken off tea altogether. Let me point out to you how much advantage the country has realized from the reduction of duties made by the present Government. A very considerable item, and one that comes home closely to every house-keeper in Canada, whether rich or poor, is the reduction of the duty on tea, which amounts to \$344,016. Then there was a reduction of the duty on coffee, amounting to \$76,313; on tin, amounting to \$91,719; stamp tax, \$203,000, postage on newspapers, \$50,000; reduction on tobacco, \$700,000; scrap iron, \$1,000; periodicals \$14,250; turpentine, wire and other articles, \$50,000; making a total reduction of \$2,027,298, and that is what the hon. gentleman calls a trifling reduction made by this Government in favour of the people of this country. My hon. friend could not let the National Policy alone, in regard to the amount of revenue realized. He must find fault because we had a surplus. Well, Sir, we are not likely to have as much surplus as we would like to have this year; but the past surpluses have been turned to good account in carrying on the great works of improvement destined to develop every part of this country. The hon. gentlemen opposite were not troubled with surpluses; they were troubled with deficits,—a circumstance that will not be forgotten in the history of this country. My hon. friend also refers to the discontent in the North-West, which he referred to the Government's land policy. Now, he seemed to forget that there was a cause of that agitation, not entirely attributable to the policy of this Government. He seemed to forget that there were men in that country who had nothing else to do but to endeavour to create discontent and indignation against the Administration—men who have gone up there to make money out of the country and have failed, and now they are endeavouring to raise an agitation against the Government. Political lines are being drawn closely in the North-West to-day, and we know that the agitation is based upon political differences rather than upon any real grievances the settlers have to endure. I hold in my hands a letter received from a friend in the North-West, dated at Moose Jaw, on the 28th of February, and these are his remarks:

"The Farmers' (Grit) Union advertised a meeting, and, to draw it mild, it was a fizzle. There were only three persons present, and it was a fine day, so that could not be urged as an excuse. The delegate got disgusted, and left by the first train. When the Mile Belt question and the Reserves, are opened up here, the Grits will not have a leg to stand upon."

I have also a communication from a gentleman well known to some of the hon. members of this House, a member of the Local Government in the North-West, who writes to me as follows:—

"The 'intense agitation,' 'popular excitement,' &c., &c., here, is largely in the minds only of a few would-be agitators. The farmers are pronounced Grits, and mostly bankrupt speculators, who have been stranded high and dry by the 'boom,' and are now struggling as drowning men, to catch at anything that promises to give them a little help. The country as a whole is sound; one good crop would bury all this—except the strong desire to have the Hudson Bay opened. That, I think, must be accomplished, if practicable."

Now, Sir, that is a communication from a member of the Local Government, one of the most intelligent members of that Government.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. HESSON. Dr. Harrison, of Minnedosa, the gentleman that defeated David Glass, one of your own friends. A man that is likely to make his mark does not go there to create discontent and ill-feeling, but to invest his money and build up that country. Men who go there to live and to better their condition do not engage in agitation, as the Grits are doing there to-day. Let me quote a few lines from another source, the *Brandon Sun*. That journal says:

"A number of the speakers were always particularly careful to say that it was of a purely no-party complexion, and the principal reason given for this was that, in their treatment of the North-West, one party was as bad as the other. As was pointed out some time ago, the movement is entirely a political one, for it is impossible that it could be anything else. And we said further, that we could not complain of grievances without also complaining of the authors of them."

That is a paper which supports hon. gentlemen opposite and does everything possible, in its own little way, to stir up farmers' grievances and make as much of them as possible. It confesses that this is a political question. Let us trace a little further the cause of discontent. I shall be able to show by a quotation from the ex-Mayor of Brandon, also taken from the *Brandon Sun*, the kind of information that he has given in his lecturing tours among the farmers of the North-West. He is from my own town, having left there several years ago, where he was considered a good citizen; but it appears to me that he is in the North-West endeavouring, because probably he has not been so successful as he expected, to create discontent, in the hope that possibly he may come to the surface by that excitement. What did that gentleman do in his perigrinations through the country—for he is paid, I presume, to go round to establish farmers' unions and talk up farmers' grievances? Here it is, as stated in the *Brandon Sun*:

"We find the Dominion Government, in the interest of the Ontario millers, lowering the duty on wheat from 15 to 7½ cents per bushel. The Government compels the farmers of Manitoba to buy their implements from Ontario manufacturers, but does not say to the Ontario millers, buy your wheat in Manitoba, but allows them to buy wheat in American markets, entirely ignoring the interests of the people of this country."

What would you say to such remarks, made by a man who possesses intelligence, who has been Mayor of Brandon, and who has gone among the people, some of whom are, unfortunately, deprived of the privilege of post office accommodation, and only hear once a week or fortnight from the contras. No wonder those farmers got up and said that if the Government are so neglectful of our interests as to propose to reduce the wheat duty from 15 to 7½ cents as there is a short crop in Ontario, we have good cause for agitation. It is with that kind of talk that those gentlemen have agitated the North-West, that they have been able to induce some of our friends to follow them for a time; but, thank God, they are getting their eyes opened, and the day is not far distant when they will leave the ranks and come to the conclusion that this was only another Reform trap to divide the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman who preceded me spoke about distress. He did not, like almost every other gentleman on that side of the House, say the Finance Minister was obliged to apologize when he introduced the Budget. He did not go so far as to make that remark, but he said the country was in very great distress and in as bad a condition as it was when the Liberals were in power. I could not apply a better test than that which has been ap-

plied before—the Post Office Savings Bank returns Hon. gentlemen opposite must thank themselves if these statements are reiterated; when they stand up and make declarations which the people of Canada have again and again refuted, among others, that the National Policy was not a curse but a blessing, they will find members on this side of the House prepared to contradict those statements. Let me give these savings bank figures. In 1869 the deposits were \$856,814. In 1874, when the Reform party came into power, they had increased to \$3,207,051. From 1884 to 1878, the period when the Liberals were in power, the deposits declined to \$2,754,484, a decline of \$452,567. The Conservative party came into power in 1879. They took up the National Policy and the country began to revive under the wise counsel of the leader of the Government and his colleagues, who so ably assist him. The result was that in 1883 the deposits had increased to \$11,976,237, an increase during the five years of \$9,221,753. That statement is only up to last year, and we might properly add another \$1,000,000 or \$1,500,000. It may be said, however, that these deposits might be increased without general advantage to the people, and without showing any great improvement in their condition. In reply, I would point to these facts. In 1874 the number of depositors was 45,329, and the number declined under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite to 40,097. In 1883 the number of depositors was 100,489. I do not think wealthy men, as a rule, are depositors in savings banks; the depositors are working men, and labouring men and small property owners; wealthy men have always some other use for their money than to invest it in this way. They place it in one of the chartered banks for a time, until some speculation opens, and then they withdraw it, and having large sums they can command the trade of the country. Now, Sir, I have to make a few further comments on the policy of that Government. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in the discussion the other day—and I have in my hands the report of his speech in *Hansard*—in referring to the imports and exports, complained that we had not good harvests from 1874 to 1879, and hence they had lost in the money coming in from the exports of the farm. He took a few of the products of the farm and tried by them to illustrate to this House, that during the five years succeeding their Administration we had been more favoured with good crops than previously, and hence the great success of this Administration. I think, Sir, I shall be able to show another reason for the trouble which fell upon the country from 1874 to 1879, and I must again trouble the House with some figures, which are taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns. The total imports from 1869 to 1874 were \$430,810,965, and the exports, \$380,651,474, leaving an excess of imports amounting to \$100,159,491. Those figures cover the first period of the administration of the Conservative party after Confederation. I have given you the total imports and exports for those years, showing what was the balance of trade, and that, of course is another very important question which we do not agree about in this House. My own impression is that it is always better to have the balance of trade in your favour, if possible. I know it is better to have a balance in the bank in your favour. But, at any rate, in that period of the Conservative Administration, when the affairs of the country were going on prosperously and happily, when there was nothing but rejoicing on every side that the Confederation had become, not only a probability, but a grand success; when industries had been created and every branch of trade was busy, even at that time, we had apparently \$100,000,000 of excess of imports over exports. Now, Sir, we come to the period of the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and I was interested in ascertaining, if possible, whether the want of success in the administration of that Government had arisen

Mr. HESSON.

entirely from the fact that our exports were smaller during their period of Administration and that the balance of trade being so largely against us, the country was therefore so much the poorer. I find that from 1874 to 1879, we imported \$529,256,154 worth of goods, and we exported \$403,403,402, the excess of imports over exports being \$125,752,782. Well, Sir, this was a little against the hon. gentlemen. It was against them to the extent of \$25,000,000 worse than it was during the previous Administration. But it was not there that their folly lay. It was not alone that Providence had not furnished them so large a quantity of farm produce, or farm surplus, to export, as during the previous Administration. I say it was not in that that their whole crime lay—because I charge that it was a crime, or at least a blunder, and a very grave blunder, they made in the importations into this country. Now, Sir, I will give you the figures for the period from 1879 to 1883. In that period the imports were \$179,521,507, and the exports \$456,916,543, leaving an excess of imports over exports of \$22,604,964. Now, Sir, of course this is a very favourable state of affairs. I confess that Providence did smile on the Conservative party in those years, and I confess there is something, which to my mind, would apparently justify the leader of the Opposition and other gentlemen on that side in saying that Providence had favoured us with better harvests, and all that sort of thing. But when I come to enquire into those imports, I will show wherein the difficulty lay, and I must be pardoned by the House for troubling the House with some figures. We find that the imports of free goods during the five years, from 1874 to 1878, were \$182,307,627. Now, I say that there was great folly, and I will show you why I consider it so. In those figures we have, unfortunately, a record that stands out very badly for the gentlemen who are charged with the administration of the affairs of this country. We find that they allowed flour to come into the country to the extent of \$12,383,485 worth; corn, \$15,285,929; other small grains and meal, \$3,429,064; and wheat, of all things, \$33,995,349—all free of duty. Here was no less than \$65,000,000 worth of these articles admitted free, articles in which our honest farmers had to compete with every day against the American producers. Now, Sir, I think these hon. gentlemen were chargeable of folly in that respect, and I say that these hon. gentlemen would perpetuate the same things to-day if they were in power. If they are true and honest to the expressions of opinions which they give in this House and in this country, they would have to stand by that policy to-day and still admit the products of the American farms to come in competition with the hardy farmers of our own country. If I am wrong, I will sit down and allow any hon. gentleman opposite to get up and state that I am wrong. If I am correct what about the protection for farmers, what about the farmers' grievances, which an hon. member opposite was talking about a few minutes ago? We all know, of course, that the farmers are the backbone of the country, and I say is it any wonder that the right arm of our trade was struck such a blow when we find that over \$65,000,000 worth—not including all farm products—but merely grain and grain products, came into this country free to compete with our farmers here. I have simply taken those figures, that I feel we have a right to deal with here, and I show by them that the gentlemen on the other side of the House may thank their colleagues for the course they pursued with reference to the imports they allowed of that class of goods. Now, Sir, it is only fair that I should deal with the free imports which have come in under the present Administration. I find that in 1879, before our policy got fairly to work—because it came into force very late in the spring, and consequently there was very little to export before the next season—we had to permit \$8,755,839 worth of grain and the products of grain,

such as flour and meal, to come in free of duty. But let us take the four following years, and what do we find? During 1880, 1881, 1882 and 1883, there was imported into this country, of the same class of goods, for home consumption, \$10,357,000 worth from the United States, upon which this Government imposed a duty of \$1,323,838, equivalent to almost 13 per cent. Now, I think I can find a reason in this fact why wheat and other grains were always higher in price at Oswego, New York, Buffalo, and Chicago in previous years, under the Administration of the Reform party than in this country. To the extent of that \$1,323,838, the farmers of Canada had a protection during the last four years on grain and the produce of grain, or no less than 13 per cent, or a fraction over 12 per cent. I think that is the answer to be given to these gentlemen, as to the imposition of duty on wheat and corn and flour. Now the total imports of grain and its products during the Conservative Administration, including 1879, amounted to \$51,303,477 against \$182,307,627 of free goods during the Administration of the Reform party. From this \$51,303,477, deduct \$10,357,900, the value of the goods that came in under a duty, and you have \$40,945,577 worth of grain and the products of grain imported into this country under the Conservative Administration, and which were merely in transit through the country, being in bond while in the country, and afterwards exported. I think that ought to be a sufficient reason to the mind of any person responsible for his own judgment and opinions for the low prices of grain that prevailed in this country from 1874 to 1879, against the high prices that prevailed in the United States. Now, I think I shall be able to prove that, by a reference to an authority which hon. gentleman on the other side will not deny. I am going to quote now from the columns of the *Globe* the prices of grain at Toronto, as against the prices at Oswego, for several years back. I have chosen Oswego, because I think it more closely assimilates to the port of Toronto than any other American port we can name. My hon. friend from North Norfolk, referring to this matter the other day, made use of these words, which drew my attention to the subject, and induced me to look up the figures. He said:

"We have always maintained that the duty on wheat could not affect the price, except in years that we could not raise sufficient for our own consumption."

Well, we will say that this is one of the years when we have not raised sufficient. I think I will show, from the Trade and Navigation Returns, that we have raised sufficient, and have had an excess for export. Now, I am going to show what have been the prevailing prices of grain at the ports of Toronto and Oswego, and I am going to give the highest price and the best quality of wheat—Michigan White, as it is quoted—in both cases:

	Toronto. Wheat.	Oswego. Wheat.	Differ- ence.
1874—December 30. ....	\$0 93	\$1 36	43 c.
1875 " 29. ....	0 96	1 55	59
1876 " 30. ....	1 28	1 50	22
1877 " 28. ....	1 25	1 45	20
1878 " 28. ....	0 85	1 09	24

Now, we find that the average difference in favour of Oswego, during that five years, was 33½ cents a bushel. If the National Policy had no effect on the price of grain in this country, we would naturally expect the same state of things to exist to-day. I was led to look further, to see if it did continue to exist—to see if this National Policy not only affected the price of wheat in the years when we had a short crop, but extended to those years when we had a good crop and a surplus to export. I found that the prices at these two places, at the same period of each year, were as follows:

	Toronto Wheat.	Oswego Wheat.	Difference.	
			Toronto.	Oswego.
1879 .....	\$1 31	\$1 40	.....	9
1880 .....	1 16	1 15	1	.....
1881 .....	1 28	1 39	.....	11
1882 .....	0 92	1 07	.....	15
1883 .....	1 16	1 12	4	.....

Now, Sir, during this period we find the price in favour of Toronto, in one case, of 1 cent, and in another case of 4 cents, making a total of 5 cents, which, taken from the 35 cents in favour of Oswego, gives us 30 cents to be divided among the five years. That makes 6 cents per bushel for each year for the five years we have just passed through, against 33 cents in favour of Oswego, from 1874 to 1878. I wish to be distinctly understood, that from 1874 to 1878, the difference in favour of Oswego, as against Toronto, was 33½ cents, whereas, from 1879 to 1883, it was only 6 cents. If the National Policy has not to do with it, what has? I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to explain how it was these differences have existed, and why they are distributed over the period of years so much in favour of my proposition and in favour of the policy of the Government. It has not happened by mere chance, but must have occurred through some action of the Government on trade. Under what other system can hon. gentlemen explain this away? Let us come a little closer to our day, and see if the state of things now is not more favourable than it was at the end of 1883. In the *Globe* of the 8th March, of this year, the price of wheat is quoted in Toronto at \$1.10, and in Oswego at \$1.11, or 1 cent per bushel in favour of Oswego. I have given the exact state of the case during the Administration of the Reform party, and I have given you, in contrast, the actual state of the case during the Administration of the Conservative party, and the actual state of the case to-day, and I defy any hon. gentleman to contradict those figures; for in order to be correct, I examined the *Montreal Herald* and some other papers, and found there might be a difference of 1 or 2 cents between them, one way or the other. I want to go further than that. I want to prove that we have a better market here than they have anywhere on the American side; that in Montreal you have a better price to-day for grain than in the city of New York. The same quality is sold in Montreal for \$1.22 which in New York City only brings \$1.07; at least, that was the case on the 8th March. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to explain that away, if they can. They cannot find that state of things existing during the period they administered the affairs of the country; no, nor had we then the control of our own home market. We all know the advantage of having a home market for bulky goods, such as grain, which forms so large a portion of our farm products, but under their Administration it was impossible for us to find a market at home. We were driven out of our own market by the \$183,307,627 worth of grain and other products that were thrown upon this market during the Administration of the Reform Government. I trace the whole misfortune of Canada to that fact. I trace to it the sad state of the farming interest, which is the backbone of the country, and if paralyzed, every other interest becomes equally paralyzed. So much for the price of grain and the effect of the National Policy. I wish to say a few words on the price of coal, on which the hon. gentleman opposite dealt at some length. They say: You tax the poor man unreasonably by putting a tax on coal, an article that we do not produce, at all events in the western Provinces. I have often had to meet that argument at political meetings, and I have shown that this tax was counterbalanced by the duty we impose on flour going into the Lower Provinces, in order to get a home market there for our own flour. Politicians have often tried to excite the people on this coal question. I will give you a few figures from the *Globe*, showing the state of the coal market during the Administra-

tion of the late Government and this Government, and I will give you the dates in each case, and the price quoted in Toronto:—

	Hard Coal.	Soft Coal.
15th October, 1874.....	\$8 00	\$7 00
30th December, 1875.....	8 50	7 00
27th December, 1876.....	6 50	7 00
20th December, 1877.....	6 50	6 50
25th December, 1878.....	5 50	5 50

The average price of hard coal for these five years is \$7 per ton, and soft coal \$6 50. Take the period from 1879 to 1883. Quotations again from the *Globe*:

	Hard Coal.	Soft Coal.
21st December, 1879.....	\$4 75	\$6 50
23rd December, 1880.....	7 00	6 50
29th December, 1881.....	7 00	7 00
28th December, 1882.....	6 50	6 50
20th December, 1883.....	7 00	6 50

Average from 1874 to 1883, \$6.45 for hard coal against \$7.00 during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. When there was no duty, the soft coal figured up to \$6.60 for the average of these five years, a difference of ten cents. In reference to that, I would say that even if it were proved that we had, by the imposition of a duty, created a higher price for coal, it is not illustrated by the figures quoted in Toronto for those past ten years. I have given you my authority, and I think that facts speak louder than any political proposition that can be got up in order to cover up the case that hon. gentlemen try to make, that the poor man is taxed for his coal by this Government. They may say: Well, take the duty off coal, and what would be the result? Would it decline by 50 cents per ton? I am not prepared to admit that. I confess I have serious doubts whether it would decline, except perhaps for a few months at first, because, as soon as the Americans found the duty was off, they would again put up their prices, I suppose, to suit their own trade, as they did in days gone by. I do not say, because there are other hon. members in this House who are better versed in the subject than I am, what the effect of this policy has been on the output of coal in the Lower Provinces. There are gentlemen in this House who could tell better what the effect has been there, and this is a great national question, and is not an Ontario question alone. We have to fight that battle there with the politicians of the country, but there are very few people who are finding fault with the price of coal to-day, who remember what it was under the Administration of that Government. I wish to trouble the House for a few minutes with the prices of agricultural implements in the North-West. Hon. gentlemen have made a very great outcry about that, and have said we were taxing the farmers of the North-West, and it was one of their great grievances. I did not know but that there might be some truth in the matter, and I took the trouble to investigate it. I wrote to the dealers in the North-West, and I have their letters and their prices here, and I shall be happy to give them to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, and I should like them to go on the records of the House, for reference hereafter, because I think it is of great importance to people who are going to the North-West, to know what they have to expect in that country when they go there; because, if you took the information obtained from some hon. gentlemen—hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, I am glad to say—one would be deterred from going in there for fear one would have to pay a much higher price for agricultural implements than that which existed previous to the additional duty, than that which one would have to pay if one lived in Dakota. Now, I am in possession of the figures here from the dealers in Brandon, and I would like to put some of them on record, and contrast the prices to-day with the prices of 1881-82. I will first take Captain Wastie, the Canadian Pacific Railway Commissioner, in the city of Brandon, probably one of the most

Mr. Hession.

intelligent business men in the city of Brandon to-day. Here are the prices he quotes for me for American and Canadian implements. I asked him to furnish a statement to cover the period of the sales in that country, so that I might go back to the time before the additional imposition of a tax on agricultural implements by this House, and ascertain what the effect had been on the prices there. This is his price list:

	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.
	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>HARVESTERS—</b>				
McCormack (American).....	.....	.....	350	330
John Elliott & Son (Canadian).....	340	340	340	330
Harris, Son & Co. (Canadian).....	340	340	340	320
<b>MOWERS—</b>				
Elliott & Son.....	100	100	100	90
Harris, Son & Co.....	100	90	85	85
<b>WAGGONS—</b>				
Moline Waggon Co. (American).....	.....	.....	100	95
Plummer & Son (Canadian).....	90	90	80	.....
P. Adams (Canadian).....	90	90	85	85
Snowball (Canadian).....	100	100	90	85
<b>HARROWS—</b>				
Cowan & Cowan (Canadian).....	22	22	22	20
<b>SEEDERS—</b>				
Vau Brunt, Davis & Co. (American).....	100	100	100	90
A. Harris, Son & Co.....	90	90	90	85

That is the price lists given by Mr. Wastie. Wherever there has been a change, it has been a reduction in favour of the buyer. The following is the list furnished by W. Johnson & Co., "steam and horse power, buggies, buckboards, &c.":

	1832.	1883.	1884.
	\$	\$	\$
Binders.....	.....	340	275
Reapers.....	145	145	100
Mowers.....	100	160	80 to 85
Rakes.....	45 to 50	45 to 50	30 to 35
Wagons.....	90 to 100	90 to 100	50 to 80
Iron harrows.....	22	.....	16 to 18
Ploughs (Canadian).....	24 to 26	.....	16 to 22
" (American).....	25 to 27	.....	24 to 26
Buckboards.....	65 to 80	30 to 60	.....
Seeders.....	90 to 100	50 to 85	50 to 85
Sleighs.....	36 to 45	20 to 35	20 to 35
Land rollers.....	55 to 70	50 to 60	50 to 60

Now, these are remarkable reductions, and I wish that some notice would be taken of them, because they are very important factors in the outfit of an immigrant going to the North-West, and have to be taken into consideration, and I would like hon. gentlemen to observe what extraordinary reductions have taken place in this case, in the face of an increase of duty. Sir, I think that ought to be a sufficient answer as to the increased cost of agricultural implements by reason of the additional duty. There are the quotations of the dealers in that country, who will be happy to fill the orders of any gentleman visiting the North-West for the purpose of settlement. Before sitting down, I wish to say that if it should ever fall to the lot of Canada to have an Administration led by the hon. member for West Durham, I trust he will have the good sense to change his policy in the interests of Canada. If he should arrive at power, I could desire nothing more favourable to my party than that he should continue his present policy, as I am certain that he would be very soon turned out again and that the Conservative party would come back to power. But I would prefer to see the hon. gentleman opposite accept the facts which are patent to every body in Canada, and to admit that we are in a more prosperous condition on every hand than we were under the Mackenzie Administration. I do not think it would be necessary to appeal to intelligent people to prove that almost every item that enters into the expense of the household is cheaper now, as well as of better quality, than it was in the days of the Mackenzie Government. I might appeal to the old ladies of the country as to the prices of cotton, of woollens, of dress goods, and of almost every article that enters into the consumption of the household, to prove that in almost every instance we now get better quality and at better prices. Mr. Speaker, thanking the House for the indulgence extended to me, I resume my seat.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We have had two very important admissions made to-night, which show that friends opposite are getting more light. The first admission was that when our people buy articles from another country, on which there is a high duty, they pay that duty themselves; the other is that Providence had a little to do with the success of the National Policy. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) and the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle), both asserted that the National Policy was not intended to benefit the manufacturers by making the consumer pay higher prices, but it was intended to benefit the manufacturer solely, by giving him the control of the home market. Now, Sir, that is just what the National Policy has not done. Instead of giving him the home market, it has, in a great measure, taken the home market from him. In 1878, before the National Policy was inaugurated, we imported immensely less of manufactured goods than we did in 1883, showing conclusively that the National Policy, instead of giving our manufacturers the possession of the home market, had deprived them of a portion of it. In respect to agricultural implements, we have been told to-night that we could get them cheaper to-day than before Protection was inaugurated, and that the National Policy was intended to give manufacturers of these implements the control of the market, and not for the purpose of raising prices. Now, Sir, how lamentably it has failed in giving the possession of the home market is apparent from the fact that in 1878, of agricultural implements, we imported into this country \$63,175 worth; while in 1883, after the National Policy had had full swing for four years, we imported \$581,859. These things speak louder than all the declamation that hon. gentlemen can indulge in. It is all very well to make these general statements. I notice that our friends opposite always wax eloquent in general statements, but when they come to deal with facts, they find the facts are against them and I suppose that, like the man who was hard up for an argument, they are ready to exclaim: So much the worse for the facts! We have been told that these articles are cheaper now than before we had Protection. That is just the point we dispute. They are not only dearer but they are also, as a general rule, of poorer quality than they were before. Great stress has been laid on agricultural implements. There is no use in wasting time going over the whole class—let us take a few. Let us take the self-binding harvester. You cannot tell whether that is dearer or cheaper, because it was not manufactured in this country before the National Policy was brought into existence. Figures have been read over to us to-night, showing that from \$100 to \$350 have been paid as the price of that article; but I tell you, from the knowledge I have of its manufacture, that it is not worth half that sum to-day, and that if we had a proper fiscal policy that did not handicap our manufacturers, they could make it, at good profit for less than half the money; and we are paying the other half as a direct result of Protection. The hon. member for South Essex has ridiculed the idea that Protection produces rings. He says that rings will exist whether we have Protection or not. That is just the point where we take issue. Rings are not possible where there is not Protection. It is only Protection that brings them into existence. How can men combine to keep up prices if there are outsiders beyond the ring standing ready to furnish the articles at a lower price? Allusion has been made to-night on both sides of the House to the article of coal oil. Now, I happened, not many years, to live where the refining industry was carried on. Before the Mackenzie Government came into power, you all remember there was a very high tariff on oil, and we were charged from 40 to 50 cents a gallon for refined oil. I paid under that tariff 45 cents a gallon, and the gentleman who sold it stated to me that he favoured me 5 cents, and that his selling price was 50 cents. At that

quotations in Liverpool, you found they were selling that oil in England for 18 cents a gallon—all the difference was money that was robbed from the people of this country. A few months afterwards, the Mackenzie Government revised the duty upon oil, and the result was that you could get refined oil of the best quality for 15 cents a gallon, retail.

Mr. FARROW. What year was that?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not remember the exact year, but it was before the Mackenzie Government changed the Tariff. The same holds good with all other manufactures. It is only a few weeks since I was coming down to this House, and I was riding on the train with a hardware merchant, who told me that he has now commenced the importation again of American nails into this country. I had to use a great deal of Canadian nails last summer, and I am ready to verify what that gentleman stated. He stated that the difference in the intrinsic value between a keg of American and Canadian nails was \$1 in favour of the American, and I believe he was right. I had reason to use a great many during last summer, and I found the Canadian nails were an inferior article and could not be driven into hard wood as well as the American nails, and there was a very large percentage of waste amongst them. He told me, also, that in the matter of spades, he is now beginning to import the American article. Time was when no one who knew anything about a good spade would use any other. But hon. gentlemen opposite so arranged the Tariff as to give the Canadian manufacturers the monopoly of the market, the consequence of which was that the people had to use poorer spades. They are now beginning to pay higher prices in order to get the American article, because it is cheaper in the long run. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle) made merry at the expense of the leader of the Opposition, in regard to some remark he had made about a surplus. I hold the leader of the Opposition was right. The Government having no right to collect a larger amount of revenue from the people than is required to carry on the Government; if they do collect more, it is dishonest in the extreme. He says the hon. gentleman should have gone on and given an illustration. Suppose, he said, the Reeve of a township was to come back for re-election, and boast that he had collected during the year a surplus of \$5,000 and claim re-election on that ground. I have been a great many years in County Councils and I never yet met a Reeve simple enough to come back and make such a plea. It is, however, the plea that the Government is now making to the country. The Government are saying in effect: Here are \$5,000,000, \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 a year taken out of the pockets of the people; look at our surplus; on this ground we ask the confidence of the people. Allusion has been made, over and over again, to the fact that our manufacturing interests have reached a crisis. It has been shown that we have a very limited market, that Protection has cut us off from the markets of the world, that our export trade is much less now, with all the improved machinery and appliances for the manufacture of goods, than it was before Protection in Canada was thought of. The country feels that we have reached the point of over-production. Last year, when the Finance Minister was making his annual statement, or during the debate, he made the prophecy that there were yet seven years of prosperity before us. The statement was challenged at the time, and it has not taken twelve months to show how egregiously he was mistaken. I do not mean to say that the Government are always to blame for hard times. I believe, as a general rule, they have very little to do with it. I believe that hard times and prosperity are under the control of the people and not under the Government, except to a very limited extent. All the Government can do is to adopt a wise fiscal policy, and to remove obstructions in the way of free trading. But there is another

respect in which the Government never can do much. They never can make up for want of industry and for what the people spend in reckless extravagance. I do not say that the Government are altogether to blame for the crisis, because it would come at some time; but what we charge them with is, that it has come three or four years before it was due, and its coming is a direct result of the course of the Government in the matter of Protection. With regard to manufactures, we have been charged with being opposed to, and enemies of, manufacturers. No greater mistake could be made. No one class of the community has a right to rejoice in distress happening to another class. I hold that no one important class in the nation can suffer distress without another class suffering. But we, on this side of the House, hold that this over-production, this stagnation of business, this locking up of capital in unproductive goods, which cannot find a market, are direct results of the protective policy. They brought about stagnation four years before it was due. Instead of the manufacturers being permanently benefitted, I am afraid they have been permanently injured. Hon. gentlemen opposite always assume that our manufacturers were making nothing before Protection was adopted. No greater mistake can be made. Taking man for man, I believe that at the beginning of 1879, before Protection was inaugurated, the manufacturers were better off than they are to-day. I know, at least, that just before Protection was inaugurated, two at least of the old manufacturers of London were able to retire with fortunes. I believe, and I have my information on good authority, that there are not manufacturers in that large manufacturing city who have made anything like competencies since Protection; in fact, scarcely one has retained his own. No doubt manufacturers made large profits when they were able to charge increased prices, owing to the protective duty; but soon the business became overdone. They had the home market, but there were so many producers they could not all make a living, and they could not sell to foreign nations, because they were handicapped in the race; so our manufacturers, I repeat, instead of being permanently benefitted have been permanently injured. Allusion has been made to the iron industry. There is the important fact that dozens and dozens of iron furnaces in the United States have been standing idle since 1876, a circumstance which is a result of Protection. We are going to have a similar experience in this country, I am afraid—manufactories closed up, the capital expended in them completely lost to the country, the Government, by its fiscal policy, being directly chargeable with that result. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle), has repeated the old story of "flies on the wheel." He talks about hon. gentlemen opposite as flies on the wheel, who did nothing to relieve the sufferings of the manufacturers. What better have the hon. gentlemen now in office done? I do not say they are flies on the wheel, but they are vampires, sucking the life-blood out of the people. I repeat that we have no reason to wish manufacturers ill; we have every reason to wish them well, because when they are prosperous other classes will have a share in the prosperity; but what we do object to is, that one class should be set above another and protected at the expense of all, and the Government pick the pockets of the people under the guise of protecting them.

Mr. WATSON. I had not intended taking part in this debate, but as certain allusions have been made to the North-West, I think it is my duty to express my opinions on the subject before the House. The member for Perth (Mr. Hesse) has made some reference to a movement which has been going on in the North-West for the past few months, and as to which, I suppose, most hon. members are well informed by the press, so that it is not necessary for me to say very much about it. I may state, however, that there has been a feeling of discontent in that country,

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

and I think this feeling has been provoked by the present Government in Ottawa. There may have been some meetings at Moose Jaw, such as the hon. gentleman refers to, but it must be remembered that the people at Moose Jaw have not suffered in the same way as the farmers in the older sections of the Province of Manitoba, because at Moose Jaw, at the present time, there is little, if anything, produced, as the country there has only been settled about a year. For that reason, the people there have not suffered to the same extent from the grievances which are complained of in Manitoba. There is one thing against which I have risen to enter my protest, and that is the high duty on agricultural implements, which are necessities of life to the farmers of the North-West. I do not belong to Ontario, and therefore I have no interest in protecting a few manufacturers who reside in the constituencies of hon. gentlemen in that Province. I speak for the farming community, and especially for the farmers of the North-West, and I say that the high Tariff is a great grievance to those people. It has always been the idea that, as the hon. Finance Minister gave this high Protection to enable the implement manufacturers in Ontario to build up that industry, to a certain extent he might see fit to reduce the Tariff on such articles. I find that that Tariff is not only annoying the farmers of the North-West, but the farmers of Ontario. I find that at a meeting of grangers, representing the farmers of Ontario, which was held here last week, a petition was sent to the Finance Minister, asking that the duty on agricultural implements be reduced. If this Tariff bears so heavily on the people of Ontario, it must bear much more heavily on the settlers of the North-West. We require in that country certain kinds of machinery, which have not been made a sufficient length of time in the factories of Ontario to attain the quality which we desire it should attain, and we can buy, in some instances, machinery from the United States much better adapted to a prairie country than the machinery from Ontario. I am glad to see that the manufacturers of Ontario are improving in their machinery, but at the same time, I cannot see that they should require 35 per cent. protection. If the Government are desirous of having that country settled, they should offer all possible inducements to settlers, not only by a liberal land policy, but by placing that country in the position of being able to buy their implements as cheaply, if not more cheaply, than on the other side of the line, and of as good quality. The hon. gentleman stated that a person from Ontario who had gone across the boundary line said that he found that he had to pay the duty, "but thank God the people who left Ontario for the United States were coming back into Manitoba, to the extent of 11,000 last year." For my own part, coming from that Province, I have not seen any such influx of people from Dakota and Minnesota to the North-West. I am sorry to say that the movement has been the other way, though I do not glory in that fact, or take any pride in it. The people of that country are not seeking for grievances as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would wish us to believe. It has been stated that we are disloyal. Now, I do not think that the people of that country are disloyal; I do not think there are more loyal subjects in the Dominion of Canada than there are in the Province of Manitoba to-day; but while they are loyal to the Dominion, as a whole, they feel that they should be loyal to themselves, and they do not consider it being disloyal to agitate or complain of their grievances. As I stated before, this high duty on implements is a great grievance. If we had manufacturers in that country who could produce these implements, they might share in the benefits of this Tariff equally with the manufacturers of Ontario; but that is not the case, and the high Protective Tariff is, I believe, injuring the many for the sake of the few, and especially is this the case in the North-West,

where we have no manufacturers. We require, as I stated before, certain machinery which is not so well manufactured in Canada, is not so well adapted to our prairie country, and is not as good value as what we could obtain from the United States, and consequently we have to pay the duty and bring these articles in from the United States. There are different articles of that kind, such as the straw-burning steam engines, for threshing machines; Deering binder, and others. I was told only last Friday, by a large manufacturer in Ontario, who was handling the Deering binder in the North-West, that there was something peculiar about the people of the North-West which he could hardly understand. That, strange to say, he could sell that machine of the American make for \$30 more than he could sell the Canadian machine. The reason for that is simply this, that in that country they have to take off a large crop in a very short time, and in order to do that they must have the best machinery that can be made, even if they pay more money for it. For that reason, the people will not stick at \$20 or \$25 on the price of a machine, when they have to take off their crop, probably, in a few days, for if there should be any flaw or breakage in the machine, owing to the manufacturers not having had experience in making it, it might result in a great loss of their crop. I might state also, that at one time the Province of Manitoba had a special Tariff, and I do not see any reason why it should not have a special Tariff now. It was stated by the First Minister that it was not possible to make a special Tariff for any particular Province, but we know that for a time after Manitoba was taken into the Confederation, the tariff was only 4 per cent. Now, as there are no manufacturers in that Province, and as we have to import all our implements from Ontario or the United States, I think it is unjust to that Province that it should not have a special Tariff. Manitoba is in a peculiar position, inasmuch as she has had to pay more since coming into Confederation, in proportion to what she has received than any other Province. I will take the figures for the last ten years :

Manitoba, net revenue.....	\$3,858,978
British Columbia .....	2,755,588
Balance in favour of Manitoba.....	\$1,103,350
Manitoba.....	\$3,858,938
Prince Edward Island.....	535,555
Balance in favour of Manitoba .....	\$3,323,383

Disbursements made by Federal Government :

British Columbia.....	\$2,793,543 30
Manitoba .....	1,541,448 10
	\$1,252,095 20

Contributions of Manitoba in excess of British Columbia.....	\$1,103,350 92
Receipts less .....	1,252,095 20
	\$2,355,446 12

Manitoba worth more to Canada than British Columbia. Disbursements made by Federal Government :

Prince Edward Island.....	\$2,249,920 15
Manitoba .....	1,541,448 10
	\$1,708,472 05

Contribution of Manitoba in excess of Prince Edward Island.....	\$3,332,383 73
Receipts less .....	1,708,472 05
	\$5,041,955 78

Manitoba profit to Canada over Prince Edward Island. Now, I shall give the amounts derived from the revenue for the last ten years, although it is probable that the figures do not place Manitoba in as high a position as she ought to

occupy with reference to the first two or three years after she went into Confederation. The following is the proportionate net revenue and the cost of Government in the Provinces named during the last ten years :

	Net Revenue.	Cost of Government.
Nova Scotia.....	\$10,611 788.30	\$6,198,833.64 or 1/2 profit.
New Brunswick.....	9,053,128 40	6,192,296.25 or 1/2 " "
British Columbia.....	5,559,131.30	2,793,543 30 or 1/2 " "
Prince Edward Island .....	535,559.19	2,249,920.15 or 4/5 loss.
Manitoba.....	3,858,938.92	1,511,448.10 or 2/5 profit.

The amounts per head contributed to the Dominion by the different Provinces for the last ten years were as follows :—

Ontario.....	\$ 31.46 ; average per year \$ 3.14 1/2
Quebec.....	51.65 " " 5.16 1/2
Nova Scotia.....	34.89 " " 8.48 3/8
New Brunswick.....	42.10 " " 4.21
Manitoba.....	107.62 " " 10.76 1/2
British Columbia.....	172.76 " " 10.27 1/2
Prince Edward Island.....	24.14 " " 2.41 1/2

This shows that each Manitoban contributes to the Dominion twice as much as a Quebecker, two and one-third times as much as a New Brunswicker, three times as much as a Nova Scotian, three and one-fourth times as much as an Ontarian, and four and one-fourth times as much as a Prince Edward Islander. Now, I think that as Manitoba holds that position with reference to the contributions to the revenue of the Dominion, the Government might see fit to make a special Tariff for Manitoba. There is another article besides agricultural implements, that I might mention, with regard to which the Tariff is very heavily felt in Manitoba, that is, canned goods. With reference to this, I may read what Mr. Mackenzie, the President of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, has to say :

"The canned goods industry is perhaps one of the least of the manufacturing industries of the Eastern Provinces, and I refer to it quite as much to show how ready the Government is to listen and to assist any demands made upon it by the eastern people—quite a contrast to its treatment of the demands of Manitoba—as to show how enormous the protection afforded on canned fruits is, and how peculiarly hard it presses on the country, owing to the fact that all fruits, green or canned, have to be brought here. The duty on canned vegetables, up to a year ago, was 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on canned fruits, 2 cents per pound. This was not considered enough, and the manufacturers went to the Government and had the duty arranged so that it was calculated to make other manufacturers sick with envy. There is no allowance for quality, poor paying a higher rate than good. Here is the Tariff :

Canned apples, 3 cts. per lb.....	58 per cent.
" gooseberries, 3 " " .....	60 " "
" pears, 3 " " .....	62 1/2 " "
" strawberries, 3 " " .....	84 " "
" peaches, 3 " " .....	74 to 105 " "

CANNED VEGETABLES.

Tomatoes, 2 cts. per lb.....	78 per cent.
Corn, 2 " " .....	80 " "
Peas, 2 " " .....	87 " "

And the weight of the cans to be always included ; jam, 5 cts. per lb., equal to 60 per cent."

Now, I think I have shown that Manitoba suffers very greatly from this high protection, and I had hoped that the hon. Finance Minister would see fit to adopt a special Tariff in order to relieve the people of that country from some of their burdens. A good deal has been said here in the way of comparison between American and Canadian manufactured articles. I do not wish to run down Canadian manufactures, but I think the effect of this higher protection is that Canadian manufacturers are producing an inferior article to what they would if they had outside competition. An hon. member of this House from British Columbia stated to me the other night, that even the Chinamen in British Columbia, who could not read or write, would select American manufactured goods, even at a higher price, in preference to those manufactured in Canada. One article that the Chinamen use out there, is long rubber boots, and he stated a Chinaman would pay \$10 for the American make when he would not give \$8 for the Canadian ; and he said the same thing was true with regard to shovels. Now, while I believe it is right to build up our manufacturing industries in

Canada, I do not think they should be protected to such an extent as to compel Canadians to buy inferior goods. I think a reasonable revenue Tariff ought to be sufficient, and I hope and trust that ere long the present high protection will give place to such, for the North-West will welcome the day when the Tariff is reduced. The hon. member for East Hastings stated that machines that were sold formerly for \$100 were now sold for \$15 less; and he went on to state that these machines were 300 pounds lighter. I do not see why a machine, which is 300 pounds lighter than it was, should not be manufactured for less money than it was before. I think we ought to manufacture goods to-day cheaper than we did five or ten years ago. There is no reason why a machine which was sold for \$100 ten years ago should not be sold to-day for \$75, and I do not think it is a fair comparison to contrast the prices at which machinery was bought in Ontario previous to the high Tariff with the prices of to-day, because, as any person who understands the manufacturing of these implements knows, there is more profit in selling machines at \$75 to-day than there was ten years ago at \$100.

Mr. TEMPLE. I should like to say a few words on the National Policy; but before entering on the subject, I feel called upon to pay a deserved tribute to the memory of the gentleman who preceded me, and who sat in this House for a number of years, Mr. John Pickard, a gentleman who was, I think highly respected by both sides of the House, and who was loved and respected by his country and by the county which he had the honour to represent, and which to-day I have the honour of representing. That gentleman ran his election in 1882, when the National Policy was the chief issue and was returned by a majority of 917 over his opponent, the Hon. John Fraser. He, to the great regret of all, passed away, and on the 29th January, 1884, I ran the election in that county; and as is well known to this House, I replaced Mr. Pickard's majority and had 178 besides over my opponent, which made a difference of over 1,100 votes in favor of the Government, and this was run under the National Policy. I merely state this to show the growth of the feeling that exists in our section of the country, and the difference now compared with what existed when the National Policy was introduced. So much has been heard for the last three or four months about the taxation under the National Policy, that this cry of taxation has been ringing in my ears ever since; but, as far as I can see, we hear nothing of it in our part of the country, except from politicians, during the elections. The whole cry seems to be in Ontario and in the west. Far and wide it is asserted that this policy means ruin and desolation to the country and nothing else; but as far as my county is concerned, it was never in a better condition than it is at present. That is my experience, and it is that of the people, or I would not be here to-day. One of the richest men we have in our county, who opposed me in my election, is putting up to-day one of the largest cotton factories there is in this country. From that fact it is impossible to think otherwise than that he cannot be fully convinced of the views he pretended to hold, or he would not have gone to work to put up this factory. A few days before I left home, I had some conversation with that gentleman, and speaking on the question of cotton goods, of which we have heard so much for the last few days, I said: The Americans are now bringing in cotton to Montreal and overflowing the market and underselling our manufacturers, and I asked him what he was going to do. He replied that he did not see any other course than that the Government should put on more duties. Yet this is a gentleman who holds the same views as hon. gentlemen opposite. We have heard a great deal about farming implements, but in Fredericton, we have an establishment for the manufacture of reaping and mowing machines and all kinds of farming implements; and

Mr. WATSON.

the gentlemen who own that factory have greatly enlarged their business since the National Policy was introduced. Although previously they had an immense business, still since that time they have more than doubled the capacity of their establishment, and yet are unable to supply the demand. One of those gentlemen is now a member of our Local House and is the gentleman who, in one of his speeches against me during the canvas, said the tree had not yet grown to make a chair to hold a Tory in at Ottawa. I never knew I was a Tory before. We have another establishment, the head of which happens to be a good Conservative; and in this connection I may say that one thing has occurred to me since I have been here—that is, that hon. gentlemen opposite, judging from their despondency and their discouraging views, must have a bad case. I cannot find any other reason for their despondency and gloom. The hon. gentleman to whom I refer has an establishment in the parish of St. Mary's, opposite Fredericton, in which he makes hames and other articles for the lumber trade; and during the last year he has more than doubled the capacity of his factory, without yet being able to begin to make enough goods to supply the wants of the country. He sends his articles as far as Winnipeg, and receives orders from Toronto and all over the country. I mention these instances to show the improvement that exists in trade to-day, owing to the introduction of the National Policy in our section of the country. I cannot understand this overproduction, about which we hear so much. In our section, the factories cannot supply the demands and have to enlarge their capacity every year. I have not heard anyone speaking especially in reference to the Eastern Provinces, but I know our people are well contented with the National Policy and the general policy of the Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness.) Mr. Speaker, it appears to me you have listened to representatives from all the Provinces of the Dominion, and from all sections of all the Provinces of the Dominion, and I feel that it is about time you would hear some person from the old Province of Cape Breton. At this late hour, it would be painful to you, Sir, and not very pleasant to myself, to detain you very much longer in your present position, so it is my intention to be as brief as possible. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure, I may say, to the discussion of this very important question, and I have taken a very considerable interest in the views expressed, from all points of view. My hon. friend from South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) came boldly forth, and advocated direct taxation as the only course to pursue, in order to raise a revenue to meet the necessities of the country. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the Opposition side, if I understood him, presented his own views, and the views of each one seemed to be very different from the views expressed by every other person; so that I have come to the conclusion that unless they concentrate their ideas and adopt some common policy, it will be absolutely impossible for them to lead any party to power on the so-called Revenue Tariff policy. I entertain views somewhat different from nearly all that were expressed by all parties. I observe that every person in Opposition claims that the consumer pays the duty, and I observe also that a great many on the Government side admit that the consumer pays the duty, and argue from that standpoint. I occupy the position that the producer pays the duty more frequently than the consumer. I have listened, with a great deal of pleasure, to my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Wigle), who has delivered one of the most practical speeches that I have heard delivered in this Parliament, and, before going further, I beg to endorse every word and sentiment that he expressed to this House. It was not only practical, but it was common sense from beginning to end. Now, I would ask—and I regret that my hon. friend from South Middlesex is not in his seat, because he represents a

fine agricultural county, like myself—I would like to ask him, when he is exporting barley to the United States, on which they impose a duty of 15 cents, who pays the duty in that case? He will say, true to his idea of the policy, that it is the consumer in the United States who pays it, but I differ with him. He will find by experience, if he will attempt to place his barley in the American market, that he will pay every cent of that 15 cents duty on his barley. Let him try barley malt, on which they impose a duty of 20 cents a bushel, and he will find, just as surely as he tries the experiment, that the producer in that case will pay every cent of duty that is imposed in the United States. Let him try peas, beans, and other articles on which they impose a duty of 10 cents a bushel, and he will find that he, as exporter from this Dominion into the United States, will pay all the duty, and the American consumer will pay not one cent. Let him try his wheat, and he will find that the producer in Canada will pay every cent of the duty. Let him try butter. If butter is sold on the American side for 25 cents a pound, and on the Canadian side for 25 cents a pound as well, how can he place butter at any profit on the American market, when he has to pay 4 cents duty on it to get there.

An hon. MEMBER. It does not get there at all.

Mr. CAMERON. It does not get there at all, I admit; but, if it does get there at all, the producer in Canada would pay the duty. There are some circumstances which will compel the Canadian producer to send his butter to the United States, even at 4 cents a pound loss, and it is not only to the United States he is compelled to do so. When he has a large quantity on hand, he must sell short to meet bills, and take as much for his butter as he can obtain for it in the markets of the world. Let him try any other article produced by the farmers of this country, and exported to the American market, and every practical farmer in this Dominion must admit that the producer will pay the duty. But the Free Trader says, and with some reason: "Oh, it is all true; when we export to a foreign market, it is true we pay the duty." That seems to be the position taken by all the Free Traders. Well, it is a bad rule that does not cut both ways. If the American exporters find a necessity for exporting their goods into Canada, is it not equally reasonable that they pay the duty? But this reasoning is met in this way. When we import from the United States we pay the duty; and, when we export to the United States, we pay such duty as they impose on such goods as we export; but it is not the case at all. Practically, now, the producers or the middlemen are the importers into foreign countries. For the last twenty-five years, business transactions made as great a revolution as did the slow coaches in former days, when transposed into the iron horse. In former days, we did import goods from foreign countries. Nowadays, the goods of foreign countries are placed in our market by the producers or the middlemen from those countries, in the same way exactly as if the producers or the middlemen in foreign countries transposed themselves into importers into our country. Down by the sea, years ago, we have been taught by experience, that whatever duty the Americans imposed upon goods exported by us, we invariably paid the duty. We tried to export potatoes there; we were met by a 15 cents per bushel tariff, and no farmer in the Province of Nova Scotia, or even in Cape Breton, will ever deny that he, when he reaches the American market, pays all the duty imposed. It is the same with horses and cattle and all the products of the farm, that we are obliged to export to the United States. There is another matter in which we take great interest in the Maritime Provinces, particularly in Cape Breton, and that is the article of coal. We had been shipping coal to the United States under a Tariff of \$1.25 a ton, and the

result was that the carriers and the miners were reduced to a starving condition. The cost of raising coal and the cost of shipping it were so great that the whole industry collapsed. The duty was reduced to 75 cents a ton, and even then it was found impossible for our miners to place coal in the American market at any profit, and the result was that during the four years that the late Government was in power, starvation and ruin prevailed in the mining sections. When our coal mines in Nova Scotia are in a state of depression, the agricultural interest suffers to an equal extent. On the Island of Cape Breton, with which I am more familiar, during the four years that the late Government was in power, the farmers were appealed to, and not in vain, to contribute to the maintenance of the starving coal miners of that Island. But since the inauguration of the National Policy, no class of people in the Province of Nova Scotia occupy a more comfortable and a more independent position than do the miners of that Island, and as a consequence, the farmers find a ready market for ready cash for all the products of the soil in eastern Nova Scotia. I have no hesitation in saying, and I say it within the hearing of my constituents, that never in the history of the Island were the farmers, the fishermen and the miners in a more prosperous condition than at present, and I attribute it almost wholly to the National Policy. Another mistake is made by hon. gentlemen belonging to the Opposition in this House. They seem to assume that the whole object of the National Policy is to raise the taxes of the people. In this they make a mistake. The object of the National Policy should be, first, to encourage an increase in the products of the soil, the sea, the mine, the factory and the forest; second, to afford facilities for distributing all these productions; third, to place in the hands of the consumer, at home, all necessary and useful goods at the lowest possible economic value; fourth, to induce our own people to remain in the country; fifth, to convince immigrants from other countries that the Dominion of Canada affords room for the sober and industrious to make homes for themselves and families; and lastly, to secure the best foreign markets for our surplus products. These, in my humble opinion, are the objects of the National Policy, nothing more and nothing less. The better way of encouraging the products of the soil is to secure all the home market for our people, and if we can produce a surplus, then it is our duty to secure the best markets abroad for that surplus, and without so doing we fail in our duty as representatives of the people. Again, it is our duty to encourage the products of the sea. The present Government, I have no hesitation in saying, has taken a step in the right direction. No wiser step has ever been taken by the Government of Canada to encourage an increase in products of the sea than that of giving a bounty to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. It has not only encouraged the fishermen to fish for a certain period of time, but it has encouraged them to pay greater attention to the fishing, which will add to their success. By the adoption of that wise policy, we now find that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces have learned that great attention is absolutely necessary to insure a large product from the sea. The policy adopted by this Government has largely tended to encourage them in that direction, and the result is a very large increase in the products of the sea. Again, the Government have wisely and well encouraged the increase of the products of the mine, of the products of the factory, and of the forest, and in this way they have fulfilled the great object of the National Policy. I observe that many hon. gentlemen in the Opposition complain that there is a great deal of emigration from Canada to the United States. To my mind, that only proves that we have not gone far enough.

Mr. BLAKE. We are going further.

Mr. CAMERON. I am glad to see the leader of the Opposition smile. If he could only show me that our emigrants go across to Free Trade England, then his argument would have some force; but when we find that they are going into a country where the industries are more protected than in Canada, to my mind that is an argument in the direction of affording greater protection to the industries of Canada, as they have done in the United States. But when we hear complaints that there is a tide of emigration from certain counties and certain sections of the Dominion, I think it behoves the Government to enquire the reason, for it may be that the evil may be remedied. One of the reasons for this emigration from certain localities in the great Province of Ontario, so far as I could learn from statements in this House, is the fact that they have not facilities for distributing the products of those localities. If there is anything calculated to drive the population from a section of country, it is want of facilities in distributing the produce of that section; and the reason they go to the United States is, that they find in that country greater facilities for distributing the products of the mine, the soil and factory. If you glance at the map of the United States, you see a net work of railways.

Mr. BLAKE. So you will in Ontario.

Mr. CAMERON. Unfortunately you will not in Cape Breton; and in Ontario you will find that in those sections where they have facilities for distribution, there is much less emigration to the United States than from those sections in which they have not those facilities. Now, I wish to say a few words in answer to my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of War, who has now the honour of representing the county of Digby (Mr. Vail). That hon. gentleman said we were promised, in Nova Scotia, before Confederation, that the tax would not be increased beyond 15 per cent. I fail to see what connection this question can have with the National Policy. He has shown also, by some extraordinary calculation, that while we paid \$1,200,000 as Customs duties in Nova Scotia prior to Confederation, on a large import, at the present time we pay a very much larger sum on a small import. This again does not prove anything against the National Policy. But the hon. gentleman is like all free traders. If the free trader is allowed to argue against Protection, he is sure to convince every intelligent business man that his theories are not practically correct. He is sure to appeal to the prejudices of the masses against the "bloated monopolists," to dilate on "legalized robbery," and to shed a tear over the miseries of the poor man who pays the taxes. But before concluding, he is sure to expose the fallacy of his reasoning by reference to practical results. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) has, like all his predecessors, fallen into his own trap. After referring to the iniquitous effects of the National Policy, he said:

"The great object of the protective policy was to assist our struggling industries. Well, I cannot see, for my own part, that the struggling industries have been helped in the slightest degree. It is true, that the protective policy has led to increased manufactures in some parts, and there are more running now than in 1878, but I think, when we find that the cotton stocks, for instance—and that industry was to be more benefited than any other industry by this policy—are worth now about 50 per cent. of the par value; and they were, even under the old trade policy of the Government of the member for East York, over par, or at least from 80 to par, that it will be easily seen that the cotton industry has not been very much benefited. While on that question, I would refer to a remark made by the member for Cardwell in regard to the prices for cotton. I think it was unfair on the part of that hon. gentleman to compare the prices in the United States with the prices in the Dominion last year. Everyone knows that last year there was a surplus quantity of cotton lying in the manufactories in this country, and that in the Maritime Provinces the agents were very numerous and were offering to sell cotton goods, delivered last autumn, and consider them as being delivered the spring of this year, in order to get them off their hands; and the consequence was, of course, that the over-production and the quantity they had on hand made a competition which reduced the value of cotton very much lower, and it was therefore an unfair thing to take the price last year and compare it with the price in the United States."

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

In this way when arguing this question of Free Trade, all persons who advocate Free Trade must admit that competition will bring down the prices of all goods manufactured in this country. They must come to the conclusion, as does every sensible man in the Dominion, that demand and supply will always regulate the prices of all goods and place them within the power of the consumer to buy. That being the case, the policy of the Government has been to increase the product of the soil, of the sea, of the factory and of the forest, and by increasing those products it has placed in the hands of the consumers of the Dominion those articles at the lowest possible value. The National Policy, besides encouraging competition at home, has not discouraged the importation of goods from foreign countries. It has not built a Chinese wall which prevents competitors from abroad coming into Canada and competing with the factories at home; and the result is that by the sharp competition which is going on between home manufacturers and manufacturers abroad, goods of all classes are now placed in the hands of consumers at lower prices than they ever were previously known to be in the history of Canada. This is our experience in Cape Breton, and I have not the slightest doubt that every person who will examine this question carefully and look at the practical results of the National Policy, must come to the conclusion that it has the same effect in every section of the Dominion.

Mr. KIRK. It is not my intention to occupy much of the time of the House, at this late hour of the night, and at this late stage of the debate. The question of Free Trade and Protection, or revenue tariff policy and protective policy, has been so fully discussed that I feel that it is not necessary for me to say much upon it. I would not have risen now to say a word, were it not for a remark which fell from the lips of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whom I am glad to see in his place, on the occasion of his making an hour's speech, which if it did not instruct the House, amused it. That hon. gentleman, speaking in justification, I take it, of his vote on the Pacific Railway question, that is for granting \$30,000,000 to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build the railway round the north shore of Lake Superior, stated that the people of Manitoba and the North-West, when they came down to Canada, must feel they came into a foreign country, because they had travelled such a long distance through United States Territory. The hon. gentleman also said that such was the way he and other Nova Scotians felt when they came up here, because we had to travel a long distance through United States Territory. I will read what the hon. gentleman said on that occasion:

"To get to that North-West, you have to travel 1,100 miles through a foreign country. A man from the North-West, coming down to Canada, travelling through the United States, feels, when he reaches here, that he is in almost a foreign country. I know how it was with us in the Maritime Provinces, before we had direct communication with this part of Canada, in the winter. I know that when we came up here to attend Parliament we had to go first to New York or Boston, and there take the railways to get here, and when we came here we felt almost we were in a foreign country. Not until the Intercolonial Railway was opened, and we had direct communication with the western part of Canada by that railway, did we begin to feel that we were part and parcel with this great Canadian people."

There was a feeling of that kind in the bosoms of the greater proportion of the people of Nova Scotia when they came up here. But I deny *in toto* that this feeling existed in consequence of having to travel through United States territory. I will remind the hon. gentleman why it was that the people of Nova Scotia had that feeling, and in doing so I will take the liberty of reading some choice extracts of speeches which the hon. gentleman himself delivered in the Legislature of Nova Scotia on the question of Confederation, and then I will leave the House to judge whether it was because of travelling through United States territory, the people of Nova Scotia felt they were coming to a foreign country

when they came here. In the *Nova Scotia Debates*, 1866, page 277, I find the hon. gentleman, in a speech, said this—

Mr. PAINT. What has this to do with the subject?

Mr. KIRK. I find that the hon. gentleman in his speech said:

"I oppose this proposition because I believe it wrong in itself; because territorially situated as we are, it will tend to destroy the harmony and good feeling existing among these Provinces, by bringing into conflict their diversified interests; that it will retard the prosperity of this Province, by imposing upon us heavy financial burthens; that it will weaken our connections with the Mother Country and our means of defence, by rendering the people less attached to their form of Government, and ultimately carry us into the arms of the Great Republic."

The hon. gentleman tried, indeed, to scare the people after we became united with Canada, by saying that they would surely fall into the hands of the Republic, and it is no wonder that he was afraid in travelling through the United States. Now, in the same *Debates* of 1867, after Confederation was carried, on page 27 of the report, I find the hon. gentleman making use of this language:

"We are so situated that a gunboat can shell almost any part of our territory, and not only the treasures of coal and minerals we have within, call for protection, but our commerce, without; our ships on every sea demand it; and yet this scheme which is being forced upon us will leave us only to the protection of Canada. What! leave us only under the protection of Canada? What absurdity. Why, Sir, it could not protect one of our potato shallops. Put one in the harbour and bring to its protection the whole navy of Canada, and there is hardly a fifth rate naval power in the world but would consider it a light task to take possession of the boat and perhaps pelt its defenders to death with the cargo. And then as to the protection of our fisheries against the Americans—it is simply preposterous. They could not prevent a smoked herring in Digby, much less a live codfish or a school of mackerel, sporting along our coast."

Is it any wonder the hon. gentleman was afraid to come to Canada. He felt he was coming into a strange country when he was coming here, and though he did not then have to travel over an American line to get here, he knew how he would feel when he arrived. The hon. gentleman went to the polls in 1867, after making this speech. He made some speeches before the people, and he led them to believe that their burdens would be enormously increased, that the people of Nova Scotia would be unduly taxed in proportion to other parts of the Dominion, and though I have not a report of the speech delivered by himself, I have a letter from a correspondent in his own county, which the hon. gentleman has never answered. The hon. gentleman was running an election, in 1867, and he was elected by a large majority. He was an opponent of Confederation, and the opposition candidate was Mr. A. G. Archibald, a gentleman who had strongly advocated Confederation. The correspondent says, addressing the hon. gentleman:

"Why did you, at a meeting in your own village, when answering A. G. Archibald, draw a map on the wall to show that the proposed Confederation would comprise a 'narrow strip of land,' and that Nova Scotia was at the extreme end and had no natural relationship with the Upper Provinces? Why did you tell us that if we were confederated that we would have to buy largely of Ontario and sell her people nothing in return? Why did you tell us that Ontario would send us her beef, butter, cheese, and all kinds of manufactured goods and take little or nothing from us except the 'hard cash,' and get that as we could?"

I think that statement is pretty nearly correct. Ontario sends us her beef, her manufactured goods, everything she raises, and she takes little or nothing back but hard cash. The correspondent goes on to say:

"Why did you repeat to us, a thousand times, that the raising of our Tariff from 10 per cent. to 15 per cent. would entail upon us a taxation grievous to be borne, and by adroit calculations proved what the additional burden would be to each of us individually? You told us, too, that our revenues were to be taken from us to enlarge the canals of Upper Canada. You told us also that Quebec would rule the Confederation; Quebec, the ignorant, the priest-ridden Province, that spoke a foreign tongue, would make our laws. When you were told that this could not happen, for the Maritime Provinces would combine with Ontario and hold Quebec in check, you said, 'No; the Tories of the Maritime Provinces will bid for the French vote and the Bleus of Quebec will rule us.'"

100

The hon. gentleman was elected, as I have said, in 1867, and he came here a rabid anti-Confederate, and repeal of the Union was his war cry. He never could submit to such a confederation as had been forced upon us. He said that we had been dragged into the Union against our will, and that therefore he would oppose it and obtain its repeal if possible. But more than that, he charged those who advocated Confederation with corrupt motives. I will read some of his remarks on that point. He said:

"The member for Inverness says all the lawyers—all the leading statesmen—all the professed politicians favour the scheme, and therefore the strong inference is that it is right. I beg to differ with him in his conclusion. When the professional politicians of a country—the men who make a living by politics—agree upon any measure, I cannot regard it as evidence that it will be beneficial to their country. The simple fact that it is to improve the position of those of them who may be successful, may make them unanimous in supporting it, and comparing the list of salaries in Canada with those in Nova Scotia, we find so great a difference that it is not impossible but it has influence here. Let me mention a few of the salaries on that list.

	Canada.	Nova Scotia.
Attorney-General, East and West.....	\$10,000	\$2,000
Solicitor-General do .....	6,000	800
Contingencies do .....	3,800	000
Provincial Secretary .....	5,000	2,800

From this comparison we might, if so disposed, draw the inference that the unanimity of our professional politicians arises from the fact that Confederation will give them very much larger salaries."

These are the motives he attributed to those gentlemen, who are called to-day the fathers of the Confederation. But had he no motives when, after coming here pledged to obtain a repeal of the Union, he joined with the leading politician whom he had always bitterly opposed, a man whom he felt it would be a contamination to join, a man whom he had described as one who had a pair of false hands in his pockets while with his own hands he was picking other people's pockets, a man whom he had charged with being a high priest of corruption. What was it influenced the hon. gentleman in coming under the very wings of this high priest of corruption? Have we not some reason to suspect that the influences which he charged against those gentlemen who supported Confederation were those which induced him to join with an hon. gentleman whom he had so often reviled on the public platform, as the leading corruptionist in Nova Scotia. Now, Sir, although so much has been said on the question of Free Trade and Protection, while I am on my feet I think I should say a few words on that subject. The policy of Protection was forced upon us, on the ground that it would foster all the industries of this country. Well, I can point out one of the greatest manufacturing industries of the Maritime Provinces that it has not fostered, but absolutely injured, that is, the shipping industry. I remember very well that in 1874, when the Minister of Finance of that day proposed to increase the Tariff from 15 to 17½ per cent., the present Minister of Railways, then as now the member for Cumberland, opposed the proposition, on the ground that it would have the effect of closing down thousands of shipyards in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. FARROW. How many are there?

Mr. KIRK. Well, that question was asked the hon. member for Cumberland at the time he made the statement, and he was told that there were not even hundreds, much less thousands. Well, he said it was going to close them all. But it did not close them all then, and it has not closed them yet, although it came pretty near doing so. The hon. member for Cumberland declared then that the effect of an increase in the Tariff would be the same as it was in the United States, where he pointed out it had had the effect of sweeping the American flag off the ocean. I took the trouble of looking into the condition of the shipping of the United States at that time, and I found that when the United States adopted a protective policy, they had a tonnage of about 6,000,000 afloat on the ocean. To-day they have not 2,000,000. That was the effect of their protective policy, and that was what the hon. member for Cumberland said would be the effect

of such a policy as was then introduced by the Minister of Finance. And what do you suppose the Minister of Finance proposed to do at that time. Simply to place a duty of 10 per cent. on materials entering into ship-building, which were then free. The hon. member for Cumberland declared that the effect of that would be to close down hundreds of ship-yards and to destroy the industry altogether. It had not that effect; but I will show what effect it had. Although the Minister of Finance proposed to fix the duty at 10 per cent., the representations of his friends in the House induced him to lower it to 5 per cent. Now, I find, on looking at the Blue Books, that under that policy we built 188,098 tons of shipping in 1875, 165,041 tons in 1876, 127,291 tons in 1877, and 126,160 in 1878, or a total in the four years of 606,596 tons. That was a very large amount, and its value, at \$21 a ton, the price at which ships were sold at that time, was about \$12,675,616. Now, let us see what the ship-building amounted to since the adoption of the National Policy. I leave out the year 1879, because both policies extended to that year. In 1880 we built 68,756 tons; in 1881, 79,364 tons; in 1882, 68,240 tons, and in 1883, 73,576 tons, or a total, in the four years, of 289,936 tons, or less by 313,660 tons than the quantity built in the four years immediately preceding under the previous policy. In other words, we had more than twice as much ship-building in the four years previous to the adoption of this taxation policy than we had in the four years since. The annual average decreased ship-building during the last four years was 79,162 tons. Now, Sir, we have heard hon. members here talking of the number of additional men who have been employed in the country, in consequence of fostering our manufacturing and coal industries; but we have heard nothing of the men who have been thrown out of employment in consequence of the destruction of the ship-building interest. Now, I do not know and I do not think any man knows the number of extra hands that have been employed since the adoption of the National Policy, in consequence of the increased number of manufactures that have been established. I do know the number of men and boys who have been employed in the coal mines, more than were employed previously.

**Mr. PAINT.** The hon. member knows very well that ship-building has doubled in his own county during the last two years.

**Mr. KIRK.** If the hon. gentleman wishes to reply to me, he will have an opportunity after I have finished; but I know nothing of the kind, and even if the ship-building had increased in my county, it would be no proof that the National Policy caused it. In 1878 the number of hands employed in the coal mines of Nova Scotia was 3,135 men and boys, including mechanics, both over the ground and under the ground; while in 1882 there were 4,235 employed all told—mechanics and miners, both men and boys. That is a very small increase; yet the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), told us that the fact of so many more men being employed in the coal mines of Cape Breton has given an impetus to agriculture and to every other industry in the Island, whereas the fact is, that very little more than 1,000 additional men have been employed in the coal industry in the whole Province of Nova Scotia.

**Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).** I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how many men were employed in vessels exporting five or six hundred thousand tons more of coal than was exported in 1877-78.

**Mr. KIRK.** Just as many men as could carry away the coal that was raised by the extra thousand men, and that would not employ a great many. As I said, I do not know how many extra men have been employed in manufactures, but I do not believe there were half as many as has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us see how many

**Mr. KIRK.**

have been thrown out of employment in consequence of the falling off in the ship-building industry. I have said that there was an average annual decrease of ships built in the four last years of 79,162 tons, or there were 396 vessels less built, of an average of 200 tons. Now the building of each of these ships would employ ten men, and the sailing of 396 ships would employ 3,960 men more, so that there was that many at least thrown out of employment by this falling off in the ship-building industry. In the Dominion of Canada build ships to sail not so much to sell; now, how many we sailors would be required to run those ships? Allowing ten men to each ship of 200 tons, that would show that 3,960 men had lost employment as sailors in one year, in consequence of the National Policy. Since the introduction of this taxation policy, we find that employment has diminished for ship builders and sailors to the extent of 23,760 men; or, in other words, had the shipping trade been as prosperous during the last four years as it was previously, that number would have been employed in the country. This is how the National Policy has affected the ship building interest of the Dominion. But they may say that is not true. The hon. Finance Minister has said: We gave them drawbacks equal to the amount of duty. We are giving them now bounties, as the United States Government did; but though the United States gave their ship-builders drawbacks and bounties equal to the amount of duties imposed, yet their protective policy has driven their flag from the ocean; our policy has had the very same effect in this Dominion. If we take the value of those ships, as an item of import and an item of manufacture, and they are worthy to be considered in that light, we find that in 1878 we sold and exported \$1,236,145 worth of ships. That is a pretty nice exportation. How many did we export last year? Just \$506,538 worth; or we exported in 1878, more than in 1883, \$729,607 worth. Yet we are told we are fostering all the manufacturing interests of this country. This is one, at least, we have not fostered. It is one we have destroyed, and it is an industry peculiar to the Maritime Provinces. I want to know what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has to say about it, for I believe he has an interest in shipping. But the hon. gentlemen opposite say that in Nova Scotia a large number of men are employed in the coal mines, but after all the number has increased by only 1,100 men and boys. I am ready to admit that the duty placed on coal was some benefit to the coal mines; it was a benefit to this extent, that it kept out the coal that came from the Old Country, and replaced that by ours. It has had that effect and no more; and that quantity has been placed by Mr. Lithgow, in his letter, read to the House the other day by the hon. member for Digby, at 100,000 tons. That the coal mining industry is in a prosperous condition, there can be no question. Cape Breton is in a prosperous condition. Why so? The manner of doing business is changing every year and during the last few years it has changed very materially; and ships now sailing between Europe and America, instead of taking full supplies of bunker coal when they leave port, manage to take only small supplies, and then call at Sydney and take in a further supply there. In this way, the Cape Breton mines are largely benefited. There are other reasons of importance altogether outside of the National Policy that explain this prosperity. When I first came to this Parliament, in 1874, I came, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said, through a portion of the United States, and I found the railways we passed over at that time burned nothing but wood. The Inter-colonial, when it was first opened and for years afterward, burned scarcely anything but wood, but to-day nearly all the railways use coal exclusively. People in their houses use more coal than they used to formerly; the farmers and people in villages and in towns also consume more, and the result is that the miners sell more coal and receive greater

benefit thereby than in former days. I do not believe the hon. member for Inverness pretends to say that they get a greater price for their coal, for they do not by any means; and I know that the miners would have been benefited in this way even had the National Policy never existed, though I do not believe such a policy should be dignified by such a name as the National Policy. There are other mining industries in the Dominion of Canada besides coal, which, I am sure, the National Policy has not improved. Take the gold mining industry, a very important industry in Nova Scotia, which employs a great number of men, though not so many as are employed in the coal industry. How does the Tariff affect the gold miners? Will any one tell me that the gold miners are not injured by the National Policy? I say they are. Everyone knows that gold is found in this country in quartz, in hard rocks, and it takes a great deal of labour and material to extract it. Powder and dynamite are used to a very large extent, and the increased duty placed on powder itself affects the gold miner very seriously. The effect of the increased duty on powder was to raise the price 50 cents on a keg of 25 pounds, or \$2 per hundred, which is a serious item in this industry. Then it had the effect of increasing the price of steel, and iron, and machinery, and everything the gold miner uses. A very intelligent gentleman, who was managing a mine in Nova Scotia a year ago, informed me that he had made a minute calculation, and he ascertained that the additional duty placed on mining material cost his company 4 cents for every hole they made and every shot they discharged in loosening the rock, in order to obtain the gold. That is a very heavy tax, and you tell me the mining industry has been benefited in consequence of this taxation policy. I say no, it has been seriously injured. But we are told the farmer is benefited. Now, I do not concede that the farmer is benefited in the slightest degree, but he is very materially injured by the National Policy. The agricultural interest in this country is the largest industry in the Dominion. Although it is the largest, and perhaps as profitable as any, yet there are not more than half the farmers of this Dominion who raise wheat enough for their own families, much less to sell. Take the four Eastern Provinces, and the farmers there do not raise enough flour for their own family use, much less to sell. Therefore, I maintain that the policy which places a duty on wheat does not benefit the man who has none to sell. But if he has to buy, and the policy increases the price of wheat and flour, it affects him injuriously. I am not prepared to say whether it increases the price of wheat or flour, or not. I see hon. gentlemen in this House differ on that point, hon. gentlemen supporting the National Policy differ. One says it increases the price, and others say that it does not. My impression is that it does increase the price of wheat and the price of flour. A Committee was appointed here in 1882 for the purpose of enquiring into the effect of the National Policy upon the agricultural interest, and it took, I suppose, a great deal of pains to ascertain the effect. At any rate, after compiling a great many figures, and making a great many calculations, they came to the conclusion that the effect it had had, during the years it was in operation, was to increase the price of spring wheat  $10\frac{1}{2}$  cents per bushel. That is the report of the Committee of which my hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) was the chairman. If that is correct, it increases the price of the wheat that goes to make a barrel of flour—that is four and a-half bushels, as I understand—45 cents, or a little over, per barrel. If it increases the price of wheat that much, although I scarcely believe it does, though we must accept it as a fact, when the hon. gentleman says so, then, after it is made into flour, it has to compete with flour coming from the United States, upon which 50 cents is paid. Therefore, I maintain that the argument which will prove that the wheat itself is increased in value to the extent of  $10\frac{1}{2}$  cents per bushel, will prove

that it will increase the price of the flour after it is put into the barrel. Therefore, we have the barrel of flour, consumed by the farmers as well as other classes of the community, increased more than 45 cents, more than 50 cents, and perhaps more than 60 cents. Now, we have the fishermen, and it is claimed that the fishermen are greatly benefited in consequence of the bounty that has been given. It has been said that, in consequence of this bounty, ship-builders have gone more largely into ship-building than before. Have they? In 1881, there were 79,364 tons; in 1882, 68,240 tons; and last year, only 71,576 tons, and those ships were built without the knowledge of the fact that a bounty was to be given. Therefore, I maintain that the bounty has had yet no effect whatever in increasing the tonnage of shipping, nor had it anything to do at all with the fact that more ships went into the business of fishing last year than the previous year. The reason why more shipping was employed last year in the prosecution of the bank fisheries was, that those who engaged it in the year previous had made a good thing of it. It was a prosperous season, and I am glad to know that last year, too, was a prosperous season, and that is the reason why, in the counties of Cape Breton, the people are so well off this year; not because there was so much more done in mining, but because the fishermen have done so well, and from the fact that the farmers had good crops, thus making good times in Cape Breton. I have no doubt that the increased output of coal had some effect also, but it has no right to the credit of the whole of the good times in Cape Breton. But we are told that the fishermen get a bounty, and therefore they have no reason to complain. The fishermen, it is true, did receive a bounty last year, but they received only that which was their right to receive. They did not receive the bounty in lieu of the increased taxation placed upon them, but in lieu of the money received by the Fishery Award; and I maintain that the fishermen of this Dominion did not receive full justice when they only received \$150,000. They ought to receive \$200,000 per year; that is their proper right, the interest at 5 per cent. on \$4,000,000. Why should they not receive it all? If they are entitled to \$150,000, if they are entitled to a portion, they are entitled to the whole, and why do they not get the whole? But what is the use of giving it to them with one hand if you take it from them with the other? Last year the Tariff was increased; increased duties were placed upon the material which the fishermen used. The duties were doubled on cordage and on cotton duck. It is true that a provision was made that a drawback should be given to fishermen for cotton duck used in boat sails. I have asked for a return, some time ago, which has not yet been brought down, to ascertain what amount was paid back to fishermen for this drawback. I do not believe there was any paid back to fishermen. If there was any benefit obtained by this drawback, it was obtained by the importer, and not by the fishermen at all. I pointed out that that would be the effect of it when the measure was before the House, and I am of opinion now that it has been the effect; but this we will see when the return I asked for comes down. A manufacturer's agent told me last fall that it was such a trifling matter that the importers took no account of it, and the fishermen had to pay the whole of the duty just the same, because the wholesale dealers would not be bothered keeping the accounts. I find the increased duty on cordage is very great. In 1878 the duty on cordage was a little over \$3,000; last year it was over \$25,000. This is paid by fishermen. This is the way the fishing industry is fostered. They give a bounty with one hand of that money which is their due, and they take it out of their pockets with the other—money which does not belong to the Dominion, but which the Dominion takes from them. We are told that there is a very large immigration

going on to the North-West, that there is a large immigration to this country, and it is denied that any of our people are leaving this country for the United States. If I am not mistaken, I have heard the hon. member for Inverness, in a speech he made some time ago, say the people of his county were going away to the United States, and he advocated the building of a road to the North-West on the ground that it would give these people a chance to go to the North-West instead of to the United States. Well, Sir, the young people are leaving and we cannot keep them at home.

Mr. DALY. They are coming back, too.

Mr. KIRK. Some of them are coming back, but if the hon. gentleman lived in the country as I do, he would find that they are only coming back to visit their friends, to return again. I scarcely ever saw a young man or woman who stayed a year or two in the United States, come back here to remain.

Mr. DALY. I have seen a great many.

Mr. KIRK. Probably you have, but that is not my experience. I know that the young men and the young women in the country are leaving their parents and going to the United States just as fast as they grow up. I am speaking of my own county—I do not know how it is with the rest of the Dominion, but I believe it is the same all over Nova Scotia, at any rate. In the municipality to which I belong, since the National Policy was adopted, the decrease in the taxable population in 1880-81 has been 17 per cent. What became of these people? Did they go to the North-West? Not one of them; everyone of them went to the United States. In the face of this fact, we all know that it is not true that our people are not emigrating; while it is true that our people are going to the United States—going almost every day. Some of them are coming back, it is true, but not to stay. Now, with regard to the money in the savings banks. I do not know how it is throughout the Dominion, but in my own municipality, more than half the money deposited in the savings bank is sent home by young men and women who have gone to the United States. They mean to come back, perhaps, but they will take their money away with them again. It is not earned in this country; it is earned in the United States, by persons who send it home to their friends to deposit it in the bank for them. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said the leader of the Opposition went down to Nova Scotia and advised the people to trade with the United States. Well, I think I can point to other gentlemen who belonged to Nova Scotia and who advised the people to trade with the United States, long before the leader of the Opposition was in Nova Scotia. I think I can remember when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was a humble follower of the late lamented Hon. Joseph Howe, that he was ready to clap and cheer him at every word he uttered, and when Mr. Howe advised the people of Nova Scotia to trade with the United States, when he pointed to the fact that the United States were our natural customers and we never could, under any circumstances, do a profitable trade with Canada, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries still remained an abject follower. Now let me read a short extract from the speech delivered by the late Hon. Joseph Howe, of whom the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was, as I said, an humble follower and an ardent admirer. The Hon. Mr. Howe made a speech in Halifax at which I dare say the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was present, and I will venture to say he did not call any of the statements in question. Mr. Howe said:

“I will not detain you long with the story of the flour duty. I would just ask you, is not flour dear enough now at \$12? But one pays the market price cheerfully, knowing that it is regulated by supply and demand; but when a man is told that he must pay a shilling more to make him eat Canadian flour, how does he feel? Is not the trade in flour with the United States a natural trade? The man with a shallop of

Mr. KIRK.

coal goes to the United States, he wants a freight to return with, and you say to him you shall not bring back flour from the United States, but you must turn your shallop up the St. Lawrence and make a twenty-five or thirty days' voyage to Quebec. A trader can only make two or three trips to Quebec in the course of a whole summer, while he can make twenty to the United States, turning his money over and over again. Yet we try to turn water up hill and try to send our fishermen up the St. Lawrence in search of food.”

And the Minister of Marine and Fisheries cheered him to the echo when he made that speech. And again, referring to trade relations with the United States, in the same speech, Mr. Howe said:

“Our neighbours may have their faults and their misfortunes, but then there are 34,000,000 of them, high spirited and energetic, divided from us by the Bay of Fundy as by a street—they on the one side and we on the other. Where will be our market for coal forever? In the United States. Where will be the market for our grindstones? In the United States. Where will be our market for fish and plaster, and our potatoes? Here are five great staples, and there is our market, and yet these men have been saying and doing everything to irritate and annoy that people. True, that Government did refuse to renew the Reciprocity Treaty, but why? She put discriminating duties upon her canals and raised her import duties.”

Now, Sir, this was the advice of the late Hon. Joseph Howe, and he was cheered to the echo, not only by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but by every other loyal Nova Scotian. Everyone in Nova Scotia knows that the natural market of our people is the United States. They require everything we have to sell, and they are ready to buy everything we have to sell. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has told us that we export more to the United States than we import from that country. Well, if it is true, as the hon. member for Inverness says, that the Americans pay the duty on all the goods we buy from them, why do we not put on a higher Tariff, and make the Americans pay it? The very fact that we do not make the Tariff higher, and make the United States pay it instead of paying it ourselves, I think ought to be proof positive that the duty is paid by ourselves, and that the revenue collected is money paid by the people of Canada. I will not detain the House any longer, and I thank the hon. members for their attention.

Resolution 1, read the second time and concurred in.

Resolution 2, read the second time.

On motion for concurrence,

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House a moment, after the discussion which has taken place in Committee; but I think it right to record my views with respect to the items of crockery and earthenware. I therefore move in amendment thereto, to leave out all the words after “that” and insert the following

The duty of 30 per cent. on common crockery or earthenware is, having regard to the heavy duty paid on packages and breakages, equal to a tax of about 35 per cent., and increases the cost of importing this necessary, over its cost at the potteries, to nearly 90 per cent.; that the duty on china is 25 per cent., and leaves the cost of importing this luxury, over its cost at the potteries, at about 45 per cent., or about one-half the cost of importing crockery.

That the duty of 30 per cent. on common crockery is oppressive and unequal, and that the Resolution be referred back to a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, with power to reduce the proposed duty, so that it may not bear more heavily on the purchaser of crockery or earthenware, than the duty on china bears on the purchaser of china.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Blake,  
Burpee (Sunbury),  
Cartwright,  
Casey,  
Davies,  
Fisher,

Gillmor,  
King,  
Kirk,  
Lauderkin,  
Mills,  
Mulock,

Paterson (Brant),  
Trow,  
Watson,  
Weldon,  
Wilson.—17.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),  
Baker (Missisquoi),  
Baker (Victoria),  
Bell,

Dodd,  
Farrow,  
Guillet,  
Hesson,

Moffat,  
O'Brien,  
Orton,  
Paint,

Baker (Victoria),	Gillet,	Orton,
Bell,	Hesson,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Hickey,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Kaulbach,	Small,
Bourbeau,	Kinney,	Stairs,
Bowell,	Krans,	Taylor,
Cameron (Inverness),	Langevin,	Temple,
Carling,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tilley,
Chapleau,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Daly,	McDougald,	Wigle,
Desjardins,	McLellan,	Williams.—39.

Resolution 2, concurred in.

Resolutions 3 and 4 were severally read the second time and concurred in.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the foregoing Resolutions, with respect to duties of Customs, shall take effect upon and after the 12th of March instant.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, it is not the hon. gentleman's intention to retain the duties he has levied since the first of January on dyed and printed cottons, because if it were his intention he would have to make that duty retroactive, as far as that class is concerned.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is something in that. There has been very little imported, and under the circumstances perhaps, it would be as well to make the refunds.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

# INDEX.

## SECOND SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT, 1884.

Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>o</sup>, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; \*, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adj., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; H., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; Intercol., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Priv. and Elec., Privileges and Elections; Prop., Proposed; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; W. & M., Ways and Means; Wthdn., Withdrawn, Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y., N., Yeas and Nays; Names in italic and parentheses are those of the movers.

### **Abbott, Hon. J. J. C.,** *Argenteuil*

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 291.

De Nederlandsch-Americansche Land Maalschappij (B. 30, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 83.

Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. Lease (B. 32, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 83; M. for Com., 810.

### **Allen, Mr. B.,** *West Grey*

Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) Amt., 1285.

Fishery Act Amt., Pets. praying for, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 299.

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 609.

Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction (B. 70, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 162; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 461.

Owen Sound Dry Dock, Ship-building and Nav. Co. in corp. (B. 45, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 131.

Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.

#### SUPPLY :

*Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.)* 1008.

*Miscellaneous (British Association Meeting)* 1311.

### **Allison, Mr. W. H.,** *Hants*

#### SUPPLY :

*Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) conc.,* 1649.

### **Allison, Mr. D. W.,** *Lennox*

Collector of Customs at Napanee, Appointment of (M. for Papers and Cor.) 208.

#### SUPPLY :

*Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.)* 1225.

### **Amyot, Mr. G.,** *Bellechasse*

Beaumont, Expropriation of (M. for Ret.\*) 1200.

Certificates to Masters and Mates and Seamen's Acts Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1057.

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1102; (Amt.) to Fifth Rep., 1272.

Dominion Arbitrators, Complaints or Pets. of Messrs. Gosselin and Chabot (Louis and Charles) of St. Charles, Bellechasse, presented to (M. for copies\*) 28.

Government Lands in Richelieu Co., Sale of (Ques.) 1109; (M. for Ret.\*) 1126.

Governor General's Commission, &c., on M. for copies, 521.

Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 964.

License Commissioners, Que., furnishing of blank forms, &c. (Ques.) 966.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 938.

**Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.**

- Pilots for and above Harbour of Quebec, Acts respecting (Ques.) 655.
- Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, incorp. (B. 18, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 67; M. to discharge Order referring B. to Sel. Com. on Banking and Commerce and to ref. B. to Com. on Miscellaneous Private Bills, 131.
- St. Charles Branch, Expropriation of Beaumont (M. for Ret.\*) 1200.
- St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1493.
- School of Navigation, Quebec (M. for Cor.) 200.
- Statutes, Dom., Distribution of (Ques.) 797.
- Subsidies to Provinces, Readjustment of, on M. for Cor., 154.
- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1493, 1495; in Com. on B., 1624.
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Government: Marine and Fisheries*, 1467.
- Public Works—Income: Buildings* (Que.) 1193.

**Armstrong, Mr. J., South Middlesex**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 373.
- Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 986.
- Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 690.
- Ways and Means—on conc., 787.

**Auger, Mr. M., Shefford**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 430
- Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 1271.
- Lachine Canal, Wharfingers on (Ques) 1387.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1597.
- Subsidies to Rys. B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 1552.

**Bain, Mr. T., North Wentworth**

- Hunter's Island, Sales of Land or Timber on (Ques.) 1054.
- SUPPLY:
- Immigration: (Salaries, &c.)* 1404, 1407, 1413, 1414, 1418.
- Public Works—Income: Buildings* (Ont.) 1197.
- Quarantine*, 1012.

**Baker, Mr. E. C., Victoria, B. C.**

- A, B, and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 1164.
- Adjournment of the House (m.) 513.
- British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1034; on Amt. (*Mr. Reid*) 1039; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup> of B., 1173.
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Rep. from Com., 494.

**Baker, Mr. E. C.—Continued.**

- Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) M. to adjn. deb., 976; (Ques. of Priv.) 977; on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1282; on M. to adjn. deb., 1285.
- Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. R. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1392; on M. to conc. in Sen Amts., 1652.
- Dominion Employés in B. C. (M. for Stmt.) 514.
- Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1094.
- Emigrant Sheds at Victoria (Ques.) 336.
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, Reimbursements for outlay (M. for O. C.) 514.
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1317.
- Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1235.
- Geological Survey, conc., 1452.
- Government Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 1227.
- Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095.
- Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com. (withdrl. of name from Com.) 208.
- Immigration Agent and Quarantine Officer, Duties and Salary of, Vancouver Island (Ques.) 336; Delay in Appointment (Ques.) 1736.
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1608.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1340.
- Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1233.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1597, 1599.
- Mail Service in B. C. (M. for Ret.) 605.
- Masters and Mates Certificates (M. for Ret.) 606.
- Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 1229.
- Meteorological Observations, in Com. of Sup., 1255.
- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1022.
- Mounted Police for B. C. (Ques.) 336.
- Naval Brigade and Torpedo Corps (Ques.) 285.
- Naval Station at Esquimalt (Ques.) 285; (M. for Ret.) 515.
- Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 928.
- Point Escuminac Breakwater, on M. for Papers (remarks) 515.
- Postmaster for Victoria (M. for Ret.) 605.
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1320.
- Public Works, Agent and Contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1319.
- Public Works, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1198, 1606.
- Publishing Debates, in Com. of Sup., 1340.
- Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1012.
- Rifle Associations, further aid to (Ques.) 285.
- School of Gunnery, Fortifications and Militia (Ques.) 285.
- Schools of Gunnery, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1164.
- Sir James Douglas*, Steamer, Expenditure on (Ms. for Stmt.) 514; Officers and Crew.: Rank, Pay, &c.,

**Baker, Mr. E. C.—Continued.**

514; Repairs, hauling out, and launching, &c. (M. for Cor.\*) 1200.

Steamboat Inspection, 1256.

## SUPPLY:—

*Arts, Agriculture, and Statistics* (Dominion Exhibition) 1094; (Health Statistics) 1095.

*Collection of Revenues*: Excise, 1317; Post Office, 1320; Public Works (Telegraph Lines, B.C.) 1318, (Agent and Contingencies, B.C.) 1319; Weights and Measures and Gas, 1318.

*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1235.

*Geological Survey*: conc., 1452.

*Indians*: Annual Grant (B.C.) 1266; (Printing Vocabularies of Dialects, B.C.) 1608.

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1340.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c.) 1233.

*Militia* (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.) 1164; (Clothing, &c.) 1022.

*Ocean and River Service* (Government Steamers) 1227; (Masters and Mates, Examination of) 1229.

*Public Works—Income*: (Buildings, B.C.) 1198; (Repairs, &c.) 1198. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 1606.

*Quarantine*, 1012.

*Scientific Institutions* (Metereological Observations) 1255.

*Steamboat Inspection*, 1256.

Telegraph Lines, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1318.

**Baker, Mr. G. B., Missisquoi**

Judicial Salaries, Readjustment of (Ques.) 1387.

**Barnard, Mr. F. J., Yale**

Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.

**Beaty, Mr. J. jun., West Toronto**

Battleford and Peace River Ry. Co. See "Souris" below.

Civil Service Board, in Com of Sup., 989.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1579; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1594.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to adjn. deb., 668.

Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 865.

Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of (B. 79, 1<sup>o\*</sup>) 198.

London Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 139) Petition presented, 1290; 1<sup>o\*</sup> of B., 1386; M. to suspend Rule 65, 1511; M. for Com., 1515; in Com., 1516.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 925.

Parkdale Village and G. T. R. legalization of Agreement B. 82 (*Mr. Wallace*) 504.

Private Bills, Petitions for (Ms. to extend time) 40; Presentation of, 162, 1240, 1359.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1114.

Real Estate Loan Co. of Canada (B. 88, 1<sup>o\*</sup>) 285.

San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co. incorp. B. 83 (*Mr. Royal*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 505.

**Beaty, Mr. J., jun.—Continued.**

Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 81, 1<sup>o\*</sup>) 231.

## SUPPLY:

*Civil Government*: Civil Service Board, 989.

*Militia* (Construction and Repairs) 1162.

Toronto Board of Trade and Corn Exchange Association amalg. (B. 14, 1<sup>o\*</sup>) 43.

Traders' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 92, 1<sup>o\*</sup>) 304.

**Béchar, Mr. F., Iberville**

Copyrights Act Amt. (B. 113, 1<sup>o\*</sup>) 655.

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1104.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1597.

St. Césaire Postmaster, Charges against (M. for Ret.\*) 1199.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1558.

**Belleau, Mr. I. N., Lévis**

Address, The (sec.) 6.

Arbitrators, Dom., Claims of Messrs. Dorion and Leclerc, of the Village of Lauzon (M. for copies\*) 88.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1575; in Com., 1626.

**Bell, Mr. J. W., Addington**

Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 80, 1<sup>o\*</sup>) 231; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1176 Rideau Canal Water Supply (M. for Cor.\*) 1200.

**Benson, Mr. W. T., South Grenville**

*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 679.

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois**

Lavallière Bay, Yamaska River, Explorations on (M. for Rep.) 820.

Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 293.

Question of Privilege, inaccurate newspaper correspondence (remarks) 469.

St. Francis River, Explorations on (M. for Rep.) 820.

**Bergin, Mr. D., Stormont and Cornwall**

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1247.

Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1017, 1018.

Civil Service Board, in Com of Sup., 991.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 291; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 667.

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1104; on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) to Fifth Rep., 1272.

McCourt, Daniel, Dismissal of (remarks) 885.

**Bergin, Mr. D.—Continued.**

- Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 67, 1°\*) 162.  
 Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1005.  
 Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Res. (M. to adjn. deb.) 986.  
 Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 819.  
 Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1014–1016.  
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 766.

**SUPPLY:**

- Canals—Income:* Cornwall (Drain between Town and Canal) 1053.  
*Civil Government:* Civil Service Board, 991.  
*Legislation:* Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1005.  
*Militia* (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1017, 1018.  
*Quarantine* (Public Health) 1014–1016.  
 Welland Ry. and G. T. R., Transfer authorization (B. 44, 1°\*) 89; M. for Com., 860; M. to recom., 886.

**Bernier, Mr. M. E., St. Hyacinthe**

- Montreal Drill Shed, Contracts for Rebuilding (Ques.) 966; (M. for copies\*) 1201.  
 St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Erection of (Ques.) 966.

**Billy, Mr. L. A., Rimouski**

- D'Anjou, Joseph, Claim of (Ques.) 798.  
 Lavoie, Geo., Claim of (Ques.) 797.  
 Skiffington, Detective, Action of, against Messrs. Michaud and Dumais of St. Paschal, on M. for copies of Repts., 622.  
 Survey Contract No. 10, Transfer of (M. for Ret.\*) 1201.

**Blake, Hon. E., West Durham**

- Address, on the, 9.  
 Adelaide, Scow, compensation for loss, in Com. of Sup. 1365.  
 Adjournment for Easter (Ques.) 1422.  
 Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 994–997, 1474;  
 Administrator of the Govt. of the N.W.T., on M. for O. C. &c., 518.  
 Adulteration of Food and Drugs Acts Amt. and Consol. B. 109 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. to introd., 598; B. 114, on M. for 2°, 1137; in Com on Res., 1244; on M. for Com. (Ques. of Order) 1244; in Com., 1246, 1294.  
 Agricultural, Industrial, &c., Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095.  
 Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of, on M. for Sel. Com., 74.  
 Agriculture and Immigration, Rep. of Minister (Ques.) 709.  
 Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1337.  
 Allan, W. F., Allowance in lieu of Board, in Com. of Sup., 1381.  
 Allowances to Manufacturers of Goods required by C. P. R. (M. for Cor.) 53.

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Analysts, Public, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1244.  
 Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1088.  
 Armouries, Public, in Com. of Sup., 1344.  
 Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1088, 1091–1094.  
 Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.  
 Banking Facilities for Agriculturists Provision B. 105 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. to introduce (Ques. of Order) 524; on M. (*Mr. Orton*) to conc. in Res., 763.  
 Boucher, de la Bruère, Payment to, for type, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1375.  
 Boundaries between Man. and Ont. (M. for Ret.\*) 88.  
 Bounty on Manufactures of Iron (M. for O. C., &c.) 70.  
 British Association Meeting, in Com. of Sup., 1310.  
 British Columbia, Agreement with, on prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 68; B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1030; in Com. on B., 1138; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3°, 1174.  
 B. N. A. Act, Cases decided under, Publication of, in Com. of Sup., 1378.  
 Canadian Immigration (Ques.) 44.  
 Canals, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1050–1052, 1350–1352; Income, 1053, 1352–1354; conc., 1464.  
 Cariboo County Court Judge, Salary of, on prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 69.  
 Census, in Com. of Sup., 1092.  
 Census, remaining Volume (Ques.) 72, 766.  
 Central Ontario Ry. B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for Com., 1175; in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202.  
 Certificates of Masters and Mates, Refusal of Board of Examiners to grant (Ques.) 1444; non-enforcement of Act (Ques.) 85.  
 Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 830, 831.  
 Chinese Immigration into B. C., on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 977.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 832–837, 1334–1366, 1466, 1468, 1474.  
 Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 1360; in Com. on B., 1388, 1394, 1422.  
 Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 1336; conc., 1459.  
 Coal Lands in the N.W., Sales and Leases (M. for Stmt.\*) 71.  
 Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1058.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1316, 1382.  
 Commercial Treaties, Negotiations of (M. for O.C., &c., touching) 57.  
 Compensation for Injuries on P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1348.  
 Concurrence—Civil Service Board, 1459; Customs, 1456; Dominion Statutes (Consolidation) 1453; Geological Survey, 1452; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 1440; *Jennie Graham* (Schooner) 1461; Mail Subsidies (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1453, (Lakes

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Huron and Superior) 1452; Marchand, L. W. (Professional Services) 1464; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I., 1454; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1459; *St. Andrews* (Schooner) 1461.
- Construction Account, Intercol. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1345.
- Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 294; on non-meeting of Sel. Com., 654; in Com. of W., 818, 819; Mr. Fortin's Vote, on point of Order, 81.
- Cotton, in Com. on W. & M., 696.
- C. P. R., in Com. of Sup., 1047-1049.
- Allowances to Manufacturers of Goods required by (M. for Cor.) 53.
- Contracts made by Co. for construction of any part of line (M. for Address\*) 66.
- Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 71.
- Co.'s Cash Deposit with Govt. (Ques.) 72; as to Deposit of Securities (Ques.) 72.
- Co.'s Steamers from Owen Sound (Ques.) 458
- Cost of (Ques.) 603.
- Further information *re* Construction Co. &c. (Ms.) 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224.
- Guarantee to Co. (Ques.) 72; as to further Reps. on same (Ques.) 72; (M. for copies of Cor., &c.\*) 79.
- Information respecting Guarantee, purchase of Securities, &c., of other Rys., Expenditure and Receipts of Co., &c. (M. for Ret. and Stmnts.\*) 66.
- Information respecting subscribed Stock of Co. (M. for Address\*) 66.
- Lake Superior and Nipissing Divisions, Cost of (Ques.) 458.
- Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res. (reply) 113-131; on Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) 6 m. h., 415; in Com., 454-456; on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Res. to take precedence, 468; respecting further Amts., 503; on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for B. to take precedence, 524; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 525; on M. for Com., 536; on M. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 568; (Amt.) 568.
- Location of (M. for Maps, &c.) 53.
- Modification of arrangement between Co. and Govt. (Ques.) 72.
- Payments on Construction, Contract and Subsidy Accounts (Ques.) 1055.
- Payments or Advances to Co. (M. for O. C., &c.) 1055.
- Payments to Co. on account of Floating Debt (Ques.) 1054.
- Postal Subsidy to (Ques.) 72; (M. for Papers) 79.
- Rumours of inadequacy of arrangements (Ques.) 1273.
- Summit of Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, Cost of (Ques.) 458.
- Tariff of Rates on (Ques.) 79.

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3. (*Mr. Cameron-Huron*) on M. for Com., 279; on M. for Com. to rise' 671.
- Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 289; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 667; on name of Member being omitted from Div. on B., 709.
- Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1091.
- Cumberland, Seat for (Ques. of Priv. 542; (Res.) 547; on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 561.
- Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1316; *ecno.*, 1457.
- Debate, Past, reference to (Ques. of Order) 1544.
- Debates, Official Rep., on M. to add names to Sp. Com. 43; on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 260; Second Rep., 883; Third Rep., 1100; Fourth Rep., 1103, 1105; on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) to Fifth Rep., 1272; in Com. of Sup., 1340.
- Departmental Reps., Publication of, in Newspapers (remarks) 141.
- Disallowance of Provincial Acts, on M. for copies of O.C., &c., 42.
- Disputed Territory between Man. and Ont. (M. for Ret.\*) 88.
- Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1093.
- Dominion Lands, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1384; Income, 1385.
- Dry Dock, B. C., Estimated net cost (M. for Ret.\*) 79.
- Dual Representation B. 13 (*Mr. Ouimet*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 144.
- Duty on Freight Charges (M. for O.C.) 82.
- Eastern Extension Ry., acquisition of, B. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 882; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1131.
- Electoral Franchise B. 7 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 31.
- Erthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 696-698, 701, 702, 704; (Amt.) 796.
- Escheat (Queen and Mercer) Proceedings before Judicial Com. of Privy Council (M. for copies of shorthand writer's notes, &c.) 74.
- Exchange Bank Notes, Instructions to Intercol. Ry. Officers respecting (Ques.) 1055.
- Exchange Bank of Canada, on M. for Stmnt., 35.
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1305, 1308.
- Factories, definition of Offences against Persons employed in, B. 106 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 524; (Ques.) 1241.
- Factory B. and Manufacturers' Association (M. for Ret.) 82.
- Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1370.
- Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1061.
- Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contracts B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.
- French Translation, in Com. of Sup., 1340.

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1056; in Com., 1129.
- General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.
- Geological Survey, conc., 1452.
- Geological Surveys, Mining and Metallurgy, on M. for Sel. Com., 515.
- Government Business, on M. for C. P. R. Res. to take precedence, 198; (remarks) 469; on M. to take in Thursdays, 625; on M. to take in Mondays, 1023; State of, 1170.
- Governor General's Sec's. Office, in Com. of Sup., 832.
- Great Britain and Germany, Treaty between respecting Immigrants (M. for copies of despatches, &c.) 800.
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 890, 894; on M. for Com., 978; Sen. Amts., on Ques. of Priv., 1513.
- Grinding in Bond (M. for O.C., &c.) 53.
- Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 1049.
- Halifax Street Railway Co. vs. The Queen, in Com. of Sup., 1345.
- Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1365.
- Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1094.
- High Commissioner and Immigration, Letter and Cablegrams of Minister of Agriculture (M. for copies) 799.
- High Commissioner (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987; suppl., 1336; conc., 1440; (House and Furniture for) in Com. of Sup., 1367.
- High Commissioner for Canada (Sir Charles Tupper) Appointment of (M. for O.C., &c.) 53, 56.
- High Commissioner, Reps. respecting Commercial Treaties (M. for O. C., &c.) 57.
- High Commissioner (Sir A. T. Galt) payments on account of (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 56.
- High Commissioner (Sir Charles Tupper) on Emigration (M. for copies of Reps.) 49.
- High Commissioner to England, on Res. (*Mr. Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1043.
- Hodge vs. The Queen, Judgements, &c., respecting (M. for copies\*) 43.
- Holden, Clara, Compensation to, in Com. of Sup., 1352.
- Hudson Bay, Expedition to, in Com. of Sup., 1379.
- Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 207.
- Hughes, Judge, Charges against, on M. for copies of Pets., 59.
- Immigrants, Applications for Services of, on M. for Ret. 511.
- Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1078.
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1404, 1408, 1411, 1412.
- Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for leave to introduce (Amt.) 624; in Com., 1423; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1446.
- Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1063; in Com., 1397, 1399.

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 841; suppl., 1336.
- Indian Islands in Lake Ontario, on M. for Ret., 87.
- Indian Lands, Fort William, Cancellation of Timber Licenses (M. for copies of O.C.) 51, 52.
- Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 67; in Com., 541; on M. for 3°, 625.
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1372, 1373.
- Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
- Inland Revenue Act, non-enforcement of (Ques.) 85.
- Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
- Inland Revenue, Resignation of Minister of (Ques.) 506; on correction, 513; (Explanations asked) 525.
- Intercol. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1345, 1346.
- Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1466.
- Iron, Bounties on Manufactures of (M. for O. C., &c.) 70.
- Jeans and Coutilles, in Com. on W. & M., 696.
- Jennie Graham*, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461.
- Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) in Com. of Sup., 833.
- Lands Sales within limits of C. P. R. and price realized, on M. for Ret., 77.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1009, 1339, 1340, 1475.
- Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 1167; on presentation of Third Rep., 1413.
- Licenses for Sale of Liquor in the N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 73.
- Liquor License Act, Expense in putting Act into operation, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1476.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to take precedence (Amt.) 823; on point of Order, 825.
- London Life Insurance Co.'s B. 139 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for leave to present Pet., 1290; on M. for Com., 1515; in Com., 1516.
- Lottery Firm at St. Stephen, N.B., on M. for Stmt. of Receipts of P.O., 614.
- MacDonell, Alex. & Co., Arbitrators Award to, in Com. of Sup., 1346.
- Mail Subsidies, conc., 1452, 1453.
- Manitoba and Hudson Bay Ry. Land Grant, on prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1590.
- Manitoba Judiciary B. 146 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1478.
- Manitoba, Persons entering by Rail, Number of (M. for Stmt.) 49, 50.
- Manitoba Public Schools, Aid to, Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for conc., 68; in Com., 69.
- Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, in Com. of Sup., 1353; conc., 1464.
- Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1468.
- McCourt, Daniel, Dismissal of (M. for Cor.) 516.
- McLaughlin, Geo. E., Gratuity to family of, in Com. of Sup., 1373.

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Miall, E., Commissioner of Standards, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 834-837; suppl., 1334.
- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1344.
- Mining Regulations for the N.W., on M. for Ret., 512.
- Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 29.
- Miscellaneous Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1009.
- Money Order Regulations (M. for copies) 613.
- Mounted Police Barracks, in Com. of Sup., 1378.
- Naval Station at Esquimalt, on M. for Ret., 516.
- Newspaper Correspondence, on personal Explanation (*Mr. Ouimet*) 457.
- North American Construction Co., Instrument of Incorporation, Names of Shareholders, &c. (M. for copies\*) 66.
- Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1547.
- North-West Coal and Nav. Co.'s B. 33 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 84.
- Nova Scotia Coal Importation into U. S. (M. for copies of despatches, &c.) 70.
- Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1369.
- O'Connor, Hon. John, Sums paid to (M. for Stmnt.) 70.
- Ontario and Quebec in account with Canada (Ques.) 72; (M. for Stmnts.\*) 79.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. Acts Amt. B. 46 (*Mr. Wells*) on unparliamentary language, 888.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) on M. to change name of mover, 843; in Com., 857; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 859, on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 860.
- Orange, Loyal, Association of British America, B. 93, (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 904-919.
- Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of, B. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*) in Com., 889.
- Page, John, payment to, as Arbitrator, in Com. of Sup., 1351.
- Parliamentary Practice, on *Mr. Speaker's* Ruling on Members being called on to vote, 458.
- Parry Sound P. O., Postal Thefts at (Ques.) 1109.
- Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1339.
- Perley, H. F., Services of, on St. Peter's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350.
- Personal Explanation respecting newspaper article, 736.
- Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, incorp. B. 18 (*Mr. Amyot*) on M. to discharge Order referring B. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 132.
- Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of, B. 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) in Com., 888.
- Post Office Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1336.
- Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 806.
- P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1348.
- Prince Arthur's Landing and Kaminstiquia Ry. Co., Bonuses to, by inhabitants of Neebing (M. for copy of Memorial to His Ex.\*) 523.

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Prince Leopold, Death of, Resolution of Condolence to Her Majesty, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 1293.
- Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1007; conc., 1440.
- Private Bills, Petitions for, on Ms. to Extend time, 40; Presentation of, 1359.
- Privileges and Elections, on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 1291.
- Privy Council, Judicial Com. of, Judgment of, *re* Hodge and the Queen (M. for copies\*) 43.
- Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1334, 1336.
- Provincial Subsidies, B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1584.
- Public Buildings, Heating of, Cost (M. for Stmnt.) 83.
- Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1355, 1359, 1362.
- Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 294; on non-meeting of Sel. Com., 654; in Com. of W., 818, 819; Mr. Fortin's Vote, on point of Order, 821.
- Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (Ques. of Order) 1445; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1586.
- Question of Privilege, Minister of Rys. and High Commissionership (speech) 542; (Res.) 547; on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 581.
- Quotations from newspapers, incorrect, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Orton*) 1582.
- Railways and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
- Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmnt., 616.
- Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1047-1049, 1245-1348.
- Railways, Subsidies to. *See* "Subsidies."
- Redemption of Small Loans B. 156 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1589.
- Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 1312, 1314; conc., 1454.
- Reid, W. G., Refund to, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- Repairs, Heating, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1359, 1362.
- Returning Officers, Claims of, in Com. of Sup., 1341; conc., 1459.
- Returns, Imperfect (remarks) 198; *re* High Commissioner (remarks) 459; respecting drawbacks on Sugar Refining Machinery, 671; production of (remarks) 1128; preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- Robertson, John, Claims of (M. for Ret.) 614.
- Rochette, Fabien, Claim of, for Land, in Com. of Sup., 1345.
- School of Navigation, Quebec, on M. for Cor., 202.
- Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 1474.
- Seizures, &c., at Ports of Entry (M. for Stmnt) 71.
- Select Standing Committees, on M. for Sp. Com. to prepare Lists, 28.
- Self-Government among the Indians B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 67; in Com., 541; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 625.

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

- Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1339; suppl., 1475.
- Sessional Returns, Expenditure on (M. for Stmtn.) 83.
- Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 764; on M. for 2°, 1131; in Com., 1132; on M. for 3°, 1170, 1293.
- Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. B. 129 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1360.
- Soap Powders, in Com. on W. & M., 728.
- Statutes, Consolidating, in Com. of Sup., 1303; purchase of type, &c., 1379, conc., 1453.
- Steel, Ingots, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 729; Needles, &c., 730.
- St. Andrew's*, Schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461.
- St. Charles Branch*, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1345.
- St. Croix Cotton Factory*, importation of machinery for, on M. for Stmtn., 808.
- St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry.*, Expenditure by C.P. R. Co. in connection with (M. for Stmtns.) 516.
- St. Patrick's Day*, on M. for adjournment, 885.
- Subsidies to Man. (M. for Ret.\*) 88.
- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1486-1492, 1496-1500, 1502-1504, 1507-1511; on M. to conc. in Res., 1517; Amt., 1530; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auget*) 1568-1572.
- Subsidies to Rys. (M. for O. C., &c.\*) 88.
- Subsides to Provinces B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1584.
- Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 733.
- Superannuation Fund (M. for Stmtns. respecting\*) 43.

## SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice*, 994-997, 1474.
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Agricultural, Industrial, &c., Statistics,) 1094; (Archives, Care of) 1088; (Census, revote) 1092; (Criminal Statistics) 1091; (Dom. Exhibition) 1093; (Health Statistics) 1094.
- Canals—Capital*: Carillon (Dam and Approaches) 1052; (*John Page*, Payment to as Arbitrator) 1351; Cornwall, 1050; Murray, 1051; *St. Peter's* (H. F. Perley, Services) 1350; Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) 1052; Welland (unpaid labourers) 1350; Williamsburg: Rapide Plat Division (Clara Holden, Compensation) to 1352. *Income*: Cornwall (Drain between Town and Canal) 1053; Rideau (Land Damages between Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills) 1354; Welland (Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*) 1352, conc., 1461.
- Charges of Management*, 830, 831.
- Civil Government*: Agriculture, 1337; Civil Service Board, 1336, conc., 1459; Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 987, suppl., 1336, conc., 1440; Indian Affairs, 841, suppl., 1336; Inland Revenue, 1334; Interior, 1466; Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) 833; Marine and Fisheries, 1468; Militia, 834-837, suppl., 1334; Post Office Dept., 1336; Privy Council Office, 1334, 1336; Railways and Canals, 1334; Secretary of State's Office, 1474.
- Collection of Revenues*: Customs, 1316, conc., 1457; Excise (Refund to W. G. Reid) 1382; Liquor License Act (Expense of putting Act into operation) 1382; Weights and Measures (E. Miall, Commissioner of Standards, Allowance to) 1382.

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY.—Continued.

- Dominion Lands—Capital* (Examination of Surveyors' Plans and Field Notes) 1384. *Income* (Settlement of Land Claims) 1385.
- Fisheries* (Fishing Bounty) 1370.
- Geological Survey*, conc., 1452.
- Immigration* (Salaries, &c.) 1404-1408, 1411, 1412.
- Indians* (B. C.) 1372; (Man. and N. W. T.) 1373.
- Legislation*: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1340; (Returning Officers, Claims of) 1341, conc., 1459. Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1007, conc., 1440; (Miscellaneous Printing) 1009; (Sessional Indemnities) 1339, suppl., 1475; (French Translation) 1340.
- Mail Subsidies* (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1453; (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1452.
- Militia* (Public Armouries, care of) 1344.
- Miscellaneous* (Allan, W. F., Allowance in lieu of Board) 1381; (British Association Meeting) 1310; (B. N. A. Act, Cases decided under, Publication of) 1378; (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1375; (Consolidating Statutes) 1303, (Purchase of Type, &c.) 1379; (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) 1379; (McLaughlin, Geo. R., Gratuity to family of) 1373; (Mounted Police Barracks) 1373; (*Mr. Fabre's* Salary, &c.) 1305, 1308; (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I.) 1312, 1314, conc., 1454; (Returns, preparation of) 1382; (Marchand, L. W., Professional Services) 1007, conc., 1464.
- Ocean and River Service* (Quebec Water and River Police) 1469.
- Penitentiaries* (Man.) 1339.
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1355; (Repairs, Heating, &c.) 1353, 1362; Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1365; (Man., scow *Alelaide*) 1365. Miscellaneous (Infantry Schools) 1366; (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367.
- Railways—Capital*: C. P. R. (B. C.) 1048; (Inspecting Engineers, Salaries, &c.) 1348; (Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 1047; (Subsidy) 1049; Thomas Temple, Patent Flanger, 1349. Intercol. Ry. (Alex. MacDonell & Co., Arbitrators' Award to) 1346; (Construction Account) 1345; (Fabien Rochette, for land) 1345; (Halifax Extension) 1049; (Halifax Street Ry. Co. vs. The Queen) 1345; (*St. Charles Branch*) 1049, suppl., 1345. P. E. I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1348.
- Supply Farm, No. 20, Fish Creek, on M. for Ret., 47.
- Supreme Court Judgments re Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (M. for copies\*) 43.
- Temple, Mr. T., M. P., Protest against (Ques.) 1110.
- Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger, in Com. of Sup., 1349.
- Timber Licenses, Cancellation of (M. for copies of O.C.) 51, 52.
- Volunteers of 1837-38, Surviving, on M. to ascertain number, &c., 89.
- Ways and Means*—in Com.: on Res. 1 (Free List) 653. On Res. 2 (jeans and coutilles) 696; (cotton) 696; (earthenware) 696-698, 701, 702, 704; (soap powders) 728; (steel, ingots, &c.) 729; (steel, needles, &c.) 730; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 733. On Res. 3, 735. On conc. (Amt.) respecting duty on crockery and earthenware, 796.
- Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1242.
- Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- Wheatley, Postmaster at, on M. for Rep., 604.
- Wilkinson, J. A., promise of Appointment to (Ques.) 1054; Payments to, 1055.

**Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**

Windsor Custom House, Appointments in (Ques.) 261.  
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co.'s  
incorp. Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on  
M. for 2°, 1281.

**Blondeau, Mr. C. B., Kamouraska**

Arbitrators, Official, and Secretaries (M. for Stmt.) 972.  
Caron, Clovis, complaints against, &c. (M. for Ret. \*)  
1200.  
Intercol. Ry. between Hadlow and Rivière du Loup,  
Sale of buildings on (M. for Stmt.) 624.  
Porpoise Fishing at River Ouelle (M. for Repr.) 86.  
Skiffington, Mr., employment of (Ques.) 603; Action of,  
against Messrs. Michaud and Dumais, of St. Paschal,  
&c. (M. for copies of Repr., &c.) 621.  
Ste. Anne and St. André, Surveys in (M. for Ret. \*)  
1199.

**Bolduc, Mr. J., Beauce**

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A.  
Macdonald*) in Com., 1597.

**Bossé, Mr. J. G., Centre Quebec**

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron,  
Huron*) on M. for Com., 278; M. for Com. to rise,  
671.  
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*)  
M. for Com. to rise, 286; M. withdn., 289; (Amt.) 6  
m. h., 980.  
Great Northern Ry. Co. (B. 90, 1°\*) 285.  
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir  
Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 943.  
Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of, B. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*)  
on M. for 3°, 890.  
Quebec Ry. Bridge Co. incorp. (B. 69, 1°\*) 162.  
Railway Bridge at Quebec (Ques.) 1635.  
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles  
Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc.  
in Res., 1557.

**Bourassa, Mr. F., St. Johns, Q.**

Isle-aux-Noix, completion of Works at (Ques.) 966.

**Bourbeau, Mr. D. O., Drummond and Arthabaska**

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir Charles  
Tupper*) in Com., 1599.

**Bowell, Hon. M., North Hastings**

Acetic Acid, in Com. on W. & M., 695.  
Allowances to Manufacturers of Goods required by  
C. P. R., on M. for Cor., 53.  
Caplins, in Com. on W. & M., 696.  
Carpeting, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 696.  
Cast Iron Forks, in Com. on W. & M., 704.  
Celluloid, in Com. on W. & M., 696.  
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for  
Com., 1175; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*)  
1204, 1213; 3° objected to, 1214.

**Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.**

Collector of Customs at Napanee, Appointment of, on  
M. for Ret., 208.  
Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Cas-  
grain*) in Com., 818.  
Cotton, in Com. on W. & M., 696.  
Customs Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 123, 1°) 885; 2° m.,  
1059; in Com., 1060.  
Customs Appraisers (Ans.) 285.  
Customs Dept. at Windsor, Employment of Officers, on  
M. for Ret., 509.  
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 841, 842.  
Customs Officers in Inverness County, on M. for Ret.,  
466.  
Debates, Official Rep. (M. for Sel. Com.) 28; (M.  
to add names to Com.) 43; Translation (Ans.) 86.  
Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for Export, on M.  
for copies of Claims, 39.  
Duty on Freight Charges, on M. for O.C., 82.  
Grinding in Bond, on M. for O.C., &c., 53; (Personal  
Explanation) 57.  
Immigration Agent and Quarantine Officer in Van-  
couver Island, Delay in Appointment (Ans.) 736.  
Immigrants, Applications for Services of, on M. for  
Ret., 510.  
Imports, Statement of, on M. for Ret., 28.]  
Jeans and Coutilles, in Com. on W. & M., 696.  
Labels, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 704.  
Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1003.  
Message from His Excellency (presented) 1240.  
Personal Explanation, Ques. misunderstood, 57.  
Pine and Spruce Logs, Export Duty on (Ans.) 655.  
Port Mulgrave, N. B., as an Out-port (Ans.) 235.  
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1005, 1007.  
Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (*Mr. Robert-  
son, Shelburne*) to prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1121.  
Quebec, Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c., on M. for  
copies, 522.  
St. Croix Cotton Factory, Importation of Machinery for,  
on M. for Stmt., 808.  
Soap Powders, in Com. on W. & M., 728.  
Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 733.  
SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government*: Customs, 841, 842.  
*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Salaries, &c., Library) 1003;  
(Printing, Paper, &c.) 1005, 1007.  
Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 27.  
United States Customs Duties on Hay, on M. for Ret.,  
520.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com.: on Res. 1 (Free List) 695;  
On Res. 2 (acetic acid) 695; (caplins) 696;  
(celluloid) 696; (carpeting, &c.) 696; (jeans and  
coutilles) 696; (cotton) 696; (cotton warp) 696;  
(earthenware) 696, 698; (india rubber) 704; (cast  
iron forks) 704; (labels, &c.) 704; (pins) 704;  
(soap powders) 728; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 733. On  
Res. 3, 734.  
Windsor Custom House, Appointments in (Ans.) 261.

**Brecken, Mr. F. De. St. C.,** *Queen's, P.E.I.*

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 331.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. 6, m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 95.

Customs Officers in P. E. I., on M. for Ret., 466.

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 613.

Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1277.

## SUPPLY:

*Ocean and River Service* (*Glendon*, steamer to replace) 1229; (Life-boats, Stations, Life Preservers, &c.) 1229.

*Railways—Capital*: P. E. I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1348.

**Bryson, Mr. J.,** *Pontiac*

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1498, 1499.

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1225; (Que.) 1223.

**Burpee, Mr. C.,** *Sunbury*

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 502.

Comitée on Agricultural Interests, 1882, Expenses (M. for Stmt.) 132.

Eastern Extension, Intercol. Ry. (M. for Cor.) 736.

Intercol. Ry. between Rivière du Loup and Moncton, original cost of (M. for Ret.)\* 623.

New Brunswick Ry. Co. (B. 54, 1°\*) 141; 2° m., 504.

Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmt., 617.

Swan Creek, N.B., Surveys (M. for Reps.) 605.

**Burpee, Hon. J.,** *St. John, N.B. (City and County)*

## SUPPLY:

*Collection of Revenues*: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1257.

**Cameron, Mr. Hector,** *North Victoria*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co. incorp. (B. 34, 1°\*) 83.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (Amt.) 1621.

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for Com., 1175; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1204, 1210.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1578-1581.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1593.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. to restore B. to Order Paper, 707.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) Ques. of Order, 666; on Amt. 667.

**Cameron, Mr. Hector—Continued.**

Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contract B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 890, 896; Sen. Amts., on Ques. of Priv., 1513.

Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 863.

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1497.

Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 31, 1°\*) 83.

Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 1168.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal, on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to take precedence, 824.

Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co. of Canada Acts Amt. (B. 64, 1°\*) 162.

Methodist Churches Union, Pets. against (M. to read and receive) 335.

Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. Acts Amt. B. 80 (*Mr. Bell*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1176.

Niagara Frontier Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 91, 1°\*) 285; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1548.

North-Western Coal and Nav. Co.'s (B. 33, 1°) 84.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. (B. 93, 1°\*) 304; 2° m., 897, 929.

Permanent Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 122, 1°\*) 822; 2° m., 986.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1116, 1118.

Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on non-meeting of Sel. Com., 654.

St. Patrick's Day, on M. for adjournment, 884.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1497.

## SUPPLY:

*Canals—Capital*: Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) 1051, 1052.

Welland Ry. and G. T. R. Transfer authorization B. 44 (*Mr. Bergin*) in Com., 860; 3° objected to, 861.

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. (B. 131) Petition read and received, 1201; Rule suspended and 1°\* of B., 1241; 2° m., 1281.

**Cameron, Mr. Hugh,** *Inverness*

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 491.

Customs Officials in Inverness County, increase of (M. for Ret.) 462.

Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) on Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1189.

Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Amounts paid under, on M. for Stmt., 264.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1574.

**Cameron, Mr. Hugh—Continued.**

## SUPPLY:

*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1278.*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 1191.*Ways and Means*—conc., 790.**Cameron, Mr. D. M., West Middlesex**

A, B, and C Batteries, and Cavalry and Infantry Schools, Officers of (M. for Ret.) 808.

Canada Temperance and General Life Assurance Co. incorp. (B. 28, 1°\*) 83.

London Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 139 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for Com., 1516.

Smith, H. H., Employment of (Ques.) 261, 457.

## SUPPLY:

*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1020-1022; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1019; (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165; (Construction and Repairs) 1162; (Drill Instruction) 1028; (Military Properties, care of) 1161, suppl., 1344; (Royal Military College) 1163.*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1197.

Wilkinson, J. A., Employment of (Ques.) 966.

**Cameron, Mr. M. C., West Huron**

Administrator of the Govt. of the N. W. T., Appointment of (M. for O. C., &amp;c.) 517.

Assiniboia and Calgary, Land Agents for (Ques.) 27.

Bell Telephone Co. of Canada Act Amt. (B. 51, 1°\*) 131.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res. 347; (Amt.) 359.

Chapleau, S. E. St. Onge (Ques.) 86; Appointment of as Sheriff (M. for O. C., &amp;c.) 145.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in (B. 3, 1°\*) 27; 2° m., 93; M. for Com., 271; in Com., 277, on M. for Com. to rise, 671; M. to restore B. to Order Paper, 705.

Criminal Law Amt., Incest, &amp;c. (B. 2, 1°\*) 27; 2° m., 79; on M. for 2°, 92; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 97; M. for Com. of W., 819.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 292.Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 549.

Dredges and Tug, construction of (Ques.) 603.

Election Act Amt. (B. 5, 1°\*) 28; B. withdn., 1290.

Fort MacLeod, Public Buildings at (M. for O. C., &amp;c.) 619.

Government Herd in the N. W. (M. for Ret.) 618.

Government Mills in N. W. T., Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 199; (M. for Ret.) 507.

Home and Indian Instruction Farms (M. for Ret.) 59.

Homestead and Preemption Lands, withdrawal of, &amp;c. (M. for O. C.)\* 79.

House of Commons, Election of Members to (B. 5, 1°\*) 28; B. withdn., 1290.

House of Commons, Representation of Territories in (B. 110, 1°) 598.

Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 844.**Cameron, Mr. M. C.—Continued.**

Intoxicating Liquors Act Repeal (B. 17, 1°\*) 57.

Land Agents for Assiniboia and Calgary (Ques.) 27:

Lands within Mile Belt, withdrawal of from Homestead and Preemption, &amp;c. (M. for O. C.)\* 79.

Liquor License Act, 1883 (M. for Cor.) 618.

Mining Regulations for the N. W., on M. for Ret., 513.

North-West Grievances (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1138-1147.

North-West Territorial Administration (M. for Ret.) 75:

Ontario and Quebec and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) on M. for Com. (Ques. of Priv.)

810; on M. to change name of mover (Ques. of Order)

843; (Ques. of Priv.) 857.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America, B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 898.

Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to (B. 12, 1°) 40; on Order for 2°, 80; in Com., 818.

Regina, Location of N. W. Capital at (M. for Cor., &amp;c.) 37.

Squatters, Claims of, on Homestead Lands (M. for O. C.)\* 79.

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works*: Buildings (N. W. T.) 1198; (Ont.) 1196; Dredging (new plant) 1225. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1224.

Supply Farm No. 20, Fish Creek (Ques.) 27; (Ms. for Ret.) 44, 48; (Ques.) 285.

Supply Farm on Pincher Creek, Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 200; (M. for O. C.) 617.

Town Reserves on line of C. P. R. (M. for Ret.) 75.

Town Site at Fort MacLeod, Reservation of (M. for O. C., &amp;c.)\* 624.

Volunteers of 1837 (Ques.) 57.

**Campbell, Mr. C. J., Victoria, N.S.**

Ingonish Breakwater (M. for Cor.) 89.

**Carling, Hon. J., London***Concurrence*—Mail Subsidies (Halifax and St. John *vid* Yarmouth) 1453, (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1452 Post Office, 1458.Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 1360.

Duart, Postmaster at, on M. for Ret., 510; (Ans.) 1053.

Fort MacLeod and Medicine Hat Mail Service (Ans.) 506.

Governmental Express System (Ans.) 57.

Lansdowne, Post Office at (Ans.) 336.

Letter Postage Rate, Amt. of Existing Law (Ans.) 89.

Letter Postage, Reduction of to two cents (Ans.) 57.

Lottery Firm at St. Stephen, N. B., on M. for Stmt. of receipts of P.O., 613.

Mail Service in New Brunswick, on M. for Ret., 78.

Mail Service North of Palmerston, Ont. (Ans.) 89.

Money Order Regulations, on M. for copies, 614.

Montreal Post Office Service (Ans.) 797.

Newspaper Mail Service, Delays in Transmission, on M. for Cor., 216.

**Carling, Hon. J.—Continued.**

Parry Sound P. O., Postal Thefts at (Ans.) 1109.  
 Postage Stamps, Sale of, at Windsor (Ans.) 655.  
 Postal Orders, France and Canada (Ans.) 967.  
 Stayner, Ont., Postmaster at (Ans.) 1109.  
 St. Clotilde Post Office, establishment of (Ans.) 1273.  
 St. Gilles, Daily Mail for (Ans.) 73.

**SUPPLY:**

*Civil Government*: Post Office Dept., 842; suppl., 1627.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office, 1319; conc., 1458.  
*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Halifax and St. John via Yarmouth) 1299, conc., 1453; (Lakes Huron and Superior) conc., 1452; (U. S. and Victoria, B.C.) 1299.

Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against, on M. for Rep., 604.

**Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A., Quebec County**

A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1164.

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114  
 (*Mr. Costigan*) on Ques. of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1246.

Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1019-1022, 1343.

Artillery competition at Shoeburyness, in Com. of Sup., 1166.

Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1018, 1019.

Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapeau*) in Com., 1382.

Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 991.

Concurrence—Militia (Dept. of) 1440; (Military Properties, care of) 1441.

Contingencies, Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1343.

Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 816, 818.

Construction and Repairs, in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1343.

Debates, Official Reps., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1104.

Departmental Reps., Publication of, in newspapers (remarks) 141,

Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 1602.

Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1096.

Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1098.

Drill Sheds, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1160.

Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3<sup>o</sup> 1062.

Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contract B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.

Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.

Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 1162.

Luard, Major General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 753; (Personal Explanation) 757.

Manitoba, Increase of Force in, in Com. of Sup., 1343.

Militia and Defence, Annual Report (presented) 98.

Militia Matters, Returns respecting (remarks) 1127.

Militia Tents, Manufacture of (Ans.) 506.

Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 833, 1334; conc., 1440.

**Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A.—Continued.**

Military Properties, &c., care of, in Com. of Sup., 1060, 1602; conc., 1441.

Naval Brigade and Torpedo Corps for B. C. (Ans.) 285.

Ottawa Rifle Range, in Com. of Sup., 1602.

Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of, B. 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) in Com., 888.

Public Armouries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1095, 1343, 1602,

Rifle Associations, B. C., further aid to (Ans.) 285.

Rifed Ordnance, in Com. of Sup., 1166.

Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1163.

Russian Leather Permeator, in Com. of Sup., 1165.

School of Gunnery, Fortifications, and Militia, B. C. (Ans.) 285.

Smith, H. H., Employment of (Ans.) 261, 458.

**SUPPLY:**

*Civil Government*: Civil Service Board, 991; Militia Dept., 833, suppl., 1331, conc., 1440.

*Militia*: (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.) 1164; (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1019-1022, suppl., 1343; (Artillery competition at Shoeburyness) 1166; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1018, 1019; (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165; (Construction and Repairs) 1162; (Contingencies) 1158, suppl., 1343; (Dominion Rifle Association) 1159, suppl., 1602; (Drill Instruction) 1098; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1098; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1160; (Militia Force, Man.) 1343; (Military Properties, care of) 1060, conc., 1441, suppl., 1602; (Ottawa Rifle Range) 1602; (Public Armouries, &c.) 1095, suppl., 1343, 1602; (Rifed Ordnance, improved) 1166; (Royal Military College) 1163; (Russian Leather Permeator) 1165.

*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) 1016, 1017.

*Public Works—Income*: Miscellaneous (Infantry Schools) 1366, Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1016, 1017.

Volunteers of 1837 (Ans.) 57:

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard, South Huron**

Acetic Acid, in Com. on W. & M., 695.

Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 994.

Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 842.

America, Works on, in Com. of Sup., 1009.

Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1019, 1020.

Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1088.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1088-1091; conc., 1440.

Auditor General's Office, in Com. of Sup., 841.

Bayfield Harbour, damage to by Storms (Ques.) 40.

Biography of Sir Charles Tupper, in Com. of Sup., 1439.

Boucher de la Bruère, payment to, for type, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1374; conc., 1464.

Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1018, 1019.

Canadian Pacific Ry., Bridge across Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1348.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 173; on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Res. to take precedence (Amt.) 304; in Com., 455; (Personal Explanation) 491, 493.

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—Continued.**

- Canadian Pacific Ry., on Ms. (*Mr. Blake*) for further information, 221, 229.
- Canals, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1050-1052, 1351; Income, 1352-1354; conc., 1461.
- Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603.
- Carpeting, &c., in Com. on W & M., 696.
- Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1165.
- Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1091; conc., 1440.
- Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 825-832.
- Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 150 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1390-1392.
- Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 988-990, 1337.
- Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 765.
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1256, 1261, 1317-1319; conc., 1449, 1456, 1458, 1464.
- Concurrence—Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, 1410; Boucher de la Bruère (Payment to, for type, &c.) 1464; Civil Service Board, 1458; Culling Timber, 1458; Customs, 1456, 1464; Excisemen (Promotion of) 1617; High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) 1615; Hudson Bay (Expedition to) 1617; Immigration, 1464; Indians (B.C.) 1617; Intercol. Ry., 1449; *Jennie Graham* (Schooner) 1461, 1613; Mail Subsidies (Halifax and St. John *via* Yarmouth) 1453; (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1452; Marchand, L. W. (Professional Services) 1463; Military Properties (Care of) 1440; N.W.T. (Expense of Govt. in) 1611; Page, John (Payment to, as Arbitrator) 1618; Port Arthur Harbour, 1616; Post Office, 1458; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1455; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1611; Temple, Thos. (Patent Flanger) 1460; Waterhen River (Man.) 1616.
- Confederation, Historical Picture, in Com. of Sup., 1309.
- Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure chargeable to (Ms. for Ret.\*) 28, 140; (M. for Stmt.\*) 1200.
- Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 461; on M. to withdraw B. 987.
- Consolidating Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1302.
- Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 815, 818.
- Cotton, in Com. on W. & M., 696.
- Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 286, 289; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 667.
- Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.
- Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1317; conc., 1458.
- Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 841-842.
- Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1456, 1464.
- Departmental Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 843.
- Deposits of Govt. money in Banks (M. for Stmt.\*) 28.
- Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1622.

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—Continued.**

- Dominion Lands, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1384, 1423; Income, 1385, 1427-1429, 1435.
- Dominion Police, in Com. of Sup., 997.
- Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 1159.
- Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1098.
- Drill Sheds, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1160.
- Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 702.
- Estimates, Suppl., 1883-84, on being communicated to the Press before laying on Table (remarks) 1240.
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1617.
- Exchange Bank of Canada (M. for Stmt.) 35; (Res.) 155.
- Exports and Imports, distinguishing products of Canada from other countries (M. for Ret.\*) 28.
- Exports and Imports to 1st March, 1883 and 1884 (M. for Ret.\*) 1200.
- Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 841.
- Finance Minister's Mission to England (M. for Papers) 86.
- Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1234.
- Fort MacLeod, Public Buildings at, on M. for O.C., &c., 620.
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1130.
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1261.
- Governor General's Sec.'s Office, in Com. of Sup. 832.
- Health Statistics, conc., 1440.
- High Commissioner (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987, 1336; (House and Furniture for) 1367, conc., 1615.
- Hudson Bay, Expedition to, in Com. of Sup., 1607, 1617.
- Immigrants settled in Ontario (M. for Ret.\*) 28.
- Immigration, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1404, 1407, 1410, 1412, 1414, 1416; conc., 1464.
- Imports, Statement of (M. for Ret.\*) 28.
- Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 840, 841.
- Indian Islands in Lake Ont., on M. for Ret., 87, 88.
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1269, 1372, 1373.
- India Rubber, in Com. on W. & M., 704.
- Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
- Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 841, 1335.
- Intercol. Ry., Refund to N. B. Govt., in Com. of Sup., 1628; Award of Commissioners, 1629.
- Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 838-840, 1646.
- Jennie Graham*, schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1613.
- Justice, Dept. of (Penitentiaries Branch) in Com. of Sup., 833.
- Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1003-1007, 1339, 1439, 1611.
- Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1004.
- Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1230.

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—Continued.**

- Life Insurance Co.'s, Co-operative, &c., B. 118 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for Com. on Res., 765.
- Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1222-1234.
- Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 757.
- Loan of \$4,000,000 (M. for Deptl. Orders, &c.\*) 40.
- Macleay, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Sup., 1607.
- Manitoba Public Schools, Aid to, Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 68.
- Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, in Com. of Sup., 1353.
- Marine and Fisheries Dept. B. 140 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (Amt.) 1609.
- Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1468.
- Meteorological Observations, in Com. of Sup., 1254.
- Military Properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1161; conc., 1440.
- Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 833-837.
- Militia Matters, Returns respecting (remarks) 1128.
- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1018-1020, 1093, 1159-1166; conc., 1440.
- Mounted Police, Pay of Force, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1294.
- Newfoundland, Trade with (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1361; (Ques.) 1653.
- Niagara Falls Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1303.
- North-West Grievances (Ques.) 766; on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1152.
- N. W. T., Expenses of Govt. in, conc., 1611.
- Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1230, 1232.
- Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, in Com. of Sup., 1351; conc., 1618.
- Patent Record*, in Com. of Sup., 1089.
- Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 998-1002.
- Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1016, 1017.
- Personal Explanation respecting Liberal press, in deb. on C.P.R. Loan B., 491.
- Port Arthur Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603; conc., 1616.
- Post Office and Finance Depts. (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987.
- Post Office Dept., in Com. of Sup., 842.
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1319, 1383; conc., 1458.
- Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.
- Printing and Advertising, Cost of, on M. for Ret., 303.
- Printing Com., on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Mess. to Sen., 31.
- Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
- Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1004, 1005, 1007; conc., 1440.
- Private Bills, Presentation of, on M. to extend time,
- Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 833, 1333, 1359.

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—Continued.**

- Provincial Subsidies B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1584.
- Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 815, 818.
- Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1328.
- Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1013.
- Public Works, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 843.
- Public Works, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1603; Income, 1190, 1191, 1193, 1194, 1198, 1218, 1222, 1223, 1226, 1354, 1355, 1362, 1604, 1606.
- Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1013.
- Railway Act, Consolidated, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 461.
- Railways and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 843.
- Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1064, 1347-1350, 1628-1630.
- Redemption of Small Loans B. 156 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1538.
- Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 1455.
- Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1611.
- Return, Missing, *re* Timber Licenses (remarks) 460.
- Rifled Ordnance, improved, in Com. of Sup., 1166.
- Robertson, John, Claims of, on M. for Ret., 615.
- Rolling Stock, P. E. I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1347.
- Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1162-1164.
- Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 1254.
- Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 837.
- Section B, Award of Arbitrators, in Com. of Sup., 1630; conc., 1645.
- Senate, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1627.
- Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1339.
- Sifton, Ward & Co., Claim of, in Com. of Sup., 1350.
- St. Andrew's*, schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1613.
- Stationery Office, in Com. of Sup., 987.
- Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 765.
- Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1255.
- Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1299.
- Steel, Ingots, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 728; Needles, &c., 730.
- Subsidies to Provinces B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1584.
- Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 731.
- SUPPLY:**
- Administration of Justice*, 994.
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, care of) 1088; (Census revote) 1091, conc., 1440; (Criminal Statistics) 1090; (Health Statistics) conc., 1440; (*Patent Record*) 1089.
- Canals—Capital*: Carillon (John Page, Payment to as Arbitrator) 1351, conc., 1618; Cornwall, 1050; Lachine, 1050; Murray, 1051; Ste. Anne's, 1052; Welland, 1051, suppl. (*Unpaid Labourers*) 1350; Williamsburgh (Lock at Rapide Plat Canal) 1051. *Income*: Beauharnois (L. W. Marchand, Professional Services) 1353, conc., 1463; Bideau (Land Damages) 1354;

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

Welland (Schooners *St. Andrew's* and *Jennie Graham*) 1352, conc., 1461, 1613.

*Charges of Management*, 825-832.

*Civil Government*: Agriculture, 842; Auditor General's Office, 841; Civil Service Board, 988-990, suppl., 1337, conc., 1458; Customs, 841, 842; Departmental Contingencies, 843; Finance and Treasury Board, 841; Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 987, suppl., 1336; Indian Affairs, 840, 841; Inland Revenue, 841, suppl., 1335; Interior, 838-840, suppl., 1466; Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) 833; Marine and Fisheries, 1468; Militia Dept., 832-837, conc., 1440; Post Office and Finance Depts. (Contingencies) 987; Post Office Dept., 842; Privy Council Office, 833, suppl., 1333; Public Works, 843; Railways and Canals, 843; Secretary of State's Office, 837; Stationery Office, 987.

*Collection of Revenues*: Adulteration of Food, 1318; Canals (Maintenance, &c., Salaries, &c.) 1261; Culling Timber, 1317, conc., 1458; Customs, 1316, conc., 1456, 1464; Excise (Salaries, increased) 1316, conc., 1617; Post Office, 1319, 1383, conc., 1458; Public Works (Telegraph Lines, B.C.) 1318, (Agent and Contingencies, B.C.) 1319; Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1256, conc., 1449; Weights and Measures and Gas, 1318.

*Dominion Lands—Capital* (Examination of Surveyors' Plans and Field Notes) 1384; (Surveys) 1423. *Income* (Outside Service) 1427-1429, 1435; (Settlement of Land Claims) 1385.

*Dominion Police*, 997.

*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1234.

*Geological Survey*, 1261.

*Immigration* (Salaries, &c.) 1404, 1407, 1410, 1412, 1414, 1416; conc., 1464.

*Indians*: Annual Grant (B. C.) 1266, suppl., 1372, conc., 1617; (Man. and N. W.) 1269, suppl., 1373; (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1263; (P. E. I.) 1266.

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1611; (Sessional Indemnities) 1339. Miscellaneous (Biography of Sir Charles Tupper) 1439; (Library, Salaries, &c.) 1003; (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1040; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1004, 1005, 1007, conc., 1440; (Works on America) 1009. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 1627.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Agencies, Rents, &c.) 1232; (Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c.) 1232; (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c.) 1233; (Signal Stations) 1234.

*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1019, 1020; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1018, 1019; (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165; (Construction and Repairs) 1162; (Contingencies, &c.) 1158; (Dominion Rifle Association) 1159; (Drill Pay and Incidental Expenses) 1098; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1160; (Military Properties, care of) 1161, conc., 1440; (Rifled Ordnance) 1166; (Royal Military College) 1162-1164.

*Miscellaneous* (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for type, &c.) 1374, conc., 1464; (Confederation, Historical Picture) 1309; (Consolidating Statutes) 1302; (Hudson Bay, Expedition to 1607, suppl., 1617; (Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1302; (Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Références) 1607; (Niagara Falls Commission) 1303; (N. W. T., Expenses of Govt. in) conc., 1611; (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I.) 1455.

*North-West Mounted Police* (Pay of Force, &c.) 1294.

*Ocean and River Service* (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1230; (Obstructions in Navigable Rivers) 1232.

*Penitentiaries* (B.C.) 1002; (Dorchester) 1000; (Kingston) 998; (Man.) 1000; (St. Vincent de Paul) 999.

*Pensions* (Compensation in lieu of land) 1017; (Veterans of 1812) 1016, 1017.

*Public Works—Capital*: N. B. (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1603; Port Arthur (Construction of Harbour) 1602, conc., 1616. *Income*: Buildings (N. W. T.) 1198; (N. B.) 1190,

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

suppl., 1604; (Ont.) 1194, suppl., 1355; (P. E. I.) 1191; (Que.) 1193, suppl., 1354; (Repairs, &c.) 1198, suppl., 1362. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 1365, conc., 1616; (N. B.) 1222; (N. S.) 1218; (Ont.) 1223, suppl., 1606; (P. E. I.) 1363; (Que.) 1223. Miscellaneous (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367, conc., 1615; (Infantry Schools) 1366; (Telegraph Lines) 1226.

*Quarantine* (Pictou Cattle Disease) 1010; (Public Health) 1013; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.

*Railways—Capital*: C. P. R. (Bridge across Red River) 1348; (Inspecting Engineers, Salaries, &c.) 1348; (Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 1084; (Section B., Award of Arbitrators) 1630, conc., 1645; (Sifton & Ward, Red River and Cross Lake) 1350; (Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger) 1394, conc., 1416. Intercol. Ry. (Claims arising out of construction, Award of Commissioners) 1629; (Expenditure on by Govt. of N.B.) 1628; (St. Charles Branch) 1049. P. E. I. Ry. (Rolling Stock) 1347.

*Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Observations) 1254.

*Steamboat Inspection*, 1255.

*Steamship Subventions* (Halifax and St. John via Yarmouth) 1299.

*Unprovided Items*, 1393.

Supply Farm, No. 20, Fish Creek, on M. for Ret., 47, 48.

Surveys chargeable to Capital in Public Accounts (M. to ref. to Com. on Pub. Accts.) 303.

*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 727.

Telegraph Lines, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 1318.

Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger, in Com. of Sup., 1349; conc., 1460.

Town Reserves on line of C. P. R., on M. for Ret., 77.

Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.

Unprovided Items, in Com. of Sup., 1383.

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1016, 1017.

*Ways and Means*—Budget Speech (reply to) 584; in Com.: on Res. 2 (acetic acid) 695; (carpeting, &c.) 696; (cotton) 696; (earthenware) 702; (india rubber) 704; (steel, ingots, &c.) 728; (steel, needles, &c.) 730; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 731, 733. On conc., 767.

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1318.

**Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin**

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1251.

Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1020-1022.

Audet, Alphonse, appointment of (M. for O. C.\*) 1201.

Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1018, 1019.

Britton, Ephraim, Postmaster at, Complaints against appointment (M. for Pat.\*) 1201.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 477.

Canadian Pacific Railway, Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1048.

Cattle, Live, Trade with Great Britain, restrictions on (M. for Q. C., &c.\*) 1200.

Cattle Stations, Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1012.

**Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.**

- Chapleau, S. E. St. Onge, further appointment (Ques.) 1387.  
 Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 990-994, 1337.  
 Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.  
 Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 556.  
 Dominion Grange and Farming Legislation (M. for Ret.\*) 1201.  
 Dominion Lands, Capital (Surveys) in Com. of Sup., 1424.  
 Dominion Police, in Com. of Sup., 1338.  
 Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1096.  
 Duart, Postmaster at (M. for Ret.) 509; (Ques.) 1053; Complaints against appointment (M. for Pet.\*) 1201.  
 Harbours and Rivers, Ont., in Com. of Sup., 1244.  
 Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 206.  
 Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1232.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1600.  
 Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 754.  
 Morpeth Harbour, Construction of Works at (Ques.) 1054.  
 Mounted Police Supplies, Tenders and Advertisements for (M. for copies\*) 1200.  
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1338.  
 Public Armouries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1095.  
 Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for Com., 814; in Com., 815.  
 Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1013-1015.  
 Section B, C. P. R., Transfer of Contract (M. for Ret.) 77; further Sums paid to Contractors (M. for Estimate) 77; Award of Arbitrators, &c. (M. for copy\*) 1200; in Com. of Sup., 1631.  
 Secretary of State, Dept. of, Chief Clerks (Ques.) 797.

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Criminal Statistics) 1090.  
*Civil Government*: Civil Service Board, 990-994; suppl., 1337.  
*Dominion Lands—Capital* (Surveys 1424)  
*Dominion Police*, 1338.  
*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1020-1022; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1018, 1019; (Drill Instruction) 1096; (Public Armouries, &c.) 1095.  
*Ocean and River Service* (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1232.  
*Penitentiaries*, 1338.  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1244.  
*Quarantine* (Oattle Stations) 1012; (Public Health) 1013-1015.  
*Railways—Capital*: C. P. R. (Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 1048; (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) 1631.  
*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 672.  
 Thames and Lake Erie Canal (Ques.) 797.  
 Whitcher, W. F., Complaints, &c., against, and retirement of (M. for O. C., &c.\*) 1200.

**Casgrain, Mr. P. P., L'Islet**

- Arbitrators, Official, and Secretaries, on M. for Stmt., 974.

**Casgrain, Mr. P. P.—Continued.**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 186.  
 Crane Island Wharf (M. for Ret.) 516; (Ques.) 736.  
 Elgin Road Station, L'Islet (Ques.) 199.  
 Fabre, Hon. Hector, retention of services (Ques.) 337.  
 Governor General's Commission, &c. (M. for copies) 521.  
 Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 29.  
 Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench, on M. for Ret., 137.  
 Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) attention of *Mr. Speaker* called to expiration of hour for Private Bills, 811.  
 Porpoise Fishing at River Ouelle, on M. for Reprs., 86.  
 Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to (B. 12) 2° m., 292; ref. to Sel. Com., 294; on reducing quorum of Sel. Com. (remarks) 624; non-meeting of Sel. Com. (remarks) 654; M. for Com. of W., 813-819; M. to restore to Order Paper, 820; Mr. Fortin's Vote, on point of Order, 821.  
 Quebec, Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c. (M. for copies) 522.  
 St. Jean Port Joli Wharf (M. for Ret.) 517.

**Catudal, Mr. M., Napierville**

- United States Duties on Hay, on M. for Ret., 520.

**Chapleau, Hon. J. A., Terrebonne**

- Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of, on M. for Sel. Com., 74.  
 Assistant Post Office Inspectors, &c., Salaries (prop. Res.) 1215; in Com., 1360; incorp. with B. 130, 1388.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 837, 988-993, 1336.  
 Civil Service Act Amt. (Ans.) 655.  
 Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. (B. 130, 1°) 1169; prop. Res. (Assistant Post Office Inspectors, &c.) 1215; in Com., 1360; ref. to Com. on B., 1388; in Com. on B. 1388-1394, 1422; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1652.  
 Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 988-993; suppl., 1336.  
 Concurrence—Returning Officers, Claims of, 1611.  
 Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron Huron*) on M. for Com., 281; on M. to restore to Order Paper, 707.  
 Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 554.  
 Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) to M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com., 1272.  
 Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1304, 1306.  
 Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 872.  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1004, 1005, 1341.  
 Luard, Major-General, complaints against, on M. for copies, 757.

**Chapleau, Hon. J. C.—Continued.**

- Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of, B. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*) in Com., 890.  
 Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.  
 Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1005.  
 Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 818, 819.  
 Returning Officers, Claims of, in Com. of Sup., 1341; conc., 1611.  
 Returns, Missing and Imperfect (Explanations) 459, 460.  
 School of Navigation at Quebec, on M. for Cor., 203.  
 Scott Act in Cumberland Co., N. S. (Ans.) 736.  
 Secretary of State, Dept. of, Chief Clerks (Ans.) 797, vol. ii; in Com. of Sup., 837.  
 Statutes, Dom., Distribution of (Ans.) 797.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1530–1539; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552.

**SUPPLY:**

- Civil Government*: Civil Service Board, 988-993, suppl., 1336; Secretary of State's Office, 837.  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) 1341; conc., 1611. Miscellaneous (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1004; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1005.  
*Miscellaneous* (*Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.*) 1304, 1308.

**Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1093.  
 British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1175.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 379; in Com., 456; on M. for Com. on B., 537.  
 Canals, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1052.  
 Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1604.  
 Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1093.  
 Chapleau, S. E. St. Onge, further appointment of (Ques.) 1387.  
 C. P. R., Station Accommodation, conc., 1449.  
 Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. (B. 6, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 28; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 141; M. for Com., 286; in Com., 290; on Ques. of Order, 667; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 668; on reprint of Amts., 812; on M. to adjn. deb., 813.  
 Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) to M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com., 1272; in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1340.  
 Deserters from American Army, Arrest of, in Can. Territory (M. for Cor.\*) 1200.  
 Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1623.  
 Dominion Lands, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1428, 1429.  
 Emigration Statistics, Can. and U. S. (M. for Cor.\*) 1199.  
 Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1061.  
 Geological Survey, conc., 1450.

**Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.**

- Homesteads and Preemptions, Number of acres entered for (M. for Ret.\*) 78.  
 Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1086.  
 Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 539.  
 Intercol. Ry. (Miscellaneous) in Com. of Sup., 1050.  
 Lands sold under Regulations and price per acre (M. for Ret.\*) 78.  
 Lands Surveyed in Manitoba and the N. W., number of acres and cost (M. for Ret.\*) 78.  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1003, 1005, 1009, 1340.  
 Letter Postage, Reduction on (M. for copies of Cor.) 87.  
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1003  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1599.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal, on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to take precedence, 824.  
 Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Sup., 1607.  
 Mail Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 1298.  
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1607.  
 Miscellaneous Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1009.  
 Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1297.  
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1230.  
 Pasture Land Leases (M. for Ret.) 73.  
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1002.  
 Port Arthur Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603.  
 Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1003.  
 Public Debt of the Dominion (Ques.) 736.  
 Public Expenditure (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1322.  
 Public Works, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1603, 1604; Income, 1199.  
 Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.  
 Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1050, 1449.  
 Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1184.  
 Returns, Imperfect, in reference to Timber Leases (remarks) 766.  
 Returns, Production of (remarks) 1128.  
 Sale and Management of Lands in N. W., Regulations respecting (M. for copies\*) 78.  
 Statistics, Emigration, Can. and U. S. (M. for Cor.\*) 1199.  
 St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1049.  
 Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1256.  
 Sunday Excursions, Prevention (B. 112, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 655.

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Census, revote) 1093.  
*Canals—Capital* (Trent River Nav. Locks, &c.) 1052.  
*Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1428, 1429.  
*Geological Survey*, conc., 1450.  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1002, suppl., 1340. Miscellaneous (Miscellaneous Printing) 1009;

**Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY—Continued.

- (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1003; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1005; (Salaries, &c., Library) 1003.  
*Mail Subsidies* (U. S. and Victoria, B. O.) 1298.  
*Miscellaneous* (Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees) 1607.  
*North-West Mounted Police* (Pay of Force, &c.) 1297.  
*Ocean and River Service* (Lifeboats, Stations, Life Preservers, &c.) 1230.  
*Penitentiaries* (B. C.) 1002.  
*Public Works—Capital*: N. B. (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1604; Port Arthur, 1603. *Income*: Buildings (Repairs, &c.) 1199.  
*Quarantine* (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.  
*Railways—Capital*: C. P. R. (Station Accommodation) conc., 1449; (Subsidy) 1049. *Intercol. Ry.* (Miscellaneous, not provided for) 1050; (St. Charles Branch) 1049.  
*Steamboat Inspection*, 1256.  
*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 709.  
 Timber Licenses and Permits (M. for Ret.\*) 78.  
 Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.  
 Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1052.  
 United States Army, Deserters from, arrest of on Canadian Territory (M. for Cor.\*) 1200.  
*Ways and Means*—conc., 771.

**Cockburn, Mr. A. P., North Ontario**

- Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., 799.  
 Gravenhurst and Callander Ry. (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 40.  
 Hunter's Island, Land or Timber Sales (Ques.) 965, 1054.  
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 766.  
 St. Lawrence Canals, Enlargement of, Rapide Plat and Cornwall, Tenders for (M. for copies\*) 1200.  
 Superior, Lake, North of, character and resources of land, on M. for Ret., 971.

## SUPPLY:

- Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1433.  
*Militia* (Formation of new Companies) 1343.  
*Public Works—Income*: Dredging (new plant) 1226.  
*Steamboat Inspection*, 1256.

**Colby, Mr. C. C., Stanstead**

- Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1208.

## SUPPLY:

- Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1438.

**Cook, Mr. H. H., East Simcoe**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 448.  
 Government Mills in the N. W., Disposal of, on M. for Ret., 508.  
 Indian Agent at Penetanguishene (Ques.) 31.  
 Indian Agent's Office, Toronto, closing of (M. for O. C.) 269, 294.  
 Leamington, Post Office at, on M. for Cor., 802.  
 Public Buildings of the Dom., on M. for Ret., 41.

**Cook, Mr. H. H.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY:

- Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1429-1433.  
 Supply Farm, No. 20, Fish Creek, on M. for Ret., 47.  
 Timber Licenses, cancellation of, on M. for Ret., 52.

**Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N. B.**

- Adulteration of Food and Drugs Acts Amt. and Consol. (B. 109, 1°) 598; Order dschgd., 1057; Prevention (B. 114, 1°\*) 655; 2° m., 1132; (Explanations) 1137; prop. Res. (Public Analysts) 1215; Res. in Com., 1244; M. for Com. on B., 1244; in Com., 1246, 1249, 1294.  
 Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1318.  
 Adulteration of Food Rep. (presented) 1321.  
 Analysts, Public (prop. Res.) 1215; in Com. on Res., 1244; incorp. with B. 114, 1294.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res. (M. to adjn. deb) 414; (Explanation) 415.  
 Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1394.  
 Coal, Sale and Delivery of (B. 119) M. for Com. on Res., in Com. and 1°\* of B., 765; 2° m., 1058; Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 1618.  
 Concurrence—Culling Timber, 1457; Customs, 1457; Excise, 1617.  
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1317; conc., 1457.  
 Customs, conc., 1457.  
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1316, 1383; conc., 1617.  
 Excise Officers at Perth and Quebec (Ans.) 132.  
 Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. (B. 108, 1°\*) 598; 2° m., 1056; in Com., 1129.  
 Gas Inspection in B. C. (Ans.) 506.  
 General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 128) Res. prop. and in Com., 1055; 1°\* of B., 1056; in Com., 1394.  
 Inland Revenue Act, non-enforcement of (Ans.) 85.  
 Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 841, 1335.  
 Inland Revenue Rep., Rets. and Statos. (presented) 27.  
 Inland Revenue Warehouse at St. John, N. B. (Ans.) 1212.  
 License Commissioners, Que., furnishing blank forms, &c. (Ans.) 966.  
 Liquor License Act, Expense of putting Act into operation, in Com. of Sup., 1383.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1598.  
 Logs and Lumber, Measurement of (Ans.) 337.  
 Minor Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1318.  
 Public Analysts, prop. Res., 1215; in Com. on Res., 1244; incorp. with B. 114, 1294.  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government*: Inland Revenue, 841; suppl., 1335.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Adulteration of Food, 1318; Culling Timber, 1317, conc., 1457; Customs, conc., 1457; Excise, 1316, suppl., 1383, conc., 1617; Liquor License Act, 1383; Minor Revenues, 1318; Weights and Measures and Gas, 1318, suppl., 1382.

**Costigan, Hon. J.**—*Continued.*

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 120) M. for Com. on Res., in Com., and 1°\* of B., 765; 2° m., 1050; in Com., 1242, 1294.

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1318, 1382.

Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 1321.

**Coughlin, Mr. T.**, *North Middlesex*

Carriers by Land, Liability of (B. 103, 1°\*) 504.

**Coursol, Mr. C. J.**, *East Montreal*

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 287.

Debates, Official Rep., on M., to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 1101.

License Act, 1883, Police organization under (Ques.) 505.

Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 749.

Private Bills, Presentation of (M. to extend time) 71.

Quebec, Claims of Province against Dominion (M. for Cor.\*) 79.

## SUPPLY:

*Miscellaneous* (Mr. Fabre's salary, &c.) 1307.

**Curran, Mr. J. J.**, *Centre Montreal*

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 305.

*Concurrence*—Returning Officers, Claims of, 1612.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 286.

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 21, 1°\*) 67; 2° m., 890, 891.

Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1077.

Insolvent Debtors Assets, Distribution of (B. 71, 1°\*) 162.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 923.

Superannuation Contributions, Refund of (Ques.) 285.

## SUPPLY:

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) 1612.

Wellington Bridge, Lachine Canal (M. for Cor.) 798.

**Daly, Mr. M. P.**, *Halifax*

Atlantic Mutual Marine Ins. Co. incorp. (B. 48, 1°\*) 131.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 502.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 95.

Customs Offices at Halifax, on M. for Ret., 466.

Halifax Mutual Marine Ins. Co. incorp. (B. 27, 1°\*) 83.

Nova Scotia Mutual Marine Ins. Co. incorp. (B. 49, 1°\*) 131.

St. Patrick's Day, adjournment (M.) 884.

**Daly, Mr. M. P.**—*Continued.*

## SUPPLY:

*Charges of Management*, 829.

*Civil Government*: Marine and Fisheries, 1471.

*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1237.

*Militia* (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165.

**Davies, Mr. L. H.**, *Queen's, P. E. I.*

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1254.

Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1089.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1089, 1091-1093.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 10 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 231.

Canals, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1614.

Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603; conc., 1616.

Census, in Com. of Sup., 1092.

Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 826, 829.

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 1467, 1470.

Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1390.

Collection of Revenues (Railways) in Com. of Sup., 1258.

Compensation Claims for repairing Piers, &c. (M. for O. C.) 1169.

*Concurrence*—Cape Tormentine Harbour (N. B.) 1616; Harbours and Rivers (P. E. I.) 1443, 1464; Hudson Bay (Expedition to) 1617; *Jennie Graham* (Schooner,) 1614; Public Buildings (Charlottetown) 1604; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1455.

Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 818, 819.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 283.

Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1091.

Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1093.

Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1236, 1369.

Freight Charges on Intercol. Ry., on M. for Stmt., 808.

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.

*Glendon*, steamer to replace, in Com. of Sup., 1228.

Government Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 1227.

Halifax Street Ry. Co. vs. The Queen, in Com. of Sup., 1345.

Harbours and Rivers, P. E. I., conc., 1443, 1464.

Hudson Bay, Expedition to, conc., 1617.

Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 868.

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 610.

Intercol. Ry., Claims arising out of construction, in Com. of Sup., 1630.

Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1343.

Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 965.

Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1229.

**Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.**

- Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1234.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1599, 1638.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 949.  
 Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Sup., 1607.  
 Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction, B. 70 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 461.  
 Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1166.  
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1303, 1312, 1315, 1607, 1617.  
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1227-1229.  
 Piers in P.E.I., payments for repairs on (Ques.) 1054; (M. for copies of O. C.) 1169.  
 P. E. I. and the Fishery Award (Res.) 1273.  
 P. E. I. Ry., Payment of Labourers on (Ques.) 965.  
 P. E. I. Salaries of Employés (M. for Stmt.) 298, 299.  
 P. E. I. Steamboats, Inspection of (M. for Papers) 59, 63.  
 Public Buildings (Charlottetown) conc., 1604.  
 Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.  
 Public Works, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1603; Income, 1221, 1355, 1362, 1366, 1604.  
 Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1586; in Com., 1588; on M. for 3°, 1609.  
 Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1345, 1347, 1630, 1648.  
 Reciprocity (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1176.  
 Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 1312, 1315; conc., 1455.  
 Returns, production of (remarks) 1128.  
 Rifled Ordnance, improved, in Com. of Sup., 1166.  
 Section B, Award of Arbitrators, conc., 1648.  
 Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 3°, 1170, 1293.  
*St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*, Schooners, conc., 1614.  
 Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1255.  
 Steamboat Inspectors' Rep. (Ques.) 460.  
 Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior, in Com. of Sup., 1303.

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, Care of) 1089; (Census, revote) 1092; (Criminal Statistics) 1091; (Dominion Exhibition) 1093.  
*Canals—Income*: Welland (Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*) conc., 1614.  
*Charges of Management*, 826, 829.  
*Civil Government*: Marine and Fisheries, 1467-1470.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1258.  
*Fisheries* (Fishing Bounty, distribution of) 1369; (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c) 1236.  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Sessional Indemnities) 1343.  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c.) 1234.  
*Militia* (Rifled Ordnance, improved) 1166.  
*Miscellaneous* (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) conc., 1617; (Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees) 1607; (Refund of

**Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.****SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Duties to Merchants in P. E. I. 1312, 1315, conc., 1455; (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 1303.  
*Ocean and River Service* (*Glendon*, steamer to replace) 1228; (Government Steamers) 1227; (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1229.  
*Public Works—Capital*: N. B. (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1603; conc., 1616. *Income*: Buildings (P. E. I.) conc., 1604. Harbours and Rivers (Man., scow *Adelaide*) 1366; (Ont.) 1355; (P. E. I.) 1221, suppl., 1362, conc., 1443, 1464.  
*Railways—Capital*: C. P. R. (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) conc., 1648. Intercol. Ry. (Claims arising out of construction, Award of Commissioners) 1630; (Halifax Street Ry. vs. The Queen) 1345; P. E. I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1347.  
*Steamboat Inspection*, 1255.  
 Washington Treaty, Fishery Clauses, termination of (M. for Ret.\*) 1200.  
 Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1243.  
 Wharves and Piers in N. B. (Ques.) 458.  
 Wharves and Piers in P. E. I., Inspection of (Ques.) 261.
- Dawson, Mr. S.J., Algoma**  
 Boundary, Legal Expenses in connection with, in Com. of Sup., 1379.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 392.  
*Concurrence—Geological Survey*, 1452.  
 Disputed Territory B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3°, 1640.  
 Fisheries in Com. of Sup., 1236, 1371.  
 Geological Survey, conc., 1452.  
 Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 204.  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1417.  
 Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1402.  
 Indians, Annual Grant, in Com. of Sup., 1265.  
 Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 541.  
 Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior (M. for Ret.) 606, 613.  
 Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.  
 Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1229.  
 Mission School at Fort William, in Com. of Sup., 1608.  
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 766.  
 Superior, Lake, North of, character and resources of land (M. for Ret.) 967.
- SUPPLY:**  
*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1236; (Fishing Bounty) 1371.  
*Geological Survey*, conc., 1452.  
*Immigration* (Salaries, &c.) 1417.  
*Indians*: Annual Grant (Mission School at Fort William) 808; (Ont. Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1265.  
*Miscellaneous* (Bourday, Legal Expenses in connection with) 1379; (Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1302; (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 1303.  
*Ocean and River Service* (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1229.

**Dawson, Mr. S. J.—Continued.**

Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior, in Com of Sup., 1303.

Timber Licenses, Cancellation of, on M. for Ret., 52.

**De St. Georges, Mr. J. E. A., Portneuf**

Subsidies to Rys. authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1627.

**Desjardins, Mr. A., Hochelaga**

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1248.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com. to rise, 671.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 288; on reprint of Amts., 812; on M. to adjn. deb., 813.

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1102, 1106.

French Translation, in Com. of Sup., 1340.

Governor General's Sec.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 833.

Grand Trunk Ry. Crossing in Montreal (Ques.) 1387.

Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1003.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1596.

Newfoundland Prohibitive Duty (Ques.) 1214.

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1319.

Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1012.

Railway Crossings on Roads and Streets (Ques.) 1273.

Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1300.

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government* : Governor General's Secretary's Office, 833.

*Collection of Revenues* : Post Office, 1319.

*Legislation* : Miscellaneous (French Translation) 1340 ; (Salaries, &c., Library) 1003.

*Quarantine* (Public Health) 1012.

*Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec) 1300.

**Dundas, Mr. J. R., South Victoria**

Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 717.

Wheat and Wheat Flour, Imported and Duty collected, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 66.

**Dupont, Mr. F., Bagot**

Subsidies to Ry. Companies, Amounts paid under (M. for Stmt.) 261.

**Fairbank, Mr. J. H., East Lambton**

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 255.

Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr Houde*) 963.

## SUPPLY :

*Legislation* : Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1007, 1008.

*Militia* (Clothing, &c.) 1021.

**Farrow, Mr. T., East Huron**

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 461.

Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 704.

Governmental Express System (Ques.) 57.

Moneys paid by Dom. to Local Govts. since Confederation (M. for Stmt.\*) 1200.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 924.

Payments on Settlers' Lands (Ques.) 57.

Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.

Two cent Letter Postage (Ques.) 57.

*Ways and Means*—in Com., on Res. (earthenware) 702.

**Ferguson, Mr. C. F., North Leeds and Grenville**

Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 486; on challenged quotation, 492.

Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 704.

Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1016.

Quebec Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c., on M. for copies, 522.

## SUPPLY :

*Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1435.

*Legislations* (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1005, 1008, 1009.

*Immigration* (Salaries, &c.) 1422.

*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) 1016.

*Quarantine* (Public Health) 1016.

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1016.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. (earthenware) 704.

**Ferguson, Mr. J., Welland**

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 32).

Saskatoon and Northern Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 41, 1°\*) 89.

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital* : Welland (Unpaid Labourers) 1361.

**Fisher, Mr. S. A., Brome**

Beemer, H. J., Claim of, for work on Gates, &c., Quebec (Ques.) 604.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com., on Res., 309.

Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1097.

Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., 799.

Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1449.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1596; in Com., 1597.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 980.

Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1189.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1563.

**Fisher, Mr. S. A.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY :

- Militia* (Drill Instruction) 1097.  
*Public Works—Income*; Buildings (Que.) 1605.

**Fleming, Mr. J., Peel**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*)  
 on M. for Com. on Res., 317.  
 Goodwin Jas., Claim of, for erecting Wall around  
 Parliament Grounds (Ques.) 604.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A.  
 Macdonald*) in Com., 1598, 1602; on Amt. (*Mr.  
 McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1637; in Com., 1639.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir  
 Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 940.

**Fortin, Mr. P., Gaspé**

- Bounty to Fishermen, Claims paid and amount (M.  
 for Stmt.\*) 140.  
 General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in  
 Com. on Res., 1056; in Com. on B., 1395.  
 International Fisheries Exhibition (M. for copies of  
 Repts.) 80.  
 Newfoundland Herring, Inspection of (M. for Ret.) 31.  
 Personal Explanation, mis-statement of fact by Member,  
 898.  
 Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Cas-  
 grain*) Vote challenged after div., 821.  
 School of Navigation, Quebec, on M. for Cor., 202, 203.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles  
 Tupper*) in Com., 1626.

**Foster, Mr. G. E., King's, N. B.**

- Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of, on M. for  
 Sel. Com., 74.  
 Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John  
 A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 1620.  
 Canadian Pacific Railway Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles  
 Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 242.  
 Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res.  
 (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.  
 Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*)  
 in Com. 287; (Amt.) 291; (Amt.) 666, neg., 980.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A.  
 Macdonald*) in Com., 1599.  
 Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp.  
 B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 927.  
 Personal Explanation on newspaper paragraph, 763.  
 Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.  
 Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic (Res.) 656; deb.  
 rsmd., 980; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1119;  
 (Personal Explanation) 1122.

**Gault, Mr. M. H., West Montreal**

- British Association Meeting, in Com. of Sup., 1310.  
 Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 989.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1318, 1320.  
 Concurrence—Military Properties (Care of) 1441; Return-  
 ing Officers (Claims of) 1459; Schooners *St. Andrews*  
 and *Jennie Graham*, 1614.

**Gault, Mr. M. H.—Continued.**

- Customs Appraisers (Ques.) 235.  
 Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 842.  
 Customs Officers in Montreal, on M. for Ret., 466.  
 Dominion Exhibition (Ques.) 1215.  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 123 (*Mr. Costigan*)  
 in Com., 1395.  
 Lachine Canal, Contract for New Basins (Ques.) 1215.  
 Military Properties, Care of, conc., 1441.  
 Montreal Carnival, Adjournment for (Ques.) 83.  
 Post Office, in Com of Sup., 1320.  
 Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1459.  
*St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*, Schooners, in Com. of  
 Sup., 1614.

## SUPPLY :

- Canals—Income*: Welland (Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie  
 Graham*) 1614.  
*Civil Government*: Civil Service Board, 989; Customs, 842.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office, 1320; Public Works (Tele-  
 graph Lines, B.C.) 1318.  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of),  
 conc., 1459.  
*Militia* (Military Properties, Care of) conc. 1441.  
*Miscellaneous* (British Association Meeting) 1310.  
 Telegraph Lines, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1318.

**Gigault, Mr. G. A., Rouville**

- Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of (M. for Sel.  
 Com.) 74; Rep. of Com. (Ques.) 1337.  
 Agricultural Industry and Mechanical Arts, Essays,  
 &c., on (M. for copies of Pets.) 33.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A.  
 Macdonald*) in Com., 1601.

**Gillmor, Mr. A. H., Charlotte**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*)  
 on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res.,  
 442.  
 General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*)  
 in Com. on Res., 1055.  
 Mail Service in New Brunswick (M. for Cor.) 78.  
 Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of  
 Sup., 1188.  
 Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. B. 129 (*Mr.  
 McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1360.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles  
 Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1486.

## SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (Fishing Bounty) 1371.  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.B.) 1192; Harbours and  
 Rivers (N.B.) 1222.

**Girouard, Mr. D., Jacques Cartier**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*)  
 on M. for Com. on Res., 315.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles  
 Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1592.  
 Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir  
 John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 851.

**Girouard, Mr. D.—Continued.**

- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1598, 1599; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt.) 1636; in Com., 1639.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 947.
- Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench, on M. for Ret., 139.
- Privileges and Elections, First Rep. of Com. (presented) 1270; M. to conc. in, 1291.
- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Chales Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1549; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1553, 1556.
- Union Jacques Cartier Ry. and C.P. Ry., on M. for Cor., 42.

**Gordon, Mr. D. W., Vancouver Island**

- British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1027; on Amt. (*Mr. Reid*) 1038; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1171; (Amt.) 1172.
- Chinese Immigration into B.C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 976; on M. to adjn. deb., 1285, 1288.
- Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. (Ques.) 85.
- Nanaimo Post Office, on M. for Cor., 805.

## SUPPLY:

*Indian Affairs*: Annual Grant (B.C.) 1266.

**Grandbois, Mr. P. E., Temiscouata**

- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1576.

**Guillet, Mr. G., West Northumberland**

- Committee on Agricultural Interests, 1882, Expenses, on M. for Stmnt., 132.
- Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 610.
- Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 750.

## SUPPLY:

*Administration of Justice* (Maritime Court of Ont.) 996.

*Civil Government*: Customs, 842.

*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1007.

United States Deserters, Arrest of (M. for Ret.) 86.

**Gunn, Mr. A., Kingston**

- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 68, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 162.

**Hackett, Mr. E., Prince, P.E.I.**

- Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1280.
- Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on M. for Papers, 63.
- Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1182.

## SUPPLY:

*Collection of Revenues*: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1260.

*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1234, 1237.

**Haggart, Mr. J. G., South Lanark**

- Frontier Police, South-Western Ontario (Ques.) 1054.
- Government Mills in the N. W., Disposal of, on M. for Ret., 508.
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. and Amts. made by Sen., on Ques. of Priv., 1512.
- Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 743; Explanation of reference in deb. to Mr. Fortin, 809.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. Acts Amt. B. 46 (*Mr. Wells*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) to M. that B. pass, 888.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) M. for Com., 810; M. to change name of mover, 843; in Com., 857; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 859; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1281.

**Hall, Mr. R. M., Sherbrooke**

- Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1017.
- Concurrence*—Geological Survey, 1451.
- Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1580; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1593.
- Geological Surveys, Mining and Metallurgy (M. for Sel. Com.) 515.
- International Ry. Co.'s (B. 50, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 131.
- Life Annuities, Sale of (Ques.) 199.
- Logs and Lumber, Measurement of (Ques.) 337.
- London Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 139 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for Com., 1516.
- Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1492.
- River St. Clair Tunnel Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (*Mr. Macmaster*) M. for Com., 603.
- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1492.

## SUPPLY:

*Geological Survey*, 1261; conc., 1451.

*Militia* (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1017.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Cos'igan*) in Com., 1242.

**Hesson, Mr. S. R., North Perth**

- Banking Facilities for Agriculturists, on M. for Sel. Com., 213.
- British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1030.
- Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.
- Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 989.
- Concurrence*—Returning Officers, Claims of, 1460.
- Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to adjn. deb., 669; on Name being omitted from div. on B., 709.
- Customs Examination of Baggage at St. Vincent (Ques.) 1444.
- Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1094.

**Hesson, Mr. S. R.**—*Continued.*

- Duval, Geo., Précis Writer, Supreme Court, Statutory increase, in Com. of Sup., 1474.  
 Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 699, 702; conc., 782.  
 Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1308.  
 Government Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 1023.  
 Intercol. Ry., Coal carried by, on M. for Ret., 65.  
 Immigration, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1407, 1413, 1414, 1420.  
 Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 759.  
 Land Improvement Fund, Ont. (Ques.) 1215.  
 Ontario and Que. Accounts and Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 73.  
 Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.  
 Postal Statistics (M. for Stmt.) 90.  
 Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod, on M. for O. C., &c., 620.  
 Post Office Dept., in Com. of Sup., 842.  
 Quebec, Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c., on M. for copies, 523.  
 Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1460.

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Dom. Exhibition 1094).  
*Administration of Justice*: Supreme Court (Statutory increase to Précis Writer) 1474.  
*Charges of Management*, 829, 830, 832.  
*Civil Government*: Civil Service Board, 989; Post Office, 842.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1260.  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1460.  
*Miscellaneous* (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 1308.  
*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) 1017.  
 Union Trust Corporation of Can. incorp. (B. 43, 1°\*) 89.  
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1017.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (earthenware) 699, 702; on conc., 782.

**Hickey, Mr. C. E.**, *Dundas*

- Ottawa, Waddington and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 40, 1°\*) 89.  
 Sanitary Journals, Subsidies to (Ques.) 1387.

**Holton, Mr. E.**, *Chateaugay*

- Exchange Bank, Security for Advance to (Ques.) 199.  
 Montreal Post Office Service (Ques.) 797.  
 Ogilvie and Buntin, Messrs., as security for Exchange Bank (Ques.) 261, 336.  
 St. Clotilde Post Office, Establishment of (Ques.) 1273.

**Homer, Mr. J. A. R.**, *New Westminster*

- British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1026; (Amt.) 1027, 1037; in Com. on B., 1138; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3°, 1173; (Amt. 6 m. h.) 1176.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 448.  
 Chinese Immigration into B.C., Prohibition of, on Amt. (*Mr. Allen*) to Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1285.

**Houde, Mr. F.**, *Maskinongé*

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 441.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Crossing in Montreal (Ques.) 1387.  
 Kazuabazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1500.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal (B. 25, 1°) 71; Res., 932.  
 North Shore Ry., St. Martin's to Quebec (Ques.) 1388.  
 Postal Orders, France and Canada (Ques.) 967.  
 St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1493.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1490, 1493, 1499, 1500; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1552-1556.  
 Union Jacques Cartier Ry. and C. P. R. (M. for Cor.) 41.

**Innes, Mr. J.**, *South Wellington*

- Freight Charges on Intercolonial Ry. (M. for Stmt.) 807.  
 Guelph Junction Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 72, 1°\*) 198.  
 St. Croix Cotton Factory, Importation of Machinery for (M. for Stmt.) 803.

**Irvine, Mr. D.**, *Carleton, N. B.*

- Concurrence*—Customs, 1457.  
 Customs Officers in Carleton County, on M. for Ret., 466.  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1417.  
 Kearney and Jacques, Messrs., Appointment of (M. for Cor.) 218.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1640.  
 Liquor License Inspectors, Payment of (Ques.) 337.  
 Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.  
 Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1125.

## SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues*: Customs, 1316; conc., 1457.  
*Immigration* (Salaries, &c.) 1417.  
*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 695.  
 United States Customs Duties on Hay (M. for Ret.) 519.

**Ives, Mr. W. B.**, *Richmond and Wolfe*

- Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.  
 British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1034.  
 Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 104, 1°\*) 504; B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (Amt.) 1619, 1620; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1621.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 163.

**Ives, Mr. W. B.**—*Continued.*

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1592.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 94; on M. for Com. to rise, 671.

Immigrants, Applications for Services of, on M. for Ret., 511.

Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.

**Jackson, Mr. J.**, *South Norfolk*,

Lansdowne, Post Office at (Ques.) 336.

Morpeth Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 132.

Port Rowan Life-saving Station (M. for Cor.) 521.

Steam Tugs, Dredges and Dumping Scows, purchase of (M. for Ret.\*) 1201.

Timber Land, Sale of, in the N. W. (Ques.) 73; (M. for Ret.) 90.

**Jamieson, Mr. J.**, *North Lonark*

Graham, John, Relief (B. 107, 1°\*) 580; 2° m., 665; 3° m., 979.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1598.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1117.

**Kaulbach, Mr. C. E.**, *Lunenburg*

Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1237.

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1397.

Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3°, 1448.

International Fisheries Exhibition, on M. for Reps., 81-  
Newfoundland Herring, Inspection of, on M. for Ret., 33.

Sick and Distressed Mariners, Exemption of Fishing Vessels from Paying Duties to Fund (Ques.) 199; (M. for O. C., &c.) 216.

## SUPPLY :

*Administration of Justice* (Vice-Admiralty Courts) 997

*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1237.

Vice-Admiralty Courts, in Com. of Sup., 997.

**Kilvert, Mr. F. E.**, *Hamilton*

Hamilton and North-Western Ry. Co. (B. 65, 1°\*) 162.

South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 10, 1°\*) 40.

Toronto, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 9, 1°\*) 40.

**King, Mr. G. G.**, *Queen's, N.B.*

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 498.

Dredging at Jemseg (M. for copies of Rep.) 295

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res. 1510.

4

**Kirk, Mr. J. A.**, *Guysborough*

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 494.

Drawback on Cotton used for Sails, to whom paid, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 624.

Elevator at Halifax (Ques.) 603.

Fishing Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1370.

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.

Goose Island, Lighthouse on (Ques.) 655.

Harbours and Rivers, N. S., in Com. of Sup., 1220.

Hearn, James, Superannuation of (M. for Cor.) 1110.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Commissioners under (Ques.) 458.

New Harbour and Indian Harbour (Ques.) 132.

Ogden, Alfred, Employment of (Ques.) 798, 965.

Oyster Pond Breakwater (Ques.) 132.

Port Mulgrave as a sub-port (Ques.) 285.

Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1122.

Public Buildings, N. S., in Com. of Sup., 1191.

Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1189.

## SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (Fishing, Bounty) 1370; Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 1220.

*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1004; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1008, 1008.

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 1191.

*Ways and Means*—conc., 793.

**Kirkpatrick Hon. G. A.**, *Frontenac*

## SUPPLY :

*Legislation*: House of Commons (French Translation) 1340; (Publishing Debates) 1340; (Salaries, Increase of) 1478; (Sessional Indemnities) 1478.

[See SPEAKER, *Mr.*]

**Landerkin, Mr. G.**, *South Grey*

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 328.

Concurrence—Military Properties, Care of, 1441.

Landry's, Mr., Vote on Contract B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.

Mail Service North of Palmerston (Ques.) 89.

Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 1229.

Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1441.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 903

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1319.

Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1006.

Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1015.

Railway Bonuses given by Townships, &c., and Prov. Govts. (M. for Stmt.\*) 1200.

**Landerkin, Mr. G.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY:

- Collection of Revenues*: Post Office, 1319.  
*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1006.  
*Militia* (Military Properties, Care of) conc., 1441.  
*Ocean and River Service* (Masters and Mates, Examination of) 1229.  
*Quarantine* (Public Health) 1015.

**Landry, Mr. A. C. P. R., Montmagny**

- Agricultural Industry and Mechanical Arts, Essays, &c., on M. for copies of Pets., 34.  
 Arbitrators, Official, and Secretaries, on M. for Stmtnt., 972.  
 Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for Com., 814.  
 Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on reprint of B. (M. to adjn. deb.) 812.  
 Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 1271.  
 European Immigrants, Port of Landing (Ques.) 89.  
 Excise Officers at Perth and Quebec (Ques.) 132.  
 Intercol. Ry., Claims for Losses on (Ques.) 655; Ferry or Bridge at Quebec, 86; Office at Quebec, 86; Tariff between Quebec and St. Charles, 260; Officials (M. for Stmtnt.) 303.  
 International Forestry Exhibition (Ques.) 260.  
 Lislois, C. J., Claim of, before Dom. Arbitrators (Ques.) 260, 965.  
 Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 751.  
 Oaths, Governor-General's and Lieut.-Governors' of Quebec (M. for copies\*) 79.  
 Ontario's Provincial Debt to Canada (Ques.) 199.  
 Petroleum in Montmagny and St. Maurice (Ques.) 85.  
 Public Works in the different Provinces, Expenditure on since Confederation (M. for Stmtnt.) 161.  
 Quebec Central Ry. and Intercol. Ry., Arrangements between (M. for copies\*) 230.  
 Quebec's Provincial Debt to Canada (Ques.) 199.  
 St. Charles Branch (Ques.) 260.  
 School of Navigation at Quebec (Ques.) 141; on M. for Cor., 202.  
 Statutes, Consolidation of, Appointment of a French Canadian (Ques.) 73.  
 Subsidies to Provinces, Readjustment of, on M. for Cor., 152.  
 Supreme Court in Appeal, limitation of Jurisdiction (B. 15, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 43.  
 Traverse, Union Station at the (Ques.) 260.

**Landry, Mr. P. A., Kent, N.B.**

- Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 274; in Com., 669.  
 Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 291.  
 Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1106; in Com. of Sup., 1341.

**Landry, Mr. P. A.—Continued.**

- Fredericton and Miramichi River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1506.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Re., 1506.

## SUPPLY:

- Legislation*: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1341.

**Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector, Three Rivers**

- Adjournment for Good Friday (M.) 1476.  
 Agent and Contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1318.  
 Agricultural Industries, Rep. of Com. (Ans.) 1387.  
 Agricultural Industry and Mechanical Arts, Essays, &c., on M. for copies of Pets., 35.  
 Amherstburg Public Buildings (Ans.) 79; on M. for Ret., 298.  
 Arbitrators, Official, and Secretaries, on M. for Stmtnt., 973, 974.  
 Bayfield Harbour, damage to by storms (Ans.) 40.  
 Beemer, H. J., Claim of, for work on Gates, &c., at Quebec (Ans.) 604.  
 Belle River, Essex County, Pier in (Ans.) 655.  
 Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1374; conc., 1464.  
 Boularderie Wharf, N.S., conc., 1618.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Further aid to, on statement in *Globe* (contradiction) 1321; Tariff of Rates on (Ans.) 79.  
 Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603.  
 Carleton, N.B., Post Office (Ans.) 966.  
 Chappleau, S. E. St. Onge, further appointment of (Ans.) 1387.  
 Cheticamp Harbour, N.S., Dredging entrance (Ans.) 967.  
 Chinese Immigration into B. C., on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 977.  
 Civil Service Board, conc., 1458.  
 Concurrence—Boularderie Wharf (N.S.) 1618; Civil Service Board, 1458; Consolidating Statutes (Purchase of Type) 1464; Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 1616, (P. E. I.) 1464; Moncton Post Office (N. B.) 1616; *Newfield* (Cost of Working) 1458; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1460.  
 Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type for, conc., 1464.  
 Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 294; on M. to reduce quorum of Sel. Com., 624; on complaints of non-meeting of Com., 654; on M. for Com. of W., 813, 818.  
 Crane Island Wharf, on M. for Ret., 516; (Ans.) 736.  
 Criminal Law Amt., Incest, &c. B. 2 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 80.  
 Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on reprint of Amts., 812; on M. to adjn. deb., 813.  
 Criminal Laws, Extension to B. C. (B. 132, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 1320.  
 Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1103, 1106.  
 Dominion Employés in B. C., on M. for Stmtnt., 514.

**Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.**

- Dredges and Tug, construction of (Ans.) 603.  
 Dredging at Jemseg, N.B., on M. for Rep., 296.  
 Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1225; suppl., 1365.  
 Emigrant Sheds at Victoria, B. C. (Ans.) 336.  
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1603.  
 Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1303.  
 Fairford River, Man., Improvements, on M. for Rep., 210.  
 Felonies and Misdemeanours, Speedy Trial of, Extension to B. C. (B. 133, 1°\*) 1321.  
 Floating Gas Lights on the St. Lawrence, on M. for Cor., 217.  
 Fortifications and Military Buildings (B. 124, 1°) 965; 2° m., 1061.  
 Goodwin, Jas., Claim of, for Walls, &c., around Parliament Grounds (Ans.) 604.  
 Government Lands in Richelieu Co., Sale of (Ans.) 1109.  
 Graham, John, Relief B. 107 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for Com., 979.  
 Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1218-1224; conc., 1464, 1616, 1618.  
 High Commissioner, House and Furniture for, in Com. of Sup., 1367.  
 Hudson Bay and Straits, Exploratory Expedition to (Ans.) 132.  
 Hughes, Judge, Charges against (Ans.) 1109.  
 Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1071.  
 Indian Agent's Office, Toronto, closing of, on M. for O. C., 295.  
 Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.  
 Ingonish Breakwater, on M. for Ret., 90.  
 Isle-aux-Noix, completion of Works at (Ans.) 966.  
 Judges, Equalization of Salaries of (Ans.) 40.  
 Kingsville Harbour, Ont., Works (Ans.) 86.  
 Lachine Canal, contract for new Basins (Ans.) 1215.  
 Lévis Graving Dock further Provision (B. 149, 1°\*) 1581; in Com., 1618.  
 Lights on the St. Lawrence, North of Island of Orleans, on M. for Ret., 218.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1596; in Com., 1598.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 936; (Amt.) 937.  
 Lotbinière, construction of Wharf at (Ans.) 1054.  
 McLaughlin, Geo. E., Gratuity to family of, in Com. of Sup., 1373.  
 Methot, Mr., M.P. for Nicolet, on resignation of seat, 1108.  
 Michaud and Dumais, Skiffington *vs.*, on M. for copies of Repts., &c., 622.  
 Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 837.  
 Moncton Post Office, N.B., conc., 1616.  
 Montreal Drill Shed, Contract for Rebuilding (Ans.) 966.  
 Morpeth Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 132, 1054.

**Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.**

- Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench, on M. for Ret., 137.  
 Naval Station at Esquimalt (Ans.) 285.  
*Newfield*, Steamer, Cost of Working, in Com. of Sup. 1318; conc., 1458.  
 New Harbour and Indian Harbour (Ans.) 132.  
 North Shore Ry., St. Martin's to Quebec (Ans.) 1388.  
 Ottawa, Additional Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1190.  
 Ottawa Gas Co., Claim of, for Leakage (Ans.) 604.  
 Oyster Pond, N.S., Breakwater (Ans.) 132.  
 P. E. I., Piers in, Payments for repairs on (Ans.) 1054; on M. for O. C., 1169.  
 P. E. I., Wharves and Piers in, Inspection of (Ans.) 261.  
 Perley, H. F., Services of, in connection with St. Peter's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350.  
 Personal Explanation on article in *Globe* newspaper, 1465.  
 Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, incorp. B. 18 (*Mr. Amyot*) on M. to dischg. Order ref. B. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 132.  
 Port Arthur Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1603.  
 Port Stanley Harbour Revenue, on M. for Stmt., 295.  
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1320, 1383.  
 Post Offices and Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.  
 Printing and Advertising, Cost of, on M. for Ret., 303.  
 Printing of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Sixth Rep. of Joint Com., 1108.  
 Private Bills, Reception of Repts. from Com. (Ms. to extend time) 567, 1100; on M. to extend time for Presentation, 1354.  
 Privileges and Elections Com. (M. to add name) 569.  
 Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 986.  
 Public Buildings, Cost of Heating, on M. for Stmt., 83.  
 Public Buildings of the Dom., on M. for Ret., 41.  
 Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 294; on reducing quorum of Sel. Com., 624; on non-meeting of Com., 654; on M. for Com. of W., 813, 818.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1190-1198, 1218-1226, 1354-1366, 1603-1606; conc., 1458, 1464, 1616, 1618.  
 Public Works Dept., Extra Clerks in, on M. for Stmt., 82.  
 Public Works, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 843.  
 Public Works of Canada Act Amt. (B. 134, 1°\*) 1321; 2° m., 1445, 1586.  
 Public Works Rep. (presented) 27.  
 Quebec Tidal Dock further provision (B. 148, 1°\*) 1581; 2° m., 1618.  
 Return, Imperfect, respecting Drawback on Machinery for Sugar Refining (remarks) 672.  
 Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1460.  
 School of Navigation, Quebec, on M. for Cor., 202.  
 Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 1474.

**Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.**

Skiffington vs. Messrs. Michaud and Dumais, on M. for copies of Repts., &c., 622.  
 St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Erection of (Ans.) 966.  
 St Jean Port Joli Wharf, on M. for Ret., 517.  
 St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, on M. for Ret., 92.  
 Standing Committees (M. to add names) 569.  
 Stone for New Departmental Building (Ans.) 736.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1493, 1495, 1511; in Com. of W., 1624.

**SUPPLY:**

*Canals—Capital*: St. Peter's (H. F. Perley, Services of) 1350.  
*Civil Government*: Civil Service Board, conc., 1458; Militia, 837; Public Works, 843; Secretary of State's Office, 1474.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office, 1320, 1383; Public Works (Steamer *Newfield*, Cost of Working) 1318; (Telegraph Lines, B.O.) 1318; (Agent and Contingencies, B.O.) 1318.  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1460.  
*Miscellaneous* (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1374, conc., 1464; (Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type for) conc., 1464; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1303; (McLaughlin Geo. E., Gratuity to family of) 1373.  
*Penitentiaries* (Dorchester) 1000; (Kingston) 998; (Manitoba) 1001, suppl., 1338; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1000.  
*Public Works—Capital*: B.C. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1603; N.B. (Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1603; Ottawa (Additional Buildings) 1190; Port Arthur (Construction of Harbour) 1603.  
*Income*: Buildings (B.O.) 1198; (Man.) 1198; (N.B.) 1191, suppl., 1604, conc., 1616; (N.S.) 1190, suppl., 1604; (N.W.T.) 1198; (Ont.) 1193-1197, suppl., 1335, 1605; (P.E.I.) 1191, suppl., 1604; (Que.) 1193, suppl., 1354, 1605; (Repairs, &c.) 1198, suppl., 1358, 1363. Dredging, 1225, suppl., 1365. Harbours and Rivers (B.O.) 1606; (Man.) 1365, conc., 1616; (N.B.) 1221, conc., 1442, 1616; (N.S.) 1605, conc., 1618; (N.W.T.) 1606; (Ont.) 1223, suppl., 1365, 1606; (P.E.I.) 1220, suppl., 1362, conc., 1464; (Que.) 1223, suppl., 1365. Miscellaneous, 1226, suppl.; (Infantry Schools) 1363; (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367; (*Newfield*, Steamer, Cost of Working) conc., 1458. Telegraph Lines, 1226, suppl., 1366.  
 Talbot, Achille, Employment and Salary of (Ans.) 966.  
 Telegraph Lines, in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1318; suppl., 1366.  
 Thames and Lake Erie Canal (Ans.) 797.  
 Wharves and Piers in N. B. (Ans.) 458.

**Laurier, Hon. W., East Quebec**

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 411.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1581.  
 Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 283.  
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1317.  
 Dominion Subsidy to Que., Readjustment of (M. for Ret.\*) 1200.  
 Emigrant Buildings at Lévis, Removal of (M. for Cor.) 90.  
 Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1303, 1307.  
 Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 964.

**Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.**

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1597.  
 Liquor License Act., 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 914.  
 Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench (M. for Ret.) 133, 139.  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1539-1543; on Main Motion, 1573; (Amt.) 1574.

**SUPPLY:**

*Collection of Revenues*: Culling Timber, 1317.  
*Miscellaneous* (Mr. Fabre's Salary and Contingencies) 1303, 1307.

**Lesage, Mr. C. A., Dorchester**

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1182.  
 Debates, Official Rep. of, Translation (Ques.) 86.

**Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton**

A, B, and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 1164.  
 Amherstburg Public Buildings (Ques.) 79; Land purchased for (M. for Ret.\*) 83.  
 Belle River, Pier on (Ques.) 655.  
 Benefit Mutual Insurance Societies (Ques.) 337.  
 Canadian Pacific Railway Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 337.  
 Colchester Reef Lighthouse (Ques.) 86, 199.  
 Corbett, John, Employment of (Ques.) 199.  
 Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 93; on M. for Com., 275.  
 Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.  
 Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 1160.  
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1098.  
 Fishery Act Amt., Petitions praying for, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 300.  
 Gold Mining in the N.W., Act relating to (Ques.) 43.  
 Goodwin, James, Claims of, for Fence around Parliament Grounds (M. for Rep.\*) 1100.  
 Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 853.  
 Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 600.  
 Kingsville Harbour Works (Ques.) 96; (M. for Ret.) 216.  
 Leamington, Post Office at (M. for Cor.) 800; (reply) 807.  
 Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction B. 70 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 461.  
 Maritime Court of Ont., in Com. of Sup., 996.  
 Militia Contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1158.  
 Mining Licenses in the N.W., Baker Creek (Ques.) 44.  
 Mining Regulations for the N.W. (M. for Ret.) 512.  
 Miscellaneous Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1009.  
 Ottawa Gas Co., Claim of, for Leakage (Ques.) 604.  
 Pelée Island, Long Point and Rondeau Lighthouses, Repairs on (M. for Ret.\*) 230.

**Lister, Mr. J. F.—Continued.**

Postage Stamps, Sale of, at Windsor (Ques.) 655.  
 Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.  
 Printing Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1007.  
 Public Buildings of the Dominion (M. for Ret.) 41.  
 Public Works Department, Extra Clerks in (M. for Stmt.) 82.  
 Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.  
 Schools of Gunnery, in Com. of Sup., 1164.  
 SUPPLY :

*Administration of Justice* (Mar. Court of Ont.) 996.  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Criminal Statistics) 1090 ;  
 (Health Statistics) 1094.  
*Legislation* : Miscellaneous (Miscellaneous Printing) 1009 ;  
 (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1004 ; (Printing Paper, &c.) 1007.  
*Militia* (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.)  
 1164 ; (Contingencies, &c.) 1158 ; (Dominion Rifle Association)  
 1180 ; Drill Pay, &c.) 1896.  
*Quarantine*, 1010.

Wheatlay, Postmaster at, Charges against (M. for Rep.)  
 604.

**Livingstone, Mr. J., South Waterloo**

Land Sales in the N. W., Names of Purchasers and  
 Amounts of rebate (M. for Ret. \*) 523.

**Macdonald, Mr. A. C., King's, P.E.I.**

Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on  
 M. for Papers, 62.

## SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1239.  
*Ocean and River Service* (Glendon, steamer to replace) 1228 ;  
 (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction, &c.) 1233.

**Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., Carleton, O.**

Address, on The, 20 ; M. for Com. to draft, 27 ; draft  
 rep. 28 ; His Excellency's reply, 304.

Adjournments (Ms.) Ash Wednesday, 524 ; Annuncia-  
 tion Day, 1053 ; Easter, 1422.

Adjournment of the House, on M. for (remarks) 514.

Administrator of the Govt. of the N. W. T., on M. for  
 O. C. &c., 517.

Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 994, 997.

Administration of Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 2.

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr.*  
*Costigan*) on Ques. of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1245 ; in  
 Com., 1246.

Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1337.

Agriculture and Immigration, Rep. of Minister (Ans.)  
 709.

Alberta Bridge Co. incorp. B. 76 (*Mr. Ross*) on M.  
 for 2<sup>o</sup>, 504.

Allan, W. F., allowance in lieu of Board, &c., in Com.  
 of Sup., 1381.

America, Works on, in Com. of Sup., 1009.

Americ, Roger, Case of, on M. for Ret., 623

Archives, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1088.

Assiniboia, Land Agent for (Ans.) 27.

Ballot Box, New Model, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.

Banking Facilities for Agriculturists Provision B. 103  
 (*Mr. Orton*) on Ques. of Order (*Mr. Blake*) on intro-  
 duction, 524.

**Macdonald, Sir John A.—Continued.**

Banking Facilities for Agriculturists, on M. for Sel.  
 Com., 215.

Boundary between B. C. and the N.-W. T. (Ans.) 261.

Boundary, Legal Expenses in connection with, in Com.  
 of Sup., 1379.

British Association, Meeting of, in Com. of Sup., 1310.

British Columbia, Agreement with (B. 126) prop. Res.  
 67 ; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1175.

B. N. A. Act, Cases decided under, in Com. of Sup., 1378.

Cabinet Representation for B. C. (Ans.) 505.

Calgary, Land Agent for (Ans.) 27.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 126, 1<sup>o</sup>\*)  
 1386 ; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1618.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*)

Ms. for Res. to take precedence, 304, 408 ; M.  
 for B. to take precedence through all stages, 524 ;  
 on M. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 568.

Cariboo County Court Judge, Salary of (B. 136) prop.  
 Res., 69 ; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 85.

Cattle Station, Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.

Chapleau, S. E. St. Onge (Ans.) 86 ; Appointment of, as  
 Sheriff, on M. for O. C., &c., 149.

Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on  
 Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1287, 1289.

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 836-840, 841, 987,  
 989, 990, 1334-1337, 1466.

Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr.*  
*Chapleau*) in Com., 1389-1392.

Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 989, 990.

Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) in  
 Com., 1059.

Concurrence—Geological Survey, 1451 ; Expenses of  
 Govt. in N. W. T., 1611 ; Indians (Man. and N. W.)  
 1610 ; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. L., 1455.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M.  
 for 2<sup>o</sup>, 461.

Consolidating Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1302.

Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type for, in Com. of  
 Sup., 1379.

Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Cas-  
 grain*) M. to substitute name on Sel. Com., 655 ; on  
 M. for Com. of W., 814 ; in Com., 815-819 ; on chal-  
 lenge of Vote after div., 821.

County Court Judges' Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 603.

County Judge of Elgin, on M. for Com. of Sup.  
 (remarks) 1217. See "Elgin."

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr.*  
*Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 93 ; on M. for Com.,  
 284.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*)  
 in Com., 287, 289-292 ; on Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) 667 ;  
 on reprint of Acts., 812.

Criminal Laws, Extension to B. C. (B. 132), 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1581.

Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.

Cumberland, Seat for, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Blake*)  
 on Res., 547 ; (Amt.) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and  
 Elec., 549 ; (remarks) 564.

**Macdonald, Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Dangerous Weapons, Carrying of (Ans.) 453.  
 Disputed Territory (B. 144) 2° m., 1634; 3° m., 1640.  
 Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 138, 1°\*) 1386; 2° m., 1622; in Com., 1623, 1624.  
 Dominion Lands Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1384, 1423-1427; Income, 1385, 1427-1429, 1435-1438.  
 Dominion Police, in Com. of Sup., 997; suppl., 1338.  
 Dual Representation B. 13 (*Mr. Ouimet*) on for M. 2°, 144.  
 Eastern Extension, Intercol. Ry., on M. for Cor., 738.  
 Electoral Franchise (B. 7, 1°) 31.  
 Elgin, County Judge of, Charges against, on M. for copies of Pets., 59; (remarks) 967; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1217.  
 Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. (Ans.) 85.  
 Fabre, Hon. Hector, Retention of Services of (Ans.) 337.  
 Factory Bill (Ans.) 1242.  
 Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., 799.  
 Frontier Police, South-Western Ont. (Ans.) 1054.  
 General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.  
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1261, conc.; 1451.  
 Geological Surveys, Mining and Metallurgy, on M. for Sel. Com., 515.  
 Geological Survey in B.C. (Ans.) 505.  
 Gold Mining in the N. W., Act relating to (Ans.) 44.  
 Government Business, C. P. R. Res. (M. to take precedence) 198.  
 Government Business, Progress of (remarks) 469; (Ms. to take in Thursdays, 625; State of, 1170; Mondays, 1023; Wednesdays, 1549; Saturdays, 1332.  
 Government Herd in the N. W. (Ans.) 506.  
 Government Mills in N. W. T., Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 199.  
 Governor General's Commission, &c., on M. for copies, 522.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 890, 895, 896; Sen. Amts., on Ques. of Priv., 1514, 1543.  
 Halifax Reformatory for Juvenile Offenders (B. 141) 2° m., 1621.  
 High Commissioner (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987; (House and Furniture for) 1367.  
 High Commissioner for Canada (Sir Charles Tupper) Appointment of, on M. for O.C., &c., 55.  
 High Commissioner to England, on Res. (*Mr. Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1042.  
 House of Commons, Representation of Territories in, B. 110 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 1°, 602.  
 Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 207.  
 Hughes, Judge, Charges against, on M. for copies of, 59; (remarks) 967; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1217.  
 Hunter's Island, Land or Timber Sales on (Ans.) 965, 1054.  
 Immigration, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1410.

**Macdonald, Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Independence of Parliament Act Amt. (B. 111) M. for leave to introduce, 624, 2° m., 844; M. to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 878; in Com. on B., 1423, 3° m., 1446; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1447.  
 Indians, Annual Grant, in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1269, 1372, 1373, conc., 1450, 1610, 1617.  
 Indian Act, 1880, Amt. (B. 87, 1°) 260; 2° m., 1063; in Com., 1397-1404; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1653.  
 Indian Affairs, Rep. of Dept. (presented) 68; in Com. of Sup., 840, 841; suppl., 1336, 1466.  
 Indian Agent at Penetanguishene (Ans.) 31.  
 Indian Islands in Lake Ont., on M. for Ret., 87, 88.  
 Indian Lands, Fort William, Cancellation of Timber Licences, on M. for Ret., 51, 52.  
 Indian Self-Government (B. 22, 1°) 67; 2° m., 538; in Com., 539-542; 3° m., 625.  
 Inland Revenue, Minister of, Resignation (Ans.) 505; (correction) 513; (further remarks) 525.  
 Insolvent Banks, Insurance and Loan Co.'s (B. 145) 2° m., 1645.  
 Interior, Dept. of, Rep. (presented) 844; in Com. of Sup., 838-840; suppl., 1466.  
 International Forestry Exhibition (Ans.) 260.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Traffic in, Act Amt. B. 102 (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) on Order for 2°, 1290.  
 Judicial Salaries, Readjustment of, on M. for Cor., 58; (Ans.) 1387.  
 Judiciary of Manitoba, Additional Appointment to (B. 146) prop. Res., 1422; in Com., 1478; 1°\* of B., 1549; 2° m., 1622.  
 Justices of the Peace out of Sessions, Duties of, Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°\*) 1386; 2° m., 1618.  
 Juvenile Offenders, Reformatory at Halifax for (B. 141) 2° m., 1621.  
 Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.  
 Land Agents for Assiniboia and Calgary (Ans.) 27.  
 Land Sales within limits of C. P. R., on M. for Ret., 77.  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1002-1006, 1008, 1009, 1340, 1339.  
 Library of Parliament Com. (M. for Mess. to Sen.) 31; on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 964, 965, 1168; on Second Rep., 1240; on presentation of Third Rep., 1443; Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., &c., 1003.  
 Licenses for Sale of Liquor in the N. W. T., on M. for Ret., 73.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal (M. to take precedence) 823; on point of Order, 825; (M.) 932; (Ans.) 964.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 143) prop. Res., 1422; in Com., 1476; 2° and M. for Com., 1595; 3° m., 1636; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1637; in Com., 1637.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Commissioners under (Ans.) 458; Inspectors, Payment of (Ans.) 337; Police organization under (Ans.) 505.

**Macdonald, Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Lottery Firm at St. Stephen, N. B., on M. for Stmtnt. of receipts of P. O., 614.
- Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 621, 757.
- Manitoba and Hudson Bay Ry. Land Grant (prop. Res.) 1590; in Com., 1591; Res. ref. to Com. of W. on B., 138.
- Manitoba and Hudson Bay Ry., Land Subsidy to (prop. Res.) 1476,
- Manitoba Judiciary (B. 146) prop. Res., 1422; in Com., 1478; 1°\* of B., 1549; 2° m., 1622.
- Manitoba Lands, Settlement of claims by Occupancy (B. 150, 1°\*) 1586.
- Manitoba Public Schools, Aid to, Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for Com., 68.
- Maritime Court for Canada (Ans.) 965.
- Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction, B. 70 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2° (M. to adjn. deb.) 462.
- McCourt, Daniel, Dismissal of, on M. for Cor., 516.
- Messages from His Excellency (presented) 27, 304.
- Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 836, 837.
- Mining Licenses in the N. W., Baker Creek (Ans.) 44.
- Mining Regulations for the N. W., on M. for Ret., 512.
- Minister of Railways and High Commissionership, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 547; (Amt.) 549.
- Ministerial Changes (Explanation) 28, 29.
- Miscellaneous Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1009.
- Moncton Post Office, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1616.
- Mounted Police, Pay of Force, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1294-1298; Barracks, in Com. of Sup., 1303, 1378.
- Mounted Police for B. C. (Ans.) 336.
- Niagara Falls Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1303.
- Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1547.
- North-West Grievances (Ans.) 766.
- North-West Territorial Administration, on M. for Ret., 75.
- North-West Territories Act, 1880, Amt. (B. 152, 1°\*) 1586, 2° m., 1651.
- North-West Territories, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1301.
- Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°\*) 2.
- Official Incomes, Taxation of (Ans.) 1054.
- Ogden, Alfred, Employment of (Ans.) 798.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R., confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) on M. for Com., 810 (Ques. of Order) 811; Assent of Crown announced, 886.
- Parliamentary Practice, on *Mr. Speaker's* Ruling on Members being called on to Vote, 458.
- Pasture Land Leases, on M. for Ret., 73.
- Patent, Rights, Fraud in Sale of, B. 26 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 460.
- Payments on Settlers' Lands (Ans.) 57.
- Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 988-1002, 1338.
- Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1017.
- Petroleum in Montmagny and St. Maurice (Ans.) 85.

**Macdonald, Sir John A.—Continued.**

- Post Office, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 806.
- Prince Leopold, Death of, Resoluton of Condolence to Her Majesty (M.) to consider Mess. from Senate, 1273; M. to conc. in, 1291.
- Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
- Printing Com. (M. for Mess. to Sen.) 31.
- Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1004-1006, 1008.
- Prisoners, Transfer of, from Gaols (B. 151, 1°\*) 1586; 2° m., 1645.
- Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
- Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod (Ans.) 506; on M. for O. C., &c., 619.
- Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) M. to substitute name on Sel. Com., 655; on M. for Com. of W., 814; in Com., 815-819; on challenge of a Vote after div., 821.
- Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1013.
- Public Works, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1367, 1616.
- Public Works in the different Provinces, Expenditure on, since Confederation, on M. for Stmtnt., 162.
- Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1587; in Com., 1588.
- Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1013.
- Quebec, Lieut. Governor's Commission, &c., on M. for copies, 522.
- Quebec, Subsidy to (Ans.) 883.
- Railway Act, Consolidated, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 460.
- Railway Bridge at Quebec (Ans.) 1636.
- Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmtnt., 616.
- Railways and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1335.
- Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1186.
- Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 1312, 1314; conc., 1455.
- Regina, Location of N. W. Capital at, on M. for Cor., &c., 38.
- Registration of Deeds and Instruments in the N. W. (Res.) 1635.
- Repatriation of Canadians (Ans.) 965.
- Returns, Imperfect, *re* High Commissioner (remarks) 460; in reference to Timber Leases, 766.
- Richardson, H., Rental allowance, in Com. of Sup., 1379.
- Robertson, John, Claims of, on M. for Ret., 615.
- Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings, in Com. of Sup., 1374.
- Select Standing Committees (m.) 2; M. for Sp. Com. to prepare Lists, 28; Lists presented, 29, conc. in, 31.
- Self-Government among Indians (B. 22, 1°) 67; 2° m., 538; in Com., 539-542; 3° m., 625.
- Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1339.
- Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 764; on M. for 3°, 1293.

**Macdonald, Sir John A.—Continued.**

Speech from the Throne, consideration of (m.) 2.  
 Speedy Trials, Felonies and Misdemeanours, Extension to Man. (B. 133) 2° m., 1581.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1492, 1501, 1503; on Amt. (*Mr. Auger* to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1564–1568.  
 St. Patrick's Day, on M. for Adjournment, 884.  
 Statutes, Consolidation of, Appointment of a French Canadian (Ans.) 73.  
 Summary Convictions, &c., Act Amt. (B. 137, 1°\*) 1386; 2° m., 1618.

**SUPPLY :**

*Administration of Justice*, 984–997.  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, Care of) 1098; (Criminal Statistics) 1090.  
*Civil Government*: Agriculture, 1337; Civil Service Board, 989, 990; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 987; Indian Affairs, 840, 841, suppl., 1336, 1466; Interior, 838–840, suppl., 1466; Militia, 836, 837; Privy Council Office, 1334; Railways and Canals, 1335.  
*Dominion Lands—Capital* (Examination of Surveyors' Plans and Field Notes) 1384; (Surveys) 1423–1427; *Income* (Outside Service) 1427–1429, 1435–1438; (Settlement of Land Claims) 1385.  
*Dominion Police*, 987, suppl., 1338.  
*Geological Survey*, 1261, conc., 1451.  
*Immigration* (Salaries, &c.), 1410.  
*Indians*: Annual Grant (B. C.) 1266, suppl., 1372, conc., 1617; (Man. and N.W.) 1269, conc., 1456, 1610, suppl., 1373; (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1263; (P. E. I.) 1266.  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1340; (Sessional Indemnities) 1002, suppl., 1339 *Miscellaneous* (Library, Salaries, &c.) 1003; (*Miscellaneous Printing*) 1009; (*Printing, &c., the Laws*) 1004; (*Printing, Paper, &c.*) 1004–1006, 1008; (*Works on America*) 1009.  
*Miscellaneous* (Allan, W. F., Allowance in lieu of Board, &c.) 1381; (Boundary, Legal Expenses in connection with) 1379; (British Association Meeting) 1310; (B. N. A. Act, Cases decided under) 1378; (Consolidating Statutes) 1302; (Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type, &c.) 1379; (Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1302; (Mounted Police Barracks) 1303; suppl., 1378; (Niagara Falls Commission) 1303; (N. W. T., Expenses of Govt. in) 1301; (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I.) 1312, 1314, conc., 1455; (Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings) 1374; (Richardson, H., Rental allowance) 1379.  
*North-West Mounted Police* (Pay of Force, &c.) 1294–1298.  
*Penitentiaries* (B. C.) 1002, suppl., 1338; (Dorchester) 1000; (Kingston) 998; (Man.) 1001, suppl., 1338; (St. Vincent de Paul) 999.  
*Pensions* (Compensation in lieu of land) 1617.  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Moncton Post Office, &c.) 1618; *Miscellaneous* (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367.  
*Quarantine* (Oattle Stations) 1010; (Public Health) 1013; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.  
 Supply Farm No. 20, Sale of (Ans.) 27; on M. for Ret., 45, 47; (Ans.) 285.  
 Supply Farm on Pincher Creek, Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 200; on M. for O.C., &c., 617.  
 Timber Lands in N.W., Sale of (Ans.) 73; on M. for Ret., 90.  
 Timber Licenses, Cancellation of, on M. for Ret., 51, 52.

**Macdonald, Sir John A.—Continued.**

Town Reserves on line of C. P. R., on M. for Ret., 75, 77.  
 Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.  
 United States Deserters, Arrest of, on M. for Ret., 86.  
 Volunteers, Surviving, of 1837–38, on M. to ascertain number, &c., 89.  
 Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1059; in Com., 1243.  
 Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against, on M. for Rep., 605.  
 Wilkinson, J. A., Promise of Appointment to (Ans.) 1054.  
 Wyandotte Indians, Distribution of moneys to (Ans.) 967.

**Mackenzie, Hon. A., East York**

*Adelaide*, Scow, in Com. of Sup., 1365; conc., 1616.  
 Administrator of the Govt. of the N. W. T., on M. for O. C., &c., 518.  
 Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com on Res., 1244.  
 Analysts, Public, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1244.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Res. to take precedence, 304; on M. for 2°, 534.  
 C. P. R., Station Accommodation on the, conc., 1449.  
 Canals, Capital, 1617; Income, 1462, conc., 1463, 1614.  
 Central Ontario Ry. B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for Com., 1175.  
 Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 833–838, 1334, 1336; conc., 1458.  
 Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1391, 1394.  
 Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 1336; conc., 1458.  
 Collection of Revenues, conc., 1457.  
*Concurrence—C. P. R.* (Station Accommodation) 1449; Civil Service Board, 1458; Culling Timber, 1458; Customs, 1457; Fishing Bounty (Distribution of) 1617; Geological Survey, 1451; Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 1616; High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) 1615; Hudson Bay (Expedition to) 1617; Intoxicating Liquors Act (Expenses in putting Act in force) 1453; Indians (Man. and N. W.) 1610; *Jennie Graham*, (Schooner) 1462, 1613; Legal Advisers (Payment to) 1617; Marchand, L. W. (Professional Services) 1463; Moncton Post Office (N.B.) 1616; *Newfield* (Cost of Working) 1458; Page, John (Payment to, as Arbitrator) 1617; Perley, H. F. (Services on St. Peter's Canal) 1460; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1459, 1612.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 1322; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1593.

**Mackenzie, Hon. A.—Continued.**

- Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 817, 819.
- Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on reprint of Amts., 812.
- Culling Timber, conc., 1458.
- Customs, conc., 1457.
- Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1105; on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) to Fifth Rep. of Com., 1272.
- Dominion Lands, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1437.
- Eastern Extension, Intercol. Ry., on M. for Cor., 738; on M. for 3° of B. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1131.
- Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., 1304.
- Fisheries, Distribution of Fishing Bounty, conc., 1617.
- Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1361.
- Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1061.
- Fort MacLeod Public Buildings at, on M. for O.C., &c., 670.
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1129.
- Geological Survey, conc., 1451
- Government Dredge for Man., Building of (Ques.) 210.
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 891\*; on M. for Com., 978; Amts. made by Sen., on Ques. of Priv., 1512.
- Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1218, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1362, 1365; conc., 1616.
- High Commissioner for Canada (*Sir Charles Tupper*) Appointment of, on M. for O. C., &c., 55.
- High Commissioner, House and Furniture for, in Com. of Sup., 1367; conc., 1615.
- Hudson Bay, Expedition to, conc., 1617.
- Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 844, 865.
- Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1403.
- Indians (Man. and N.W.) conc., 1610.
- Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
- Insolvent Banks, Insurance and Loan Co.'s, &c. B. 145 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1645.
- Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 838.
- Intoxicating Liquors Act, Expense of putting Act into operation, conc., 1453.
- Kamloops to Spencer's Bridge, B.C., Mail Service (M. for Ret. °) 1126.
- Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.
- Legal Advisers, Payment of, conc., 1617.
- Legislation, on Com. of Sup., 1340, 1459; conc., 1612.
- Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Joint Com., 1167.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1599; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1637.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal (Ques. of Order) 824.

**Mackenzie, Hon. A.—Continued.**

- London Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 139 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for Com., 1515; in Com., 1516.
- Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, in Com. of Sup., 1463.
- Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 833-837.
- Moncton Post Office, N.B., conc., 1616.
- Mounted Police, Pay of Force, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1297; Barracks, in Com. of Sup., 1303.
- Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry Co.'s incorp. Act. Amt. B. 80 (*Mr. Bell*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1176.
- Newfield, Cost of Working, conc., 1458.
- Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) 1546.
- North-West Territories, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1301; conc., 1611.
- North-West Grievances, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1156.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Abbott*) on Ques. of Order, 811.
- Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, conc., 1617.
- Perley, H. F., Services on St. Peter's Canal, conc., 1460.
- Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803, 806.
- Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1277.
- Printing of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Sixth Rep. of Joint Com., 1108; Seventh Rep. (Ques. of Order) 1321.
- Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
- Public Buildings of the Dom., on M. for Ret., 41.
- Public Works, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1218, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1362, 1365, 1366-1367; conc., 1616.
- Quotations from newspapers, Incorrect, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Orton*) 1582.
- Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmt., 617.
- Railways, Capital, in Com. of Sup., 1449, 1648.
- Registration of Deeds and Instruments in the N.W., on Res., 1635.
- Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1459, 1612.
- Returns, on production of (remarks) 1128.
- Robertson, John, Claims of, on M. for Ret., 615.
- St Andrews and Jennie Graham*, Schooners, conc., 1462, 1613.
- St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1494.
- Section B, Award of Arbitrators, in Com. of Sup., 1648.
- Sovereign Fire Ins. Co., Winding-up (B. 94, 1°\*) 304.
- Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1301.
- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1494, 1498, 1499; on Amt to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1553.
- SUPPLY:
- Oanals—Capital: Welland* (Page, John, Payment to as Arbitrator) conc., 1817; *St. Peter's* (Perley, H. F., Services of) conc., 1460. *Income: Beauharnois* (Marchand, L. W., Professional

**Mackenzie, Hon. A.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY—Continued.

Services) conc., 1463. Welland (Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*) conc., 1462, 1613.

*Civil Government*: Civil Service Board, 1336, conc., 1458; Interior, 838; Militia, 833–837; Privy Council Office, 1334.

*Collection of Revenues*: Culling Timber, conc., 1458; Customs, conc., 1457.

*Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1437.

*Fisheries* (Fishing Bounty, Distribution of) conc., 1617.

*Geological Survey*, conc., 1451.

*Indians* (Man. and N.W.) conc., 1610.

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1340; (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1459, 1612.

*Miscellaneous* (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1304; (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) conc., 1617; (Intoxicating Liquors Act, Expense of putting Act into operation) conc., 1453; (Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1302; (Legal Advisers, Payment of) conc., 1617; (Mounted Police Barracks) 1303; (*Newfield*, Coat of Working) conc., 1458; (N.W. T., Expenses of Govt. in) 1301, conc., 1611.

*Mounted Police* (Pay of Force, &c.) 1297.

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.B.) conc., 1616. Harbours and Rivers (Man., Scow *Atlatie*) 1365, conc., 1616; (N.B.) 1221, conc., 1616; (N.S.) 1218; (Ont.) 1224; (Quebec) 1223; (Repairs, &c.) 1362. Miscellaneous (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1367, conc., 1615; (Infantry Schools) 1366. Telegraphs, 1366.

*Railways—Capital*: C. P. R. (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) 1648; (Station Accommodation) conc., 1449.

*Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec) 1301.

Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 1366.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1059.

Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against, on M. for Rep., 605.

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. B. 131 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. to read and receive Pet., 1202.

**Macmaster, Mr. D., Glenarry**

Address, The (moved) 3.

Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 818.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 291.

Eastern Ry. Co. of Canada consolidation (B. 63, 1°\*) 162.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 953.

Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 745.

River St. Clair Tunnel Co. incorp. (B. 62, 1°\*) 162.

**Macmillan, Mr. D., East Middlesex**

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 3°, 812.

Ontario and Quebec Ry. Acts Amt. B. 46 (*Mr. Wells*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) to M. that B. pass, 837.

Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of, B. 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) in Com., 889.

Provincial Bank incorp. (B. 39, 1°\*) 83.

River Thames, Surveys of (M. for Reps., &c.\*) 1199.

**Macmillan, Mr. D.—Continued.**

Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 765.

## SUPPLY:

*Militia* (Drill Instruction) 1096.

**McCallum, Mr. L., Monck**

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 609.

**McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe**

Carriers by Land (B. 4, 1°\*) 27.

Commercial Bank of Man. incorp. (B. 42, 1°\*) 89.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1578–1581; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1594; (Amt.) 1594.

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. and Sen. Amts., on Ques. of Priv., 1514.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1595; in Com., 1597–1602; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1636; in Com., 1637; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1653.

Methodist Churches Union (B. 11, 1°\*) 40.

Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1547.

Railway Commissioners for Canada (B. 8, 1°\*) 31.

Titles to Land, Transfer of (B. 16, 1°\*) 43.

**McCraney, Mr. W., Halton**

Intoxicating Liquors Imported and Duties Paid (M. for Ret.\*) 67.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1636.

Morpeth Harbour, Construction of Works at (Ques.) 1054.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1118.

Rideau Hall, Expenditure on, since Confederation, all services (M. for Ret.\*) 1201.

St. Lawrence Canals, Expenditure on, since Confederation (M. for Ret.\*) 1201.

## SUPPLY:

*Militia* (Russian Leather Permeator) 1165.

Welland Canal, old and new works, Expenditure on since Confederation (M. for Ret.\*) 1201.

**McDonald, Mr. W., Cape Breton**

Credit of Canada, Decrying of, by Mr. Potter (M. for Cor.) 763.

Railway Matters in N. S. (M. for Cor.\*) 65.

Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmt., 617.

**McDougald, Mr. J., Pictou**

Ocean Mutual Marine Ins. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 20, 1°\*) 67.

Pictou Marine Ins. Co. incorp. (B. 35, 1°\*) 83.

*Ways and Means*—in Com.: on Res. 2 (steel, ingots, &c.) 730.

**McIntyre, Mr. P. A., King's, P.E.I.**

Concurrence—Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1453.

Peake's, Station at, on P. E. I. Ry. (Ques.) 261.

Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1278.

Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on M. for Papers, 63.

St. Peter's Harbour Breakwater, Contract for (M. for copy\*) 1200.

## SUPPLY:

*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1238.

*Miscellaneous* (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I.) conc., 1453.

*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (P. E. I.) 1220.

**McIsaac, Mr. A., Antigonish**

Antigonish Public Works, Expenditure on (M. for Stmt.\*) 66.

Bounty to Fishermen, Payment of (Ques.) 655.

Great American and European Short Line Ry. (Ques.) 57.

Preventive Officer at Morristown (M. for Cor.\*) 140.

Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.

Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1490.

## SUPPLY:

*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1234.

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 1190; Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 1218.

**McLelan, Hon. A. W., Colchester**

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1055; in Com. of Sup., 842; suppl., 1337.

Agriculture, Industrial, &c., Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095.

Archives, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1088.

Automatic Buoy in Lockport Harbour (Ans.) 604.

Bounty to Fishermen (Ans.) 603, 655.

Census of Canada, Second Vol. (presented) 1322.

Census, revoke, in Com. of Sup., 1091.

Certificates of Masters' and Mates' Act, non-enforcement of (Ans.) 85.

Certificates of Masters and Mates Act, 1874, Amt. (B. 116) M. for Com. on Res., 763; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 763; 2° m., 1057.

Certificates of Masters and Mates, Refusal of Board of Examiners to grant (Ans.) 1444.

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 842, 1337, 1467, 1471.

Colchester Reef Lighthouse (Ans.) 86, 199.

Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1456, 1464.

Concurrence—Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, 1440; Customs, 1456, 1464; Fishing Bounty (Distribution of) 1617; Hudson Bay (Expedition to) 1617; Imports and Exports of Fish (Tables respecting) 1464; Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, 1443.

Corbett, John, Employment of (Ans.) 199.

**McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.**

Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1090.

Customs, Examination of Baggage at St. Vincent (Ans.) 1444.

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1454, 1456.

Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1093.

Eathenware, in Com. on W. & M., 701.

Fishery Act Amt., Petitions praying for, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 300.

Fishing Bounty (Ans.) 603, 655; Distribution of, in Com. of Sup., 1369; conc., 1617.

Fishery Overseer for Digby County (Ans.) 89.

Georgian Bay, Survey of, Steamer for, in Com. of Sup., 1374.

Glendon, Steamer to replace, in Com. of Sup., 1227.

Goose Island, N. S., Lighthouse on (Ans.) 655.

Government Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 1227.

Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1605.

Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1094; conc., 1440.

Hudson Bay, Expedition to, in Com. of Sup., 1379, 1607; conc., 1617.

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1404–1414.

Imports and Exports of Fish, Tables respecting, conc., 1464.

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 611, 613.

International Fisheries Exhibition, on M. for Reprs., 82; outstanding Claims, in Com. of Sup., 1374.

Lakes Huron and Superior, Surveys, in Com. of Sup., 1303.

Life-boat at Wellington, Ont., Cost of (Ans.) 603.

Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1229.

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1232–1234; conc., 1443.

Marine and Fisheries Dept. (B. 140, 1°\*) 1386.

Marine and Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 260; in Com. of Sup., 842; suppl., 1467, 1471.

Masters' and Mates' Certificates, B. C., on M. for Ret., 606.

Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 1229.

Meteorological Observations, in Com. of Sup., 1255.

Navigable Rivers, Obstructions in, in Com. of Sup., 1232.

Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1254.

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1227, 1229, 1232, 1369.

Ogden, Alfred, Employment of (Ans.) 966.

Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1234, 1238.

Patent Record, in Com. of Sup., 1089.

Pictou Cattle Disease (Quarantine) in Com. of Sup., 1010.

Pilots for and above Harbour of Quebec, Acts respecting (Ans.) 655.

Port Rowan Life-saving Station, on M. for Cor., 521.

**McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.**

Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on M. for Papers, 61, 63.

*Princess Louise*, Steamer, on M. for copy of Contract, &c., 36.

Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1014.

Public Works, Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1357.

Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010-1014.

Returns, Production of (remarks) 1128.

Sanitary Journals, Subsidies to (Ans.) 1387.

School of Navigation at Quebec (Ans.) 141; on M. for Cor., 202.

Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 1254, 1255.

Seamen's Act, 1863, and Masters' and Mates' Certificates Act, 1874, Amt. (B. 116) M. for Com. on Res., 763; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 763; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1057.

Shipwrecks, Enquiries into (B. 117) M. for Com. on Res., 763; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 764; 2<sup>o</sup> m. and in Com., 1131; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1170, 1293.

Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. (Ans.) 269.

Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. (B. 129) prop. Res. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1126; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1360.

Sick and Distressed Mariners, Exemption of Fishing Vessels from payment to Fund (Ans.) 199.

Signal Stations, in Com. of Sup., 1234.

Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. (B. 121) M. for Com. on Res., and Res. in Com., 765; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 766; 2<sup>o</sup> m. and in Com., 1059.

Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1245.

Steamboat Inspector's Rep. (Ans.) 460.

**SUPPLY:**

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Agricultural, Industrial, &c., Statistics) 1095; (Archives, Care of) 1088; (Census, revote) 1091; (Criminal Statistics) 1090; (Dominion Exhibition) 1093; (Health Statistics) 1094, conc., 1440; (*Patent Record*) 1089.

*Civil Government*: Agriculture, 842, suppl., 1337; Marine and Fisheries, 842, suppl., 1467, 1471.

*Collection of Revenues*: Customs, 1316; conc., 1456, 1464

*Fisheries* (Fishing Bounty, Distribution of) 1369, conc., 1617; (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1234, 1238.

*Immigration*, 1404-1414.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Agencies, Rents, &c.) 1232; (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, Construction, &c.) 1233, conc., 1443; (Lighthouse-keepers, Salaries, &c.) 1232; (Signal Stations) 1234.

*Miscellaneous* (Imports and Exports of Fish, Tables respecting) conc., 1464; (International Fishery Exhibition, outstanding Claims) 1374; (Georgian Bay, Survey of, Steamer for) 1374; (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 1303; (Hudson Bay Expedition to) 1379, suppl., 1607, conc., 1617.

*Ocean and River Service* (*Glendon*, Steamer to replace) 1227; (Government Steamers) 1227; (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1229; (Masters and Mates, Examination of) 1229; (Obstructions in Navigable Rivers) 1232; (Water and River Police) 1232, suppl., 1369.

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1357; Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 1605.

*Quarantine* (Picton Cattle Disease) 1010; (Public Health) 1010-1014; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.

*Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Observations) 1255; (Observatories) 1254.

*Steamboat Inspection*, 1255.

**McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.**

*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 722.

Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.

Water and River Police, in Com. of Sup., 1232; suppl., 1369.

*Ways and Means*—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 701.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1243.

Weller's Bay, Ont., Range Lights (Ans.) 336.

Wellington, Ont., Life-boat House (Ans.) 336.

Wilkinson, J. A., Payments to (Ans.) 1055.

**McMillan, Mr. H., Vaudreuil**

Vaudreuil and Prescott Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 23, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 71.

**McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington**

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 322.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1594.

Dangerous Weapons, Carrying of (Ques.) 453.

Hearn, James, Superannuation of, on Ms. for Cor., 1111, 1289.

Immigration Agents, Salaries and Expenses (M. for Ret.) 303.

Improvement Fund, Money due Township of Wallace (Ques.) 200

Intercol. Ry. Claims Commissioners, Services of &c. (M. for Ret.) 303; (Ques.) 1387.

Intercol. Ry., Coal carried by (M. for Ret.) 65.

Judges, Equalization of Salaries of (Ques.) 40.

Printing and Advertising, Cost of (M. for Ret.) 303.

Scott Act, Enforcement of (Ques.) in Com. of Sup., 1383.

Section B, Arbitrators or Commissioners on (Ques.) 1386.

Senate, Expenditure in connection with (M. for Ret.\*), 1200.

Superannuation Fund (M. for Ret.) 65.

Returns, Production of (Ques.) 1128.

**SUPPLY:**

*Legislation* (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1007.

*Ways and Means*—conc., 778.

**McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce**

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 426.

Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 607.

Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 760.

**SUPPLY:**

*Indian Affairs*: Annual Grant (B. C.) 1267.

*Lighthouses and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, Construction, &c.) 1234.

*Militia* (Clothing, &c.) 1021.

*Miscellaneous* (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) 1380.

**Massue, Mr. L. H., Richelieu**

Agricultural Fertilizers (B. 38) Res. in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 88; 2<sup>o</sup> and ref. to Sel. Com., 294.  
Bank Returns, Inspection of (Ques.) 44, 1444.  
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 751.

**Methot, Mr. F. X. O., Nicolet**

Resignation as Member tendered, 1108.

**Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell**

Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1137; in Com., 1246 1248.  
Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 997.  
Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1337.  
America, Works on, in Com. of Sup., 1009.  
Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1019, 1020.  
Archives, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1089.  
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1089, 1092, 1095.  
Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.  
Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1376.  
Cassals, in Com. of Sup., 1051.  
Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1092.  
Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 833, 836-840, 988-990, 1337.  
Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1390, 1392.  
Civil Service Board, in Com. of Sup., 988-990.  
Coal, Sale and Delivery of, Bill 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1058; in Com., 1059.  
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1460.  
Concurrence—Indians (Man. and N. W.) 1450, 1610; High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) 1615; Returning Officers (Claims of) 1612.  
Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 13 (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Com., 815, 817, 818.  
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on reprint of Amts., 812.  
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1089.  
Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 553.  
Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1622.  
Dominion Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1384, 1385, 1425, 1428, 1433.  
Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 703.  
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1304.  
Fishery Exhibition, outstanding Claims, in Com. of Sup., 1374.  
Fortifications and Military Buildings B. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1062.  
Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contract B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on point of Order, 821.  
Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1262.

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**

Government Business, on M. to take Mondays, 1023; Measures abandoned (remarks) 1653.  
Governor General's Secretary's Office, in Com. of Sup., 833.  
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 896.  
Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1219, 1224.  
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095.  
High Commissioner (Contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 987; (House and Furniture for) conc., 1615.  
High Commissioner to England (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1039-1041.  
Hudson Bay, Expedition to, in Com. of Sup., 1380.  
Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 855, 861; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1447.  
Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1063; in Com., 1400-1403.  
Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 840.  
Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 838-840.  
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1267, 1269, 1373; conc., 1450, 1610.  
Intercol. Ry., Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1260.  
Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in, in Com. of Sup., 1302.  
Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1003, 1005, 1009, 1339; conc., 1612.  
Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Joint Rep. of Com., 964, 1168; in Com. of Sup., 1003.  
Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1596; in Com., 1600; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1636; in Com., 1637; (Amt.) 1640.  
Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of (Ques.) 964.  
Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Com. Sup., 1607.  
Manitoba Judiciary B. 146 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1622.  
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1019, 1020, 1163.  
Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 836.  
Molasses, in Com. on W. & M., 734.  
Mounted Police, Pay of Force, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1295.  
North-West Council, Constitution of (M. for Stmtnt.\*) 1200.  
North-West Grievances, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1135.  
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 898.  
Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1000, 1002.  
Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1017.  
Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1003.  
Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1005, 1009.  
Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod, on M. for O. C., &c., 620.  
Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1014.

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**

- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1192, 1219, 1224.  
 Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1587.  
 Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1014.  
 Quotations from newspapers, Incorrect, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Orton*) 1582.  
 Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation, on M. for Stmt., 617.  
 Railways, conc., 1650.  
 Reciprocity, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1188.  
 Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1612.  
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1163.  
 Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 837.  
 Section B., Award of Arbitrators, conc., 1650.  
 Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1339.  
 Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 3°, 1170, 1293.  
 Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1300.

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (Vice Admiralty Courts) 997.  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, Care of) 1089; (Census, revote,) 1092, (Criminal Statistics) 1089; (Health Statistics) 1095.  
*Canals—Capital* : Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) 1051.  
*Civil Government* : Agriculture, 1337; Civil Service Board, 988-990; Governor General's Secretary's Office, 833; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 987; Indian Affairs, 840; Interior, 838-840; Militia, 836; Secretary of State's Office, 837.  
*Collection of Revenues* : Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1260.  
*Dominion Lands—Capital* (Examination of Plans and Field Notes) 1384; (Surveys) 1425. *Income* (Outside Service) 1428, 1433; (Settlement of Land Claims) 1385.  
*Geological Survey*, 1262.  
*Indians* : Annual Grant (B. O.) 1267; (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1263; (Man. and N.W.) 1269, suppl., 1373, conc., 1450, 1610.  
*Legislation* : House of Commons (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1612; (Sessional Indemnities) 1339. *Miscellaneous* (Library, Salaries, &c.) 1003; (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1003; (Printing, Papers, &c.) 1005, 1009; (Works on America) 1009.  
*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1019, 1020; (Royal Military College) 1163.  
*Miscellaneous* (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1376; (Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c.) 1304; (Fishery Exhibition, outstanding Claims) 1374; (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) 1380; Keewatin, Expenses of Govt. in) 1301; Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees) 1607.  
*North West Mounted Police* (Pay of Force, &c.) 1295.  
*Penitentiaries* (B. U.) 1002; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1000.  
*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) 1017.  
*Public Works—Income* : Buildings (N.B.) 1192. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 1219; (Ont.) 1224.  
*Quarantine* (Public Health) 1014.  
*Railways—Capital* : C. P. R. (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) conc., 1650.  
*Steamship Subventions* (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1300.  
 Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W & M., 718.  
 Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1061.  
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1017.

**Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.**

- Vice-Admiralty Courts, in Com. of Sup., 997.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 703; (molasses) 734.  
**Mitchell, Hon. P., Northumberland, N. B.**  
 Adjournment of the House, on M. (remarks) 514.  
 British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3°, 1172.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 497; on M. for 2° (Personal Explanation) 528; on M. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 567.  
 Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1208, 1211.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1577; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1592.  
 Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 842.  
 Customs Officers in Northumberland County, on M. for Ret., 466.  
 Dominion Employés in B. C., on M. for Stmt., 514.  
 Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 700, 703.  
 Eastern Extension Ry., acquisition of, B. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 882.  
 Fishery Act Amt., Petitions praying for, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 301.  
 Fortin, Mr., Services of (remarks) 809.  
 Fredericton and Miramichi River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1504.  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1395.  
 Government Business, State of (remarks) 1170.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 892, 978; (remarks) on prop. Govt. B. to amend., 1608, 1635.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s Stockholders (M. for Stmt.)\* 1200.  
 Hamilton and North-Western Ry. B. 65 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 977.  
 Intercol. Ry. (Repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1258.  
 Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 839.  
 Jack Head River Timber Limits (M. for Cor.)\* 1201.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal, on point of Order, 824.  
 Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1472.  
 Naval Station at Esquimalt, on M. for Ret., 516.  
 New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 54 (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) on M. for 2°, 504.  
 Nova Scotia Ry. Agreement B. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 882.  
 Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Haggart*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace*) to M. for 3°, 859.  
 Parkdale Village and G. T. R. legalization of Agreement B. 82 (*Mr. Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 504.  
 Private Bills, Presentation of, on M. to extend time, 1359.

**Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.**

- Point Escuminac Breakwater (M. for Papers) 514.  
 Question of Privilege *re* Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. (remarks) 1511-1515.  
 Returns, Imperfect (remarks) 1128.  
 San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 83 (*Mr. Royal*) on M. for 2°, 505.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1504, 1506, 1507; in Com., 1625.  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government*: Customs, 842; Interior, 839; Marine and Fisheries, 1472.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1258.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 700, 703.  
 White, Mr. (Hastings) on Personal Explanation (remarks) 1241.

**Moffatt, Mr. R., Restigouche**

- SUPPLY:  
*Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1237.  
*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 695.

**Montplaisir, Mr. H., Champlain**

- Intercol. Ry., Passes on (M. for Stmtnt.\*) 1201.

**Mulock, Mr. W., North York**

- Disallowance of Provincial Acts (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 42.  
 Fishing in Ontario Waters, Regulations (M. for Ret.) 71.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. and Construction Co., on Ms. (*Mr. Blake*) for Ret. (Amts.) 221, 225.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s Shareholders (M. for Stmtnt.) 513.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 409.  
 Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1208.  
*Concurrence*—Geological Survey, 1451; High Commissioner (Contingencies) 1610.  
 Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 52, 1°\*) 131; 2° m., 460; B. withdn., 986; on B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1577-1581; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1592.  
 Geological Survey, conc., 1451.  
 Hamilton and North-Western Ry. B. 65 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on M. for Com. (Amt) 977.  
 High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) in Com. of Sup., 1368; (Contingencies) conc., 1610.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1636.  
 Luard, Major-General, Complaints against (M. for copies, &c.) 295; M. withdn., 506; (M. for copies,

**Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.**

- &c.) 621; (speech) 738; (correction) 749; (reply) 761.  
 Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1161.  
 Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1161.  
 Patent Rights, Fraud in Sale of (B. 26, 1°) 71; 2° m., 145; ref. to Sel. Com., 145; Rep. from Sel. Com., 230; 3° m., 460.  
 Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 804.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1355, 1368.  
 Railways, Assistance to, since Confederation (M. for Stmtnt.) 616.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1486.  
 SUPPLY:  
*Civil Government* (High Commissioner, Contingencies) conc., 1610.  
*Geological Survey*, conc., 1451.  
*Militia* (Contingencies, &c.) 1168; (Military Properties, Care of) 1161.  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1355. Miscellaneous (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1388.

**O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka**

- Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1251.  
 Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1018.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 453.  
 Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1165.  
 Clothing, &c., Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1021.  
*Concurrence*—Military Properties, Care of, 1441.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 461; on B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1580.  
 Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1196; Drill Pay, &c., 1199.  
 Fishery Act Amt., Pets. praying for (M. to ref. to Sel. Com.) 299, 303.  
 Gravenhurst-Callander Ry. (Ques.) 604.  
 Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 874.  
 Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 608.  
 Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 751.  
 Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1161; conc., 1441.  
 Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 803.  
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1163.  
 Superior, Lake, North of, Character and Resources of Land, on M. for Ret., 972.  
 SUPPLY:  
*Militia* (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 1018; (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1165; (Clothing, &c.) 1021; (Contingencies, &c.) 1158; (Drill Instruction) 1096; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1099; (Military Properties, Care of) 1161, conc., 1441; (Royal Military College) 1163.

**Ouimet, Mr. J. A., Laval**

- Ballot Box, New Model (M. for Sel. Com.) 800.  
 Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 1621.  
 Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for 2°, 94.  
 Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to adjn. deb.; 812.  
 Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1107.  
 Dual Representation Repeal (B. 13, 1°\*) 40; 2° m., 144.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1595, 1638.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 963; (Amt. to Amt.) 963.  
 Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 760.  
 Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench, on M. for Ret., 135.  
 North Shore Ry., St. Martin's to Quebec (Ques.) 1388.  
 Personal Explanation respecting article in Toronto *Mail*, 456.  
 St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res., 1494.  
 Subsidies to Provinces, Readjustment of (M. for Cor.) 150.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1494.

**Orton, Mr. G. T., Centre Wellington**

- Agricultural Banking and Lending Provision (B. 105, 1°) 524.  
 Banking Facilities for Agriculturists (M. for Sel. Com.) 210; (Res.) 763.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 343.  
 Dominion Lands, Income, in Com. of Sup., 1430.  
 Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 699, 702.  
 Fairford River, Man., Improvements (M. for Reprs.) 208; (Explanation) 210.  
 Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., 799.  
 Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1094.  
 Hudson Bay and Straits, Exploratory Expedition to (Ques.) 132.  
 Hudson Bay Navigation, on M. for Sel. Com., 206.  
 Question of Privilege, on Mr. Sykes' letter in Regina *Leader* (remarks) 1582.  
 San Francisco and Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 83 (*Mr. Royal*) M. to withdr., 1169.  
 Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act. Amt. B. 81 (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 979.  
 Supply Farm No. 20, Fish Creek, on M. for Ret., 47.

**SUPPLY :**

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Health Statistics) 1091.  
*Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1430.

**Orton, Mr. G. T.—Continued.**

- United States Customs Duties on Hay, on M. for Ret., 520.  
 Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 699, 702.  
 Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. B. 131 (*Mr. Camrean, Victoria*) on M. to read and receive Pet., 1202; on M. for 2° of B., 1281.

**Paint, Mr. H. N., Richmond, N.S.**

- Customs Officers in Richmond County, on M. for Ret. 465.  
 Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 610.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1575.

**SUPPLY :**

- Fisheries* (Fishing Bounty) 1371; (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1236.  
*Legislation* (Miscellaneous Printing) 1009.  
*Militia* (Drill Instruction) 1097; (Royal Military College) 1164.  
*Miscellaneous* (Hudson Bay, Expedition to) 1381.  
*Ocean and River Service* (*Glendon*, Steamer to replace) 1228; (Life-boats, Harbours, &c.) 1230; (Obstructions in Navigable Rivers) 1232.  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 1191.

**Patterson, Mr. J. C., North Essex**

- Amherstburg Custom House and Post Office (M. for Reprs.) 297.  
 Ballot Box, New Model of, on M. for Sel. Com., 800.  
 Coal Oil Barrels, Seizure of, at Sandwich, &c. (M. for Papers) 298.  
 Customs Dept. at Windsor, Employment of Officers (M. for Cor.) 508.  
 Duart, Postmaster a, on M. for Ret., 509.  
 Ferries (B. 115, 1°) 736.  
 Frontier Police, South-Western Ont. (Ques.) 1054.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) in Com. (Amt.) 973.  
 Harbour in Essex County (M. for Ret.) 506.  
 Kingsville Harbour Works, on M. for Ret., 216.  
 Leamington, Post Office at, on M. for Cor., 801; on withdr. of Stmt. reflecting on a Member, 802.  
 Maritime Court for Canada (Ques.) 965.  
 Pajot Farm, Claim of Indian Dept. to (M. for Ret.\*) 1201.  
 Wyandotte Indians, Distribution of moneys to (Ques.) 966.

**Paterson, Mr. W., South Brant**

- Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1253.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s Funded Debt (Ques.) 337.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 395; on M. for 2° of B., 532; on M. for Com., 538.  
 Clothing, Militia, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1021, 1022.  
 Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1091.

**Paterson, Mr. W.**—*Continued.*

- Customs Act, 1883, Amt. B. 123 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 1060.  
 Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1108.  
 Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1094.  
 Dominion Lands (Outside Service) in Com. of Sup., 1438.  
 Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for Export (M. for copies of Claims) 38.  
 Grinding in Bond, on M. for O. C., &c., 53.  
 Great Britain and Germany, Treaty between, respecting Immigrants, on M. for copies of Despatches, &c., 800.  
 Immigration to Manitoba and the N.W., Agreement between Govt. and C. P. R. (M. for Cor.) 83.  
 Immigrants, Applications for Services of (M. for Ret.) 510.  
 Immigration and Emigration (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 1063-1071.  
 Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1399-1404.  
 Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 539; in Com., 539-542; on M. for 3°, 625.  
 Leamington, Post Office at, on M. for Cor., 802.  
 Maritime Court of Ont. Extension of Jurisdiction B. 70 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 462.  
 Molasses, in Com. on W. & M., 734.  
 Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 802.  
 Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1008.  
 Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.  
 Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 731, 732.  
 SUPPLY:  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Census, revote) 1091; Dominion Exhibition, 1094.  
*Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1438.  
*Indian Affairs*: Annual Grant (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1264, (B.C.) 1266.  
*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1008.  
*Militia* (Clothing, &c.) 1021, 1022.  
*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) 1016.  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1197.  
*Quarantine*, 1010.  
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1016.  
*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 641; in Com.: on Res. 2 (sugars, syrups, &c.) 731, 732; (Molasses) 734.  
 Wheat and Flour Importations (M. for Ret.) 38.

**Platt, Mr. J. M.**, *Prince Edward*

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 437.  
 Central Ontario Ry. (B. 73, 1°\*) 198; M. for Com., 1175; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202, 1212.  
 Indian Islands in Lake Ont. (M. for Ret.) 87.  
 Life-boat at Wellington, Cost of (Ques.) 603.  
 Life-saving Stations, Life-boats, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 1199; in Com. of Sup., 1232.

**Platt, Mr. J. M.**—*Continued.*

- Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1232, 1233.  
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051.  
 Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1014.  
 Public Health Officers (M. for Ret.) 88.  
 Return, Missing, re Mail Service in P. E. County (remarks) 459.  
 SUPPLY:  
*Quarantine* (Public Health) 1014.  
*Canals—Capital*: Murray, 1051.  
*Ocean and River Service* (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 1230.  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c.) 1232; (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c., Maintenance) 1233.  
 Weller's Bay Range Lights (Ques.) 336.  
 Wellington Life-boat House (Ques.) 336.

**Pope, Hon. J. H.**, *Compton*

- Canadian Immigration (Ans.) 44.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 483.  
 Census, remaining Volume (Ans.) 72, 766.  
 Emigrant Buildings at Lévis, on M. for Cor., 90.  
 High Commissioner on Emigration, on M. for Ret., 49; Letter and Cablegrams to, on Immigration, on M. for copies, 799.  
 Immigration Agent and Quarantine Officer, Duties and Salary of, Vancouver Island (Ans.) 336.  
 Manitoba, Persons entering by rail, on M. for Stmt., 49, 50.  
 Patent Rights, Fraud in Sale of, B. 26 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 145.  
 Port of Landing for European Immigrants (Ans.) 89.  
 Public Health Officers, on M. for Ret., 88.

**Reid, Mr. J.**, *Cariboo*

- Boundary between B. C. and the N. W. T. (Ques.) 261.  
 British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1037; (Amt.) 1038.

**Rinfret, Mr. C. J.**, *Lotbinière*

- Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1074.  
 Lotbinière, Construction of Wharf at (Ques.) 1054.  
 Mail Service in the County of Lotbinière (M. for Papers, &c.) 296.  
 St. Gilles, Daily Mail for (Ques.) 73.  
 Talbot, Achille, Employment and Salary of (Ques.) 966.

**Riopel, Mr. L. J.**, *Bonaventure*

- School of Navigation, Que., on M. for Cor., 201.

**Robertson, Mr. A.**, *West Hastings*

- Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1497.  
 Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 748.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1497.

**Robertson, Mr. T., Hamilton**

Chinese Immigration into B.C., Prohibition of, on Amt. (*Mr. Allen*) to Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) M. to adjn. deb., 1285.

Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice (B. 97, 1°\*) 457.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in (B. 96, 1°\*) 457.

Criminal Cases, Procedure in, Duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions (B. 98, 1°\*) 457.

Speedy Trial of Persons charged with Felonies, &c., Acts Amt. (B. 93, 1°\*) 457.

## SUPPLY:

*Legislation* (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1003.

**Robertson, Mr. T., Shelburne**

Automatic Buoy in Lockport Harbour (Ques.) 603.

Bounty to Fishermen, Names, &c., of those who received same (M. for Stmt.\*) 67; (Ques.) 603.

Intoxicating Liquors, Traffic in, Act Amt. (B. 102, 1°\*) 504; Order for 2° allowed to stand, 1290.

Ogden, Alfred, Employment of (Ques.) 965.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic (Amt.) to prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1123.

Scott Act in Cumberland Co. (Ques.) 736.

Sick and Distressed Mariners Act Amt. (Ques.) 269.

## SUPPLY:

*Steamship Subventions* (Halifax and St. John *via* Yarmouth) 1298.

Upper Wood Harbour, Wharf and Bridge at (M. for Ret.\*) 1199.

**Ross, Mr. A. W., Lisgar**

Alberta Bridge Co. incorp. (B. 76, 1°\*) 198.

Bank of Winnipeg incorp. (B. 29, 1°\*) 83.

Calgary Omnibus, Tramway and Transfer Co. (B. 78, 1°\*) 198.

Calgary Waterworks Co. incorp. (B. 77, 1°\*) 198.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 404.

Manitoba South-Western Colonization Ry. Co. (B. 75, 1°\*) 198.

Ranchers' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 74, 1°\*) 198.

**Royal, Mr. J., Provencher**

Alberta Bridge Co. incorp. B. 76 (*Mr. Ross*) 2° m., 504.

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1105:

Hudson Bay, Navigation of (M. for Sel. Com.) 203.

San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co. incorp. (B. 83, 1°\*) 231; 2° m., 505.

## SUPPLY:

*Miscellaneous* (*Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.*) 1308.

**Rykert, Mr. J. C., Lincoln**

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 359.

Commercial Cable Co. (B. 19, 1°\*) 67.

Welland Ry. and G. T. R. Transfer authorization (B. 44, 1°\*) 89; 2° m., 271.

**Scott, Mr. T., Winnipeg**

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 493.

**Scriver, Mr. J. C., Huntingdon**

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 1621.

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1103; on Amt. (*Mr. Landry*) Fifth Rep., 1271.

Earthenware, in Com. on W. & M., 699.

Library of Parliament, First Rep. of Joint Com., Ms. to conc. in, 964, 1167; Second Rep., 1240; Third Rep. (presented) 1443; M. to conc., 1476.

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1598.

Newspaper Correspondence, on Personal Explanation (*Mr. Ouimet*) 457.

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1123.

United States Customs Duties on Hay, on M. for Ret., 520.

*Ways and Means*—in Com.: on Res. 2 (earthenware) 699.

White, Mr. (Hastings) on Personal Explanation (remarks) 1241.

**Shakespeare, Mr. N., Victoria, B.C.**

British Columbia, Agreement with, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) to M. for Com. on Res., 1028; on receiving Rep. of Com., 1039; on Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) to M. for 3°, 1172.

Cabinet Representation for B. C. (Ques.) 505.

Chinese Immigration (M. for Cor.) 616; Prohibition of into B. C. (Res.) 975; on M. to adjn. deb., 1287.

Gas Inspection in B. C. (Ques.) 506.

Geological Survey in B. C. (Ques.) 505.

Indian Act, 1880, Amt. B. 87 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1399.

Indian Troubles at Metlakatla and Dept. of Indian Affairs (M. for Cor.\*) 83.

## SUPPLY:

*Militia* (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.) 1164.

**Small, Mr. J., East Toronto**

Civil Service Acts Amt. (Ques.) 655.

Northern and North-Western Junction Ry. Co. (B. 59, 1°\*) 141.

Northern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 57, 1°\*) 141; on Sen. Amts., 1546.

Toronto Esplanade and Harbour Accommodation (B. 60, 1°\*) 141.

**Smyth, Mr. H., Kent**

Huron and Erie Ry. Co. (B. 85, 1°\*) 260.

**Somerville, Mr. J., North Brant**

- Blackeby, A. H., Employment of (Ques.) 966.  
 Canadian Express Co., Transport Requisitions on Militia Dept. (M. for copies\*) 523.  
 Fishery Regulations, Fines imposed under, and Receipts (M. for Ret.\*) 1201.  
*Le Courier de St. Hyacinthe*, Payments to (M. for Stmt.\*) 66.  
 Militia, Returns respecting (remarks) 1127.  
 Militia Tents, Manufacture of (Ques.) 505.  
 Ministerial Expenses to England and elsewhere (M. for Ret.\*) 66.  
 Moccasins, Purchase of, by Militia Dept. (M. for Cor.\*) 624.  
 Rivers and Streams, Rental of, Sums received on account of (M. for Ret.\*) 1201.

## SUPPLY :

- Militia* (Contingencies) 1343.  
*Miscellaneous* (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1375; (Consolidated Statutes, Purchase of Type, &c.) 1379.  
 Tents, Purchase of, by Militia Dept. (M. for Cor.\*) 624.

**Speaker, Mr. (HON. GEO. A. KIRKPATRICK) Frontenac**

- Accountant, Receipts and Disbursements (presented) 31.  
 Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 111: on Ques. of Order (*ruling*) 1246.  
 Albert Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.  
 Banking Facilites for Agriculturists, Provision B. 105: on Ques. of Order on introduction, 524; on M. for Com. on Res., 763.  
 Berthier Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 1443.  
 Blake's, Mr., Speech on the Orange B.: on Ques. of Priv., 1544, 1545.  
 Bothwell Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 524.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan Res.: Member requested not to use unparliamentary language, 342; on reference to Member sitting by the grace of others, 448; on Members being called on to vote, 454; flat contradictions restrained, 484; unparliamentary language, 532.  
 Chinese Immigration into B. C.: on Ques. of Priv., 977.  
 Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12: on objection taken by Member who introd. B. moving its 2°, 80.  
 Controverted Elections: Judges Reps. (read) 1, 337, 524, 735, 1321, 1443.  
 Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in B. 3: on Member speaking twice, 97.  
 Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6: on an Amt. to 3°, 668; on name of Member being omitted from div. on B., 709; on reprint of Amts., 812; unparliamentary language checked, 813.  
 Cumberland, Seat for: on using offensive words in debate, 561.  
 Debates, Official Rep.: on Amt. to ref. Fifth Rep. back to Com., 1271.

**Speaker, Mr.—Continued.**

- Fortin's, Mr., Vote on Contracts B. 12: on hearing question read from the gallery and subsequent withdrawal from seat (*ruling*) 824.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21: on Amt. to passing of B., 978; on Ques. of Priv., respecting Amts. made by Sen. (*ruling*) 1515.  
 Hamilton and North-Western Ry. B. 65: on Ques. of Procedure, 977.  
 Huron, West, Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.  
 Kent Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1; Notification of Return of Member elect, 198.  
 Leamington, Post Office at: Member requested to withdraw certain Stmnts., 802; reference to former deb. checked, 807.  
 Lennox Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.  
 Library of Parliament: Rep. of Librarian (presented) 2; on M. to conc. in First Rep, 964, 1167, 1169; on Second Rep., 1240; on presentation of Third Rep., 1443.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143: on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to repeal (*ruling*) 1640.  
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal: on M. to take precedence, Ques. of Order, no notice having been given (*ruling*) 825.  
 Luard, Major-Gen, on M. for Complaints against, 295.  
 Lunenburg Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.  
 Megantic Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (*read*) 1321.  
 Messages from His Excellency (read) 27, 56, 145, 304, 1240, 1439, 1576.  
 Middlesex, West, Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.  
 Montcalm Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 337.  
 New Members, Return of (announcement) 1, 198.  
 Nicolet, Vacancy in the Representation, Warrant issued, 1126.  
 Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57: on Sen. Amts (rule read) 1547.  
 North-West Grievances, Personal allusions checked, 1152.  
 Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. confirmation of Lease B. 32: on promotion of B. by Member who is paid Solicitor of Co. (*ruling*) 810, 811; on M. to change the name of mover (*ruling*) 843; on Ques. of Priv., 857.  
 Orange, Loyal, Association B. 93: Personal allusions checked, 920; Member requested to withdraw unparliamentary language, 923.  
 Parliamentary Practice: respecting Member being called on to Vote, 458.  
 Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, B. 18: on M. (*Mr. Amyot*) to discharge Order referring B. to Sel. Com. on Banking and Commerce, 131.  
 Prince Leopod, the late, Resolution of Condolence to Her Majesty, Mess. from Senate (announcement) 1273.  
 Printing of Parliament: on M. to adopt Sixth Rep. of Joint Com., 1109.

**Speaker, Mr.—Continued.**

- Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic: on Amt. to prop. Res., 1233.
- Prorogation, Letter from His Excellency's Secretary (read) 1652.
- Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 131: on Ques. of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1445; (*ruling*) 1536.
- Quotations from newspapers, Incorrect: on Ques. of Priv., 1582.
- Receipts and Disbursements of Accountant, House of Commons (presented) 31.
- Return, Missing, *re* P. E. County Mail Service (explanation) 459.
- Royal Assent to C. P. R. Loan B. (announcement) 664.
- Secretary, His Excellency's, Letter from, respecting Royal assent to C. P. R. Loan B. (read) 655.
- Sick and Distressed Mariners' Fund: on Member confining himself to Ques., 217.
- Simcoe, South, Election: Judge's Rep. (read) 1.
- Soulanges Election: Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 735.
- Speech from the Throne (Rep.) 2.
- St. Patrick's Day: on M. for adjournment, 885.
- Vacancies: Notification of, 1, 1126; 1321
- Warrants issued for new Elections (announcements) 1, 1126, 1321.
- [See, "KIRKPATRICK Mr.," 1126; also "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE," and "PROCEDURE."]

**Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey**

- Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention B. 114 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. 1246.
- Banking Facilities for Agriculturists, on M. for Sel. Com., 213.
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Res., 432.
- Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1389.
- Debates, Official Rep., in Com. of Sup., 1341.
- Dominion Lands (Outside Service) in Com. of Sup., 1435.
- Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1237, 1372.
- Inspection of Vessels on Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Ret., 608.
- Newspaper Mail Service, Delays in Transmission (M. for Cor.) 216.
- Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1548.
- Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 928.
- Public Health, in Com. of Sup., 1014.
- Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 81 (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 979.
- Superior, Lake, North of, Character and Resources of Land, on M. for Ret., 971.

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY:

- Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1435.
- Fisheries* (Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.) 1237; (Fishing Bounty) 1372.
- Immigration*: Salaries, &c., 1418.
- Legislation*: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1006; (Publishing Debates) 1341.
- Public Works—Income*; Buildings (Repairs, &c.) 1199.
- Quarantine* (Public Health) 1014.
- Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1243, 1249.

**Sutherland, Mr. H., Selkirk**

- Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1623.
- Examiner Under Dom. Lands Act at Brandon (Ques.) 1109.
- Public Buildings at Brandon, Erection of (Ques.) 1110.
- SUPPLY:
- Penitentiaries* (Manitoba) 1001.

**Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford**

- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1572.

**Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-William, Halifax**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 326.
- Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 829, 830.
- Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1058.
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1130.
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2°, 897.
- Halifax Steam Navigation Co. incorp. (B. 24, 1°\*) 71.
- Molasses, in Com. on W. & M., 734.
- Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1058.
- Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, amounts paid under, on M. for Stmt., 269.
- SUPPLY:
- Charges of Management*, 829, 830.
- Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 686; in Com.: on Res. 2 (molasses) 734.

**Tassé, Mr. J., Ottawa City**

- Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) 1392.
- Kazuabazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1501.
- Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of (B. 95, 1°\*) 304; M. for Com., 889.
- Repatriation of Canadians (Ques.) 965.
- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1501; on Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1559-1561.

**Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds**

Customs Officer at Gananoque, on M. for Ret., 465.  
 Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Ry. Co. (B. 58, 1°\*)  
 141.  
 Gananoque, Post Office at (correction) 802.  
 Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93  
 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 904.  
 Rideau Canal, Extension of (M. for Cor.\*) 1201.  
 Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. &  
 M., 693.  
 Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (steel, needles,  
 &c.) 730.

**Temple, Mr. T., York, N.B.**

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles  
 Tupper*) on Amt (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1593.  
 Customs Officers in York County, on M. for Ret., 466.  
 Ways and Means—conc., 790.

**Thompson, Mr. D., Haldimand**

Letter Postage Rates, Amt. of Existing Law (Ques.) 89.  
 Library of Parliament, First Rep. of Joint Com., on M.  
 to conc. in (Ques.) 964.

## SUPPLY:

*Militia* (Construction and Repairs) 1163; (Dominion Rifle Asso-  
 ciation) 1160; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1160; (Military Properties,  
 Care of) 1162

*Public Works—Income*: (Buildings, Repairs, &c.) 1199.

**Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard, St. John, N.B.**

America, Works on, in Com. of Sup., 1009.  
 Auditor General's Office, in Com. of Sup., 841.  
 Auditor-General's Rep. (presented) 27.  
 Bank Returns, Inspection of (Ans.) 44, 1444.  
 Benefit Mutual Insurance Societies (Ans.) 337.  
 Blackeby, A. H., Employment of (Ans.) 966.  
 Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c., in  
 Com. of Sup., 1375.  
 Bounty on Manufactures of Iron, on M. for O. C., &c.,  
 70.  
 Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John  
 A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Vic-  
 toria*) 1621.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ans.) 71; De-  
 posit of Securities (Ans.) 72; Funded Debt (Ans.)  
 337.  
 Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1608; conc., 1618.  
 Cape Tormentine Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 1604.  
 Chloride of Zinc, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 734.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 832, 833, 839, 841,  
 843, 987, 1333, 1336, 1602; conc., 1440, 1610.  
 Clothing, &c., Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1020.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1457.  
 Commercial Treaties, negotiations, on M. for O. C., &c.,  
 58.  
 Concurrence—Customs, 1457; High Commissioner (Con-  
 tingencies, &c.) 1610; Legal Advisers (Payment to)  
 1617; Page, John (Payment to, as Arbitrator) 1617;

**Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard—Continued.**

Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1454; Re-  
 turning Officers (Claims of) 1459, 1612.  
 Confederation, Historical Painting, in Com. of Sup.,  
 1310.  
 Customs, conc., 1457.  
 Customs, Tariff of Duties of (B. 142, 1°\*) 1443.  
 Debates, Official Rep., in Com. of Sup., 1002.  
 Departmental Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 843.  
 Disallowance of Provincial Acts, on M. for copies of  
 O.C. &c., 42.  
 Dominion Exhibition (Ans.) 1215.  
 Dunsville, Waste Weir at, in Com. of Sup., 1608.  
 Estimates, The, 1884-85: Mess. from His Ex., 145; ref.  
 to Com. of Sup., 145; Suppl. Est., 1883-84, 1240;  
 Suppl. Est., 1884-85, 1439; Further Suppl. Est.,  
 1884-85, 1576.  
 Exchange Bank of Canada, on M. for Stmt., 35; on  
 Res. censuring Govt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 159;  
 Security for advance to (Ans.) 199; Ogilvie & Bantin,  
 Securies for, 261, 337.  
 Examiner under Dom. Lands Act at Brandon (Ans.)  
 1109.  
 Factories, definition of offences against persons em-  
 ployed in (B. 106, 1°) 524.  
 Factory B. and Manufacturers' Association, on M. for  
 Ret., 82.  
 Flag Treaty, between U. S. and Spain (remarks) 1361.  
 Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 841.  
 Finance Minister's Mission to England, on M. for  
 Papers, 87.  
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costi-  
 gan*) in Com., 1395.  
 Governor General's Secretary's Office, in Com. of Sup.,  
 832.  
 Grain, Tariff on, Readjustment of (Ans.) 336.  
 Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1222.  
 High Commissioner (Removal Expenses) in Com. of  
 Sup., 1336; (Contingencies) conc., 1440, 1610.  
 Immigration, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1602.  
 Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1602.  
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1608.  
 Iron, Bounties on Manufactures of, on M. for O. C., &c.,  
 70.  
 Insurance, Superintendance of, in Com. of Sup., 1423.  
 Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 839.  
 Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) in Com. of Sup., 833.  
 Land Improvement Fund Money due Township of  
 Wallace (Ans.) 200.  
 Land Improvement Fund, Ont. (Ans.) 1215.  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1002-1004, 1008, 1009,  
 1602, 1627.  
 Lévis Graving Dock, further advance towards com-  
 pletion (prop. Res.) 1516.  
 Library of Parliament, on presentation of Third Rep.,  
 1443; Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1003, 1602.  
 Life Annuities, Sale of (Ans.) 199.

**Tilley, Sir Leonard—Continued.**

- Life Insurance Co.'s, Co operative, &c. (B. 118) M. for Com. on Res., 764; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 765.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) M. for Com., 1595.
- Loans, Redemption of Small (B. 156) prop. Res. 1516; in Com., 1588; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B. 1610.
- Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, in Com. of Sup., 1617.
- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1298-1301; conc., 1453.
- Manitoba Public Schools, Aid to (B. 36) prop. Res. 43; M. for Com., 68; in Com., 69; conc. in and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 85.
- Messages from His Excellency (presented) 145, 1240, 1439, 1576.
- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1020.
- Mission School at Fort William, in Com. of Sup., 1608.
- Molasses, in Com. on W. & M., 734.
- Newfoundland Prohibition Duty (Ans.) 1214.
- Newfoundland, Trade with (remarks) 1361.
- Ogilvie and Buntin, Messrs., as Security for Exchange Bank (Ans.) 261, 337.
- Ontario and Quebec Accounts with Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 72, 73.
- Ontario Land Improvement Fund (Ans.) 1215.
- Ontario's Provincial Debt to Canada (Ans.) 199.
- Optional Subjects, on conc., withdn., 1602.
- Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, in Com. of Sup., 1608; conc., 1618.
- Post Office Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1336.
- Printing of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Sixth Rep. of Joint Com., 1108.
- Printing, Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1004, 1008; conc., 1440.
- Printing Vocabularies of Indian Dialects, in Com. of Sup., 1608.
- Private Bills, Presentation of, on M. to extend time, 1360.
- Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 833; suppl. 1333, 1336.
- Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 1124.
- Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment (B. 154) prop. Res. 1215; M. for Com., 1583; in Com., 1584; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B. 1610.
- Public Accounts (presented) 27.
- Public Buildings at Brandon, Erection of (Ans.) 1110.
- Public Debt of the Dominion (Ans.) 736.
- Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1326.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1193, 1222, 1362, 1604.
- Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
- Quebec's Provincial Debt to Canada (Ans.) 199.
- Quebec Tidal Dock, further advance towards completion (prop. Res.) 1516.

**Tilley, Sir Leonard—Continued.**

- Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 843.
- Redemption of Small Loans (B. 156) prop. Res., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1610.
- Refund of Duties in P. E. I., 1312; conc., 1454.
- Returning Officers, Claims of, conc., 1459.
- Returns, Imperfect, *re* High Commissioner (remarks) 460.
- Returns, Preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 1381.
- Secretary of State's Office, in Com. of Sup., 1602.
- Senate, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1627.
- Stationery Office, in Com. of Sup., 987.
- Steel, Ingots, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 728; Rolled, &c., 730; Needles, &c., 730.
- Subsidies to Provinces, Readjustment (B. 154) prop. Res., 1215; M. for Com., 1583; in Com., 1584; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1610.
- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1496.
- Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 731-733.
- SUPPLY:**
- Res. for Com., 28; Mss. for Com., 825, 987, 1039, 1063, 1138, 1176, 1215, 1245, 1294, 1322, 1361, 1404, 1423, 1465, 1602, 1626.
- Canals—Capital*: Welland (Page, John, Payment to as Arbitrator) 1608, conc., 1618. *Income*: Welland (Waste Weir at Dunsville) 1608.
- Civil Government*: Auditor General's Office, 841; Departmental Contingencies, 843; Finance and Treasury Board, 841; Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832; High Commissioner (Removal Expenses) 1336, (Contingencies) conc., 1440 1610; Immigration, 1602; Indian Affairs, 1602; Interior, 839; Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) 833; Post Office, 1336; Privy Council Office, 833, suppl., 1333, 1336; Railways and Canals, 843; Secretary of State's Office, 1602; Stationery Office, 987.
- Collection of Revenues*: Customs, conc., 1457.
- Indians*: B.C. (Printing Vocabularies of Dialects) 1603; Ont. and Que. (Mission School at Fort William) 1608.
- Insurance, Superintendence of* (Expenses, &c.) 1423.
- Legislation*: House of Commons (Publishing Debates) 1002; (Returning Officers, Claims of) conc., 1459. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 1627, Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 1003, suppl., 1602; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1004, 1008, conc., 1440; (Works on America) 1009.
- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1299, conc., 1453; (France and Quebec) 1300; (Grand Maan, N.B. and Mainland) 1298; (Halifax and St. John *via* Yarmouth) 1298; (Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax) 1301.
- Militia* (Clothing, &c.) 1020.
- Miscellaneous* (Boucher de la Bruère, Payment to, for Type, &c.) 1375; (Confederation, Historical Painting) 1310; (Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees) 1617; Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I.) 1312, conc., 1454; (Returns, Preparation, of) 1381.
- Public Works—Capital* (N.B., Cape Tormentine Harbour) 1604; *Income*: Buildings (N.B.) 1193; (Repairs, &c.) 1362. Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 1222.
- Quarantine* (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.
- Unprovided Items*: Vide Auditor Gen's. Rep., 1383.
- Supply (B. 155) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1651.
- Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
- Unprovided Items, in Com. of Sup., 1383.
- Ways and Means*—Res. for Com., 28; Budget Speech 569. [For Debate see "WAYS AND MEANS."] In Com.: on Res. 1 (Free List) 653. On Res. 2 (steel,

**Tilley, Sir Leonard—Continued.**

ingots, &c.) 728; (steel, rolled, &c.) 730; (steel, needles, &c.) 730; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 731-734; (molasses) 734; (zinc, chloride, &c.) 734. On Res. 3, 735. On Res. 4, 735. On conc., 770. Res. rep. from Com., 1651; *see Supply Bill*.

Zinc, Chloride, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 734.

**Trow, Mr. J., South Perth**

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 484.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1581.

Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*) Mr. Fortin's vote (Ques. of Order) 821.

Government Herd in the N. W. (Ques.) 506.

Medicine Hat and Fort MacLeod Mail Service (Ques.) 506.

Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod (Ques.) 506.

Superior, Lake, North of, Character and Resources, on M. for Ret., 970.

**SUPPLY:**

*Legislation* (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1066.

*Quarantine*, 1011.

**Tupper, Mr. C. H., Pictou**

Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 1474.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2° (Amt. 6 m. h.) 93; on M. for Com., 271.

Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 292.

Great American and European Short Line Ry. Co. (B. 89, 1°\*) 285.

Molasses, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 734.

Montreal and European Short Line Ry. Co. *See* B. 89.

Prince Edward Island and the Fishery Award, on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1279.

Privileges and Elections, Com. on, withdrawal from serving, 569.

Sessional Indemnities, in Com. of Sup., 1339.

Spring Hill and Parrsborough Coal and Ry. Co. winding-up and transfer (B. 47, 1°\*) 131.

Steel, Ingots, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 729.

**SUPPLY:**

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Sessional Indemnities) 1339.

*Administration of Justice* (Statutory increase to Geo. Duval, Précis Writer, Supreme Court) 1474.

*Ways and Means*—in Com.: on Res 2 (steel, ingots, &c.) 729; (molasses, &c.) 734. On conc., 769.

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Cumberland**

Accommodation at St. John, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1344.

Annapolis and Digby Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1509.

Aylmer and Pembroke Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1497.

**Tupper, Sir Charles—Continued.**

Beauce Junction and International Boundary Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1491.

Beauharnois Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1353, 1354; conc., 1463.

Bogart and Bridgewater Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1502.

Bridge over Red River at Emerson, in Com. of Sup., 1348.

British Association Meeting, in Com. of Sup., 1310.

British Columbia, Agreement with (B. 126) prop. Res. 67; M. for Com., 1023; on Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) 1032; Res. in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1039; in Com., 1137; 3° m., 1171.

C. P. R. Bridge over Red River at Emerson, in Com. of Sup., 1348.

— British Columbia, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1048.

— Cost of (Ans.) 603.

— Cash Deposit with Govt. (Ans.) 72.

— Guarantee, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 56.

— Guarantee to Co., further Cor. respecting (Ans.) 72.

— Inspecting Engineers, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1348.

— Lake Superior and Nipissing Divisions, Cost of (Ans.) 458.

— Loan (B. 101) prop. Res., 84; M. for Com. on Res. (statement) 98-113; (remarks) 182; on Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) 6 m. h., 419-424; in Com., 454-456; M. to conc. in Res., 469; (1°\* of B.) 503; 2° m., 525, 529; M. for Com., 535; M. to recom., 567; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 568.

— on Ms. (*Mr. Blake*) for further information, 220, 221, 225, 228.

— Payments to Co. on account of Floating Debt (Ans.) 1054.

— Payments to Co. on Construction Contract and Subsidy Accounts (Ans.) 1055.

— Postal Subsidy to Co. (Ans.) 72.

— Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1046, 1048.

— Rumours of inadequacy of arrangements (Ans.) 1273.

— Section B, Award of Arbitrators, in Com. of Sup., 1630; conc., 1646.

— Sifton & Ward, Red River and Cross Lake, in Com. of Sup., 1350.

— Smith & Ripley, Georgian Bay Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1349.

— Station accommodation, in Com. of Sup., 1049; conc., 1449.

— Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1049.

— Steamers from Owen Sound (Ans.) 458.

— Summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, Cost of (Ans.) 458.

**Tupper, Sir Charles—Continued.**

C. P. R. Temple, Thomas, Patent Flanger, 1349; conc., 1460.  
 Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1050-1053, 1350-1354; conc., 1460-1463, 1612.  
 Caraqueet and Shippigan Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1510.  
 Carillon Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1052, 1351.  
 Central Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1510.  
 Claims arising out of construction (Intercol Ry.) Award of Commissioners, in Com. of Sup., 1628.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1256, 1261; conc., 1449.  
 Compensation for Injuries (P. E. I. Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1347.  
*Concurrence*—C. P. R. (Station Accommodation) 1450; Collection of Revenues (Intercol. Ry.) 1449; High Commissioner (House and Furniture for) 1615; *Jennie Graham* (Schooner), 1461, 1612; Marchand, L. W. (Professional Services) 1463; Perley, H. F. (Services on St. Peter's Canal) 1460; Temple Thomas (Patent Flanger) 1560; Welland Canal (Unpaid Laborers) 1460.  
 Construction Account (Intercol. Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1345.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 52 (*Mr. Mulock*) on M. to withdr. B., 987.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 135, 1<sup>o</sup>) 1322; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1576; in Com., 1577-1580; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1591; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) 1592; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 1594.  
 Cornwall and Perth Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1507.  
 Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1053.  
 Dalhousie Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1344.  
 D'Anjou, Joseph, Claim of (Ans.) 798.  
 Derby Station and Indiantown Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1511.  
 Eastern Extension Ry., acquisition of, B. 125 (prop. Res.) 825; M. for Com. on Res., 878; in Com., 882; conc. in and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 987; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1131.  
 Elevator at Halifax (Ans.) 603.  
 Elgin Road Station, L'Islet (Ans.) 199.  
 Erie and Huron Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1507.  
 Exchange Bank Notes, Instructions to Intercolonial Ry. Officers respecting (Ans.) 1055.  
 Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1305.  
 Falconer, James, land damages (Intercol Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1346.  
 Ferguson, William, purchase of land (Intercol Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1347.  
 Fredericton and Miramichi Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1503.  
 Galops Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051.  
 Gatineau Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1499.  
 Grand Piles and Lake des Isles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1509.

**Tupper, Sir Charles—Continued.**

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 895; on M. for Com., 977; in Com., 978; Amts. made by Sen., on Ques. of Priv., 1513.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Crossing in Montreal (Ans.) 1187.  
 Gravenhurst-Callander Ry. (Ans.) 604; on M. for copies of Cor., 41.  
 Great American and European Short Line Ry. (Ans.) 57.  
 Great Northern Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1508.  
 Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1344.  
 Halifax St. Ry. Co. vs. The Queen, in Com. of Sup., 1345.  
 Hamilton and North-Western Ry. B. 65 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on Ques. of Procedure, 977.  
 High Commissioner, House and Furniture for, in Com. of Sup., 1367; conc., 1615.  
 Holden, Clara S., Compensation to, in Com. of Sup., 1352.  
 Hopewell and Alma Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1509.  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1405-1409, 1415.  
 Immigration, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1405-1409, 1415.  
 Inspecting Engineers (C.P.R.) Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1348.  
 I. C. R., Accommodation at St. John, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1344.  
 ——— Claims arising out of construction, Award of Commissioners, in Com. of Sup., 1628.  
 ——— Claims Commissioners, Payment of (Ans.) 1187.  
 ——— Claims for Losses on (Ans.) 655.  
 ——— Construction Account, in Com. of Sup., 1345.  
 ——— Dalhousie Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1344.  
 ——— Falconer, James, land damages, in Com. of Sup., 1346.  
 ——— Ferry or Bridge at Quebec (Ans.) 86.  
 ——— Ferguson, William, purchase of land, in Com. of Sup., 1347.  
 ——— Halifax Street Ry. Co. vs. The Queen, in Com. of Sup., 1345.  
 ——— Halifax Extension, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1344.  
 ——— MacDonell, Alex., Award of Commissioners, in Com. of Sup., 1346.  
 ——— Miscellaneous, not provided for, in Com. of Sup., 1050.  
 ——— New Brunswick, Refund to Govt. of, in Com. of Sup., 1627.  
 ——— Office at Quebec (Ans.) 86.  
 ——— Rivière du Loup Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1344.  
 ——— Rochette, Fabien, for land, in Com. of Sup., 1345.  
 ——— St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1049; suppl., 1345.

**Tupper, Sir Charles—Continued.**

- I. C. R., Tariff between Quebec and St. Charles (Ans.) 260.
- Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1496.
- Jacques Cartier Union Ry. and North Shore Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1508.
- Jennie Graham, Schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1612.
- Kazuabazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1499.
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1508.
- Lachine Canal, jurisdiction of wharfingers (Ans.) 1187.
- Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1050.
- Lake Simon and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1503.
- Lavoie, Geo., Claim of (Ans.) 797.
- Lislois, C. J., Claim of, before Dom. Arbitrators (Ans.) 261, 965.
- Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills, Land Damages, in Com. of Sup., 1354.
- MacDonell, Alex., Award of Commissioners, in Com. of Sup., 1346.
- Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, in Com. of Sup., 1353; conc., 1463.
- Message from His Excellency (presented) 56.
- Metapediac and Paspebiac Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1510.
- Miscellaneous (Intercol. Ry.) not provided for, in Com. of Sup., 1050.
- Mississippi and Renfrew Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1508.
- Miramichi Valley Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1503.
- Montreal and Western Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1503.
- Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Napanee and Tamworth Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1502.
- New Brunswick, Expenditure by Govt. of (Intercol Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1627.
- Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1546.
- North-West Grievances, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1147, 1152, 1156.
- Ontario and Pacific Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1507.
- Oxford and Sydney or Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1490.
- Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, in Com. of Sup., 1351.
- Peake's, Station at, on P. E. I. Ry. (Ans.) 261.
- Perley, H. F., Services on St. Peter's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.
- Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1496

**Tupper, Sir Charles—Continued.**

- Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1046-1048.
- Prince Edward Island Ry., Salaries of Employés, on M. for Stmt., 298; Payment of Labourers on (Ans.) 965; in Com. of Sup., 1347.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1219, 1221, 1367; conc., 1615.
- Quebec Central Ry. Co., Subsidy to, in Com. on Res., 1491.
- Raceway between Feeder and Chippewa River (Weland) in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Railway Crossings on roads or streets, Level (Ans.) 1273.
- Railways and Canals, Rep. (presented) 43.
- Railways, in Com. of Sup. (C. P. R.) 1046-1049, 1348, 1350, conc., 1460, 1646; (Intercol. Ry.) 1049, 1050, 1344-1347, 1627, 1628; (P. E. I.) 1347.
- Rapide Plat Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Repairs, &c. (Intercol Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1256, conc., 1449; (Windsor Branch Ry.) 1261.
- Returns, Imperfect (Explanations) 198, 1128.
- Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1354.
- River St. Clair Tunnel Co.'s incorp B. 66 (*Mr. McMaster*) on M. for Com., 603.
- Rivière du Loup Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1344.
- Rochette, Fabien, for land (Intercol. Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1345.
- Rolling Stock (P. E. I. Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1347.
- Section B, Award of Arbitrators, in Com. of Sup., 1630; conc., 1646.
- Section B, further sums for Contractors, on M. for Estimate, 77; Arbitrators or Commissioners (Ans.) 1386.
- Short Line Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1486.
- Sifton & Ward, Red River and Cross Lake, in Com. of Sup., 1350.
- Skiffington, Mr., Employment of (Ans.) 603.
- Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 81 (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 979.
- St. Andrew's and Lachute Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1509.
- St. Andrews, Schooner, in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1612.
- St. Charles Branch (Ans.) 260; in Com. of Sup., 1049, suppl., 1345.
- Ste. Anne's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1052.
- St. Jérôme and New Glasgow Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1508.
- St. Lawrence River and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1492.
- St. Peter's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.
- Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Amounts paid under, on M. for Stmt., 268.
- Subsidies to Rys., authorization (B. 147) prop. Res., 1444; M. for Com., 1479; in Com., 1486-1492, 1496-

**Tupper, Sir Charles—Continued.**

1511; M. to conc. in Res., 1517; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1574; 1°\* of B., 1576; 2° m., 1624; in Com., 1624-1626; M. to recom., 1640.

Superannuation Contributions, Refund of (Ans.) 285.

**SUPPLY:**

*Canals, Capital*: Carillon (Dam and Approaches) 1052; (Page, John, Payment to as Arbitrator) 1351; Cornwall, 1050; Lachine, 1050; Murray, 1051; St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1051; Ste. Anne's, 1052; Trent River Nav. (Locks &c.) 1051; Welland, 1051; (Raceway between Feeder and Chippewa River) 1051; (Unpaid Labourers) 1350, conc., 1460; St. Peters' (Perley, H. F., services on) 1350, conc., 1460; Tay, 1053; Williamsburg (Clara S. Holden, Compensation to) 1352; (Lock at Rapide Plat Canal) 1051; (Galops Canal) 1051. *Income*: Beauharnois (Marchand, L. W., Professional Services) 1353, conc., 1463; Cornwall (Drain between Town and Canal) 1053; Miscellaneous, 1053; Rideau (Land damages between Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills) 1354; Welland (Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*) 1352, conc., 1461, 1612.

*Collection of Revenues—Railways*: Repairs, &c. (Intercol. Ry.) 1256, conc., 1449; (Windsor Branch Ry.) 1261. *Canals*: Maintenance, &c. (Salaries, &c. Canal Officers) 1261.

*Immigration*, (Salaries, &c.) 1405-1409, 1415.

*Miscellaneous* (Mr. Fabre's Salary, &c.) 1305; (British Association Meeting) 1310.

*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 1221; (N.S.) 1219. *Miscellaneous* (High Commissioner, House and Furniture for) 1307; conc., 1615.

*Railways, Capital*: C. P. R. (Bridge over Red River at Emerson) 1348; (British Columbia, revote) 1048; (Inspecting Engineers, Salaries, &c.) 1348; (Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 1046-1048; (Section B, Award of Arbitrators) 1630, conc., 1646; Sifton & Ward (Red River and Cross Lake) 1350; (Smith & Ripley, Georgian Bay Branch) 1349; (Station Accommodation) 1049, conc., 1449; (Subsidy) 1049; (Temple, Thomas, Patent Flanger) 1349, conc., 1460. *Intercol. Ry.* (Accommodation at St. John) 1049, suppl., 1344; (Alex. MacDonell, Award of Commissioners) 1346; (Claims arising out of Construction, Award of Commissioners) 1628; (Construction Account) 1345; (Dalhousie Branch) 1344; (Fabien Rochette, for Land) 1345; (Halifax Extension) 1049, suppl., 1344; (Halifax Street Ry. Co. vs. The Queen) 1345; (James Falconer, Land damages) 1346; (Miscellaneous, not provided for) 1050; (Refund to Govt. of N. B.) 1627; (St. Charles Branch) 1049, suppl., 1345; (William Ferguson, purchase of Land,) 1347. P. E. I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1347; (Rolling Stock) 1347.

Surveys chargeable to Capital in Pub. Accts., on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 303.

Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1053.

Temple, Mr. T., M. P., Protest against (Ans.) 1110.

Temple, Thomas, Patent Flanger, in Com. of Sup., 1349.

Traverse, Union Station at the (Ans.) 260.

Trent River Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1051.

Union Jacques Cartier Ry. and C. P. R., on M. for Cor., 42.

Unpaid Laborers on Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.

Wallaceburg and Sarnia Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 1507.

Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051, 1350, 1352; conc., 1460, 1461, 1612.

**Tupper, Sir Charles—Continued.**

Welland Ry. and G. T. R. Transfer authorization B. 44 (*Mr. Rykert*) on M. for 2°, 271.

Wellington Bridge, Lachine Canal, on M. for Cor., 798.

Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1051, 1352.

Wilkinson, J. A., Employment of (Ans.) 966.

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. B. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. to read and receive Pet., 1202.

**Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe**

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 927.

Volunteers, Surviving, of 1837-38 (M. to ascertain number, &c.) 89.

**Vail, Hon. W. B., Digby**

A, B, and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 1164.

Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1020-1022. Annapolis and Digby Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1509.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res. (Amt. 6 m. h.) 415; (speech) 424.

Carpeting, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 696.

Certificates to Masters and Mates and Seamen's Acts Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1057.

Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 826, 828, 829.

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 1471.

Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1258.

*Concurrence—Harbours and Rivers* (N. S.) 1442, 1616 Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, 1443; Militia (Military Properties, Care of) 1441.

County Court Judges, Travelling Expenses (Ques.) 603.

Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 1159.

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1365.

Drill Instruction, in Com. of Sup., 1097.

Eastern Extension Ry., acquisition of, B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Res. for Com., 879.

Fishery Overseer for Digby County (Ques.) 89.

Fishing Bounty, in Com. of Sup., 1369.

Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1361.

Harbours and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1605; conc., 1442, 1616.

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1408, 1409.

Ingonish Breakwater, on M. for Ret., 90.

Intercol. Ry., Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1258.

Judicial Salaries, Readjustment of (M. for Cor.) 58.

Lighthouse and Coast Service, conc., 1443.

Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 761.

Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1471.

Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1160; conc., 1441.

Militia Clothing, Tenders for manufacture of (M. for copies\*) 1201.

**Vail, Hon. W. B.**—*Continued.*

- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1020, 1022, 1095, 1097, 1159, 1160, 1164; conc., 1441.  
 Pine and Spruce Logs, Export Duty on (Ques.) 655.  
 Public Armouries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1095.  
 Public Buildings, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.  
 Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1587.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1365, 1604, 1605; conc., 1412, 1616.  
 Schools of Gunnery, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1164.  
 Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1300.  
 Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Amounts paid under, on M. for Stmt., 269.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1509.  
 Sugars, Syrups, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 733.

## SUPPLY:

- Charges of Management*, 826, 828, 829.  
*Civil Government*: Marine and Fisheries, 1471.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Railways (Repairs, &c., Intercol. Ry.) 1258.  
*Fisheries* (Fishing Bounty) 1369.  
*Immigration* (Salaries, &c.) 1408, 1409.  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms) 1443.  
*Militia* (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c.) 1164; (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 1020, 1022; (Dominion Rifle Association) 1159; (Drill Instruction) 1097; (Public Armouries, &c.) 1095; (Military Properties, Care of) 1160, conc., 1441.  
*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) 1017.  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 1604; Dredging (Maritime Provs.) 1365; Harbours and Rivers, (N. S.) 1605, conc., 1442, 1616.  
*Steamship Subventions* (Canada and West Indies and Brazil) 1300.  
 Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com on W & M., 679.  
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1017.  
 Ways and Means—in Com.: on Res. 2 (carpeting, &c.) 696; (sugars, syrups, &c.) 733.

**Valin, Mr. P. V.**, *Montmorency*

- Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to adjn. deb., 813.  
 Floating Gas Lights on the St. Lawrence (M. for Cor.) 217.  
 Lights on the St. Lawrence, north of Island of Orleans (M. for Ret.) 218.  
 Quebec Lieut.-Governors' Commissions, &c., on M. for copies, 523.  
 School of Navigation, Quebec, on M. for Cor., 201.  
 St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1495.  
 Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1495; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) to M. to conc. in Res., 1556.

**Vanasse, Mr. F.**, *Yamaska*

- Lavallière Bay, Yamaska River, Explorations on (M. for Rep.\*) 820.  
 St. Francis River, Explorations on (M. for Rep.\*) 820.

**Wallace, Mr. N. C.**, *West York*

- Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R., confirmation of Lease B. 32 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 859.  
 Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 928.  
 Parkdale Village and G. T. R., legalization of Agreement (B. 82, 1°\*) 231; 2° m., 504.

**Watson, Mr. R.**, *Marquette*

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. to conc. in Res. from Com. (Amt.) 469; on M. for Com. on B., 538.  
 Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 138 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1623.  
 Fairford River, Man., Improvements, on M. for Repr., 210.  
 Hudson Bay, Navigation of (M. for Cor.\*) 71; on M. for Sel. Com., 205.  
 North-West Grievances, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1155.  
 Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 81. (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 979.  
 Subsidies to Provinces B. 154 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1585.

## SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Dominion Exhibition) 1094.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office, 1320.  
*Dominion Lands—Capital* (Examination of Plans and Field Notes) 1384; (Surveys) 1425.  
*Dominion Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1429.  
*Indians* (Man. and N. W.) 1373.  
*Militia*: Manitoba (Pay of Force) 1343.  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Man.) 1198.  
 Ways and Means—conc., 788.  
 Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1242.

**Weldon, Mr. C. W.**, *St. John, N. B., City and County*

- A, B, and C Batteries and Cavalry and Infantry Schools, Officers of, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 808; in Com. of Sup., 1164.  
 Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 995.  
 Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1091.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Res. to take precedence (Amt.) 305; on M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 495; (Amt.) 497; on M. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 568.  
 Carleton, N.B., Post Office (Ques.) 966.  
 Census, revote, in Com. of Sup., 1091.  
 Coal entered Ex-Warehouse (M. for Ret.\*) 67.  
 Coal, Sale and Delivery of, B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1058; in Com., 1059.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1318.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act. Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1580; on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1593; on Amt. (*Mr. McCarthy*), 1594.  
 Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 280; in Com., 671.

**Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.**

- Customs Act, 1883, Amt. B. 123 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 1060.
- Derby Station and Indfantown Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1511.
- Drawback on Ship-building Materials (M. for copies of Claims\*) 67.
- Drawback on Sugar (M. for copies of Memorials, &c.\*) 67.
- Fredericton and Miramichi River Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1505.
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1057.
- General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1056.
- Glendon*, Steamer to replace, in Com. of Sup., 1227.
- Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 875.
- Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1366.
- Inland Revenue Warehouse at St. John (Ques.) 1212.
- Intercol. Ry., Casualties, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 79.
- Intercol. Ry. Claims Commission, Moneys paid to (M. for O. C., &c.\*) 66.
- Intercol. Ry., Purchase of Rolling Stock (M. for Ret.\*) 66.
- Intercol. Ry., Revenue and Working Expenses (M. for Stmt.\*) 66.
- Intercol. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1050.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
- Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 965.
- Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1233.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1595; in Com., 1597-1599.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal of, on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 958.
- Lottery Firm at St. Stephen (M. for Stmt. of Receipts of P. O.) 614.
- Mail Service in New Brunswick, on M. for Ret., 78.
- Meteorological Service at St. John, Expenses, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 1200.
- Military Properties, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 1161.
- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1161-1164.
- Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1254.
- Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 1227.
- Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 1000.
- Princess Louise*, Steamer (M. for copy of Contract, &c.) 35; Loss of the (M. for Rep. of Capt. Scott, R.N.\*) 40; Amount paid J. O'Brien for building (M. for Stmt.\*) 623; Steamer to replace, contracts for (M. for Ret.\*) 820.
- Printing, &c., the Laws, in Com. of Sup., 1004.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1191, 1192, 1366.
- Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1586.
- Pullman Cars on Intercol. Ry. (M. for Cor.) 77.

**Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.**

- Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
- Railways, in Com. of Sup., 1050.
- Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1163.
- Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 1254.
- Shipwrecks, Enquiries into, B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 764; on M. for 3°, 1170, 1293.
- Sick and Distressed Mariners Act. Amt. B. 129 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1360.
- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1505-1507, 1511; in Com., 1625.
- St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1050.
- Stone for New Departmental Building (Ques) 736.
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice* (Vice-Admiralty Courts) 995.
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Census, revote) 1091.
- Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1318.
- Legislation: Miscellaneous* (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1004.
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lights, Fog-whistles, &c., maintenance) 1233.
- Militia* (A, B, and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery) 1164; (Construction and Repairs) 1162; (Military Properties, Care of) 1161; (Royal Military College) 1163.
- Ocean and River Service* (*Glendon*, Steamer to replace) 1227.
- Penitentiaries* (Dorchester) 1000.
- Public Works—Income: Buildings* (N. B.) 1192; (N. S.) 1191.
- Miscellaneous* (Infantry Schools) 1366.
- Quarantine* (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1010.
- Railways—Capital: Intercol. Ry.* (St. Charles Branch) 1050; (Miscellaneous, not provided for) 1050.
- Scientific Institutions* (Observatories) 1254.
- Tracadie Lazaretto, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
- Vice-Admiralty Courts, in Com. of Sup., 995.
- Vice-Admiralty Courts of the Dom. (M. for copies of Imp. despatches\*) 65.
- Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1059; in Com., 1243.
- Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1318.

**Wells, Mr. R. M., East Bruce**

- Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1580; on M. for 3°, 1591; (Amt.) 1592.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co. (B. 46, 1°\*) 131.
- Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1587.
- Solway, Postmaster at, Appointment of (M. for Ret.\*) 1200.

**Wheler, Mr. G., West Ontario**

- Tariff on Grain, Readjustment of (Ques.) 336.

**White, Mr. J., East Hastings**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res. from Com., 473.
- Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) on M. for Com., 1175; in Com. (Amt.) 1202, 1211; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1214.
- Indian Self-Government B. 22 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 539; in Com., 539.

**White, Mr. J.—Continued.**

Ontario and Quebec Ry. Acts Amt. B. 46 (*Mr. Wells*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) that B. pass, 888.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 898-921.

Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of, B. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*) in Com., 883.

Personal Explanation of remarks in Ry. Committee, 1241.

Prorogation (remarks) 1654.

## SUPPLY:

*Ocean and River Service* (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 1231.

*Ways and Means*—conc., 772.

**White, Mr. P., North Renfrew**

Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1391, 14-2.

Concurrence—Culling Timber, 1457.

Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 135 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wells*) to M. for 3°, 1594.

Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh (M. for Cor.) 798.

Patent Act, 1872, Amt. (B. 86, 1°\*) 260.

Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of (B. 84, 1°\*) 260; in Com., 888.

Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 805.

Superior, Lake, North of, Character and Resources of land, on M. for Ret., 970.

## SUPPLY:

*Collection of Revenues*: Culling Timber, conc., 1457

*Dominion. Lands—Income* (Outside Service) 1430.

*Immigration* (Salaries, &c.) 1417.

**White, Mr. T., Cardwell**

Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 180.

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1212.

Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. 130 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1652.

Debates, Official Rep. of: M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 260; Second Rep. (presented) 704; M. to conc. in, 883; Third and Fourth Reprs. (presented) 1022; M. to conc. in Reprs., 1100; (remarks) 1102, 1104; Fifth Rep. (presented) 1240; M. to conc. in, 1270; in Com. of Sup., 1340.

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 128 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1394.

Immigration and Emigration, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1084.

Live Stock Insurance Co. incorp. (B. 55, 1°\*) 141.

Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57 (*Mr. Small*) on Sen. Amts., 1546.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 902.

Printing of Parliament (Ms.) to conc. in Fifth and Sixth Reprs. of Joint Com., 1108; Seventh Rep., 1321, 1359; Eighth Rep., 1543.

Private Bills, Hour for (Ques.) 811; on M. to extend time for presentation, 1359.

**White, Mr. T.—Continued.**

Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) Amt., 1113.

Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1334.

Royal Canadian Insurance Co. (B. 53, 1°\*) 141.

St. Clair Frontier Tunnel Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (*Mr. Macmaster*) M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1281.

St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co. Bondholders (B. 56, 1°\*) 141; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1281.

## SUPPLY:

*Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Printing, &c., the Laws) 1003; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1004, 1007, 1008; (Publishing Debates) 1340.

*Miscellaneous* (British Association Meeting) 1311.

Unlawful Associations and Oaths (B. 100, 1°) 468.

*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 625.

**Wigle, Mr. L., South Essex**

Post Offices, Erection of, on M. for Cor., 807.

*Ways and Means*—conc., 773.

**Williams, Mr. A. T. H., East Durham**

Langtry vs. Dumoulin, Petition (M. to read and receive) 57.

Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 753.

Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan Act Amt. (B. 61, 1°\*) 162.

**Wilson, Mr. J. H., East Elgin**

County Judge of Elgin, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.

Hughes, Judge, Charges against (M. for copies of Peta.) 59; (remarks) 967; (Ques.) 1109; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.

Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 46 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. that B. pass, 886, 888.

Port Stanley and Port Burwell as Harbours of Refuge (M. for Ret.) 519.

Port Stanley Harbour Revenue (M. for Stmt.) 295.

Stayner, Postmaster at (Ques.) 1109.

St. Thomas, Public Buildings at (M. for Ret.) 92.

## SUPPLY:

*Ocean and River Service* (Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.) 1229.

*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) 1016.

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1194, suppl., 1605.

Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1225, suppl., 1606.

*Quarantine* (Cattle Disease) 1011; (Public Health) 1012.

Watson, Chas. T., Services of, and Moneys paid (M. for Stmt. \*) 820.

**Wood, Mr. J. F., Brockville**

Chinese Immigration into B. C., Prohibition of, on Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1286.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 279.

Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 904.

**Wood, Mr. J., Westmoreland**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*)  
on M. for Com. on Res., 376.  
Maritime Bank of the Dom., Capital Stock reduction (B.  
66, 1°\*) 162.

**Woodworth, Mr. D. B., King's, N. S.**

- Améro, Roger, Case of (M. for Ret.) 622.  
Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*)  
on M. for Com. on Res., 189.  
Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron,*  
*Huron*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) to M. for  
2°, 94.  
Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c. B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*)  
in Com., 292.  
Cumberland, Seat for, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*)  
to Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 558; (Personal Explanation)  
566.  
Intercol. Ry., Coal carried by, on M. for Ret., 65.  
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for  
copies, 759.  
Orange, Loyal, Association of British America B. 93  
(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 919.  
Public Buildings at Fort MacLeod, on M. for O. C., &c.,  
621.  
Question of Privilege, Mr. Blake's Speech on the Orange  
B. (remarks) 1544.  
Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 81  
(*Mr. Beaty*) M. for Com., 979.

**Woodworth, Mr. D. B.—Continued.**

## SUPPLY:

- Immigration; Salaries, &c.*, 1420.  
*Public Works—Income (Ont.)* 1355.

**Wright, Mr. A., Ottawa County.**

- Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, on M. for Cor., M.  
to adjn. deb., 799.  
Kazuabazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on  
Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1499, 1500.  
Land Sales within limits of C. P. R. and average price  
realized (M. for Ret.) 77.  
Luard, Major-General, Complaints against, on M. for  
copies, 740; (correction) 744.  
Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Amounts paid under, on M. for  
Stmnt., 68.  
Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (*Sir Charles*  
*Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1499, 1500.

**Yeo, Mr. J., Prince, P.E.I.**

- Prince Edward Island Ry., Payment of Labourers on  
(Ques.) 965.  
Prince Edward Island Steamboats, Inspection of, on M.  
for Papers, 64.  
SUPPLY:  
*Miscellaneous (Refund of Duties paid by Merchants in P. E. I.)*  
conc., 1454.  
Temperance Act, 1878, Medical Certificates given under  
(M. for Ret.\*) 1201.

# INDEX—PART II.

## SUBJECTS.

- "A," "B" AND "C" BATTERIES, OFFICERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*) 808; and SCHOOLS OF GUNNERY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1164.
- ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 1608.
- ACCIDENTS ON THE I. C. R.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 79.
- ACCOUNTANT, HOUSE OF COMMONS: Receipts and Disbursements, presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 31.
- ACTS, PROVINCIAL, DISALLOWANCE OF, &c.: M. for O.C. (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.
- ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH: Moved (*Mr. Macmaster*) 3; sec. (*Mr. Belleau*) 6; reply (*Mr. Blake*) 9; answer (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 20; agreed to, 27; His Ex.'s Reply, 304.
- "ADELAIDE," SCOW, LOSS OF: in Com. of Sup., 1365.
- ADJOURNMENTS: Ms., Rideau Hall Festivities, 513; Ash Wednesday, 524; St. Patrick's Day, 884; Good Friday, 1476.
- Adulteration of Food and Drugs, consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 109** (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°, 598; withdn., 1057.
- Adulteration of Food and Drugs, Prevention of, B. No. 104** (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°, 655; 2° m., 1132; 2°, 1137; prop. Res. (Public Analyst.) 1215; in Com., 1244; M. for Com. on B., 1244; point of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1244; Ruling (*Mr. Speaker*) 1246; in Com., 1246; recom. and 3°, 1294. (47 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD AND DRUGS: on M. for 2° of B. (*Mr. Lesage*) 1132; (*Mr. Costigan*) 1137.
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD, EXPENSES UNDER ACT: in Com. of Sup., 1318.
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD: Rep. presented, 1321.
- ADMINISTRATION OF AFFAIRS IN THE N.W.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 994, 1474.
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 2 (*pro forma*).
- ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE N. W. TERRITORIES, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.
- AGENT AND CONTINGENCIES (PUBLIC WORKS) B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1318.
- AGREEMENT WITH B. C.: Mess. from His Ex., 27; prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 67; M. for Com. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1023; Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) 1026; Deb. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1027; (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1028; (*Mr. Blake*) 1030; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1032; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 1034; (*Mr. Reid*) 1037; (*Mr. Homer*) 1037; Amt. neg. 1038; Amt. (*Mr. Reid*) 1038; deb. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1038; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 1039; neg., 1039; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1171; deb. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1172; (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1172; (*Mr. Homer*) 1173; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 1173; (*Mr. Blake*) 1174; (*Mr. Charlton*) 1175; neg., 1176; Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176.
- Agricultural Fertilizers, Prevention of Fraud in Manufacture, &c., B. No. 38** (*Mr. Massue*). Res. and 1° of B., 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; in Com. and 3°, 669. (47 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- AGRICULTURAL, INDUSTRIAL, &c., STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1095.
- AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES AND MECHANICAL ARTS, ESSAYS ON: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Gigault*) 33; M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Gigault*) 74; Rep. of Com.: Ques., 1387.
- AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS AND THE TARIFF, Rep. of Com., Distribution of: in Com. of Sup., 1003, 1006-1009.
- AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS, EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.
- AGRICULTURAL LANDS, &c., M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- AGRICULTURE, DEPTL. REP.: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 709; presented, 1055; in Com. of Sup., 842, 1337.
- AGRICULTURISTS, BANKING FACILITIES FOR: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Orton*) 210; withdn., 216.
- Agriculturists, Banking and Loan Facilities for, provision B. No. 105** (*Mr. Orton*). 1°, 524.
- AIDES-DE-CAMP, GOVERNOR GENERAL'S: in Com. of Sup., 832.
- Alberta Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 76** (*Mr. Ross*). 1°, 198; 2°, 504; withdn.
- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co. Incorp. B. No. 34** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°, 83; 2°, 173; in Com. and 3°, 736. (47 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- ALBERT CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
- ALDRICH, E. P.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
- ALLAN, W. F., ALLOWANCE IN LIEU OF BOARD, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1381.
- ALLISON, Mr. D. W.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- AMERICA, PURCHASE OF WORKS ON: in Com. of Sup., 1009.
- AMERO, ROGER, ARREST OF, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 622.
- AMHERSTBURG, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LAND SOLD FOR: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Lister*) 83; M. for Repr. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 297.

- AMMUNITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1019.
- ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1215.
- ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.
- ANNUAL GRANT TO SUPPLEMENT INDIAN FUND, Ont, Que. and Mar. Provs.: in Com of Sup., 1263.
- ANNUITIES, LIFE, SALE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Hall*) 199.
- APPOINTMENTS, MILITIA DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 833-837.
- ANTIGONISH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmnt.\* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 66.
- APPRAISERS, CUSTOMS: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 285.
- ARBITRATORS ON SECTION B: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 1386; in Com. of Sup., 1630.
- ARBITRATORS. See "Dominion" and "Official."
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1088.
- ARCHIVES, TRANSFER OF TO LIBRARY: Ques (*Mr. Mills*) in Com. of Sup., 1009.
- ARMOUR, MR. JUSTICE: Reps. on Lennox, West Middlesex, West Huron, and South Simcoe Controverted Elections, 1
- ARTILLERY COMPETITION AT SHOE BURYNESS: (withdrawn) 1166.
- ARTS, ACADEMY OF: in Com. of Sup., 1608.
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1088-1095; conc., 1440.
- ASH WEDNESDAY: Adjournment for (M.) 524.
- Assets (Insolvent Debtors) Distribution of, B. No. 71** (*Mr. Curran*). 1°\*, 162.
- "ASIA," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- ASSINIBOIA AND CALGARY, LAND AGENTS FOR: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27.
- ASSISTANT P.O. INSPECTORS, &c.: prop. Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 1215.
- ASSURANCE COMPANIES. See respective headings.
- Atlantic Mutual Marine Insurance Co. InCorp. B. No. 48** (*Mr. Daly*) 1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 665. (47 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- AUDET, ALPHONSE, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for O. C., &c.\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.
- AUDITOR-GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 841.
- AUDITOR-GENERAL'S Rep. for 1883: presented, 27.
- AUTOMATIC BUOY IN LOCKPORT HARBOUR: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603.
- AYLMER AND PEMBROKE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1497.
- BACON, COL., APPOINTMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 833.
- BAIE DE CHALEURS RY., CARAQUET TO SHIPPIGAN, SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.
- BAIN, MR. J. W.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- BAKER CREEK, N. W., MINING LICENSES ON: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 44.
- BANKING AND COMMERCE: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
- BANKING FACILITIES FOR AGRICULTURISTS: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Orton*) 210; withn., 216.
- Banking and Loan Facilities for Agriculturists provision B. No. 105** (*Mr. Orton*). 1°, 524.
- Bank of Winnipeg InCorp. B. No. 29** (*Mr. Ross*). 1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 1035. (47 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- BANK RETURNS, INSPECTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Massue*) 44, 1444.
- BANKS, GOVT. DEPOSITS IN: M. for Stmnt.\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
- BANKS. See respective headings.
- BARRY, JAMES, PREPARATION OF TABLES OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF FISH: conc., 1464.
- BATTLEFORD AND PEACE RIVER RY. Co. See "Souris."
- BAYFIELD HARBOUR, DAMAGE TO, BY STORMS: Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.
- BEAUCE JUNCTION AND INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1491.
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL. See "CANALS."
- BEAUMONT, EXPROPRIATION OF: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1200.
- BEEMER, H. J., CLAIM OF, FOR WORK ON GATES, &c., QUEBEC: Ques. (*Mr. Fisher*) 604.
- BELLEAU, MR. J. N.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- Bell Telephone Co.'s InCorp. Act Amt. B. No. 51** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BENEFIT MUTUAL INSURANCE SOCIETIES: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 337.
- BERTHIER CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1443.
- BILL, COMMITMENT OF: Ques. of Procedure, 131.
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 2 (*pro forma*).
- BILL (No. 2) To amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting Offences against the Person.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 27; 2° m., 79; 2°, 92; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 97; M. for Com. of W., 819.
- BILL (No. 3) To further amend the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 1°\*, 27; 2° m., 93; Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., 93; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) and 2°, 97; ref. to Sel. Com. on a div., 98; M. for Com. of W., 271; in Com., 285, 669; Amt. (*Mr. Bossé*) that Com. rise, 671; agreed to, 671; M. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to restore to Order Paper, 705; neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.
- BILL (No. 4) Respecting Carriers by Land—(*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 27.
- BILL (No. 5) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 1°\*, 28; withn., 1290.
- BILL (No. 6) To provide for the Punishment of Seduction and like Offences.—(*Mr. Charlton*). 1°\*, 28; 2° m., 141; in Com., 286; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to recom., agreed to (Y. 79, N. 70) 666; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) to recom., 666; M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to adjn. deb., 668; agreed to (Y. 96, N. 63) 669; rsmtd., 980; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Bossé*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 69, N. 74) 980; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) neg. and 3°, 980; *killed in Sen.*

- BILL (No. 7) Respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
1° 31; withdn., 1627.
- BILL (No. 8) For constituting a Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)  
1°\*, 31.
- BILL (No. 9) To amend the several Acts relating to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)  
1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 57; in Com., 861; 3°\*, 886.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 10) Further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)  
1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 83; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 11) Respecting the Union of certain Methodist Churches therein named.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)  
1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 665.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 12) To amend the Act entitled An Act for the better Prevention of Fraud in relation to Contracts involving the Expenditure of Public Moneys.—(*Mr. Casgrain.*)  
1° 40; Order for 2° read, 80; 2° m., 292; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; M. for Com. of W., 813; in Com., 815; killed in Com. of W. 819; M. to restore to Order Paper neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.
- BILL (No. 13) To repeal an Act to render Members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included, or which may hereafter be included, within the Dominion of Canada, ineligible for sitting or voting in the House of Commons of Canada.—(*Mr. Ouimet.*)  
1°\*, 40; M. for 2° neg. (Y. 59, N. 102) 144.
- BILL (No. 14) To amalgamate the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto and the Toronto Corn Exchange Association.—(*Mr. Beatty.*)  
1°\*, 43; 2°\*, 88; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 15) To limit the Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in Appeal.—(*Mr. Landry, Montmagny.*)  
1°\*, 43.
- BILL (No. 16) For the declaration of Titles to land, and to facilitate its Transfer in the Territories of Canada.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)  
1°\*, 43.
- BILL (No. 17) To repeal an Act respecting the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, and the issue of Licenses therefor.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)  
1°\*, 57.
- BILL (No. 18) To incorporate the Pilots serving between Montreal and Quebec.—(*Mr. Amyot.*)  
1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 89; *Preamble not proven.*
- BILL (No. 19) To grant certain powers to the Commercial Cable Company.—(*Mr. Rykert.*)  
1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 20) To amend the Act incorporating the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(*Mr. Tupper, Pictou.*)  
1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Curran.*)  
1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 89; M. for Com. 890; deb. adjd., 897; rsmtd., 977; in Com., 978; 3° 978.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 22) For conferring certain privileges on the more advanced Bands of the Indians of Canada, with the view of training them for the exercise of Municipal Powers.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
1° 67; 2° m., 538; 2° and in Com., 539; 3° 625.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Company.—(*Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.*)  
1°\*, 71; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 736.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the Halifax Steam Navigation Company, limited.—(*Mr. Stairs.*)  
1°\*, 71; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 580.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 25) To repeal the Liquor License Act, 1883.—(*Mr. Houde.*)  
1° 71.
- BILL (No. 26) For the better Prevention of Fraud in connection with the Sale of Patent Rights.—(*Mr. Mulock.*)  
1° 71; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 145; rep. from Sel. Com., 230; in Com. of W., 285; 3° 460.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 27) To incorporate the Halifax Mutual Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(*Mr. Daly.*)  
1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 28) To incorporate the Canada Temperance and General Life Assurance Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex.*)  
1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 580.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(*Mr. Ross.*)  
1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 1035.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 30) To extend to the Dominion of Canada the powers of the corporation called De Nederlandsch-Americansche Land Maalschappij (The Netherlands-American Land Company).—(*Mr. Abbott.*)  
1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 665.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 715.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 32) To confirm the lease of the Ontario and Quebec Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(*Mr. Abbott.*)  
1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; M. for Com., 810; objection (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) Ques. of Priv., 810; M. to substitute name of Mr. Haggart for promoter, agreed to, 843; in Com., 857; 3° m., 859; Amt. (*Mr. Wallace*) 859; neg., 860; 3° 860; B. passed, 886.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 33) Empowering the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (limited) to construct and operate a railway from Medicine Hat.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1° 84; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 736.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

- BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 736.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Pictou Mutual Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(*Mr. McDougald.*)  
1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 36) To authorize a further advance to the Province of Manitoba in aid of the Public Schools therein.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)  
Res. prop., 43; in Com., 68; 1°\* of B., 85; 2°\* and in Com., 542; 3°\*, 625.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 37) To provide for the salary and travelling allowances of the Judge of the County Court of Cariboo, in the Province of British Columbia.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
Res. prop., 69; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 85; 2°\* and in Com., 542; 3°\*, 625.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 38) For the prevention of Fraud in the Manufacture and Sale of Agricultural Fertilizers.—(*Mr. Massee.*)  
Res. and 1° of B., 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; in Com. of W. and 3°\*, 669.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the Provincial Bank.—(*Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex.*)  
1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 40) To amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Waddington, and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(*Mr. Hickey.*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 603.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 41) To incorporate the Saskatoon and Northern Railway Company.—(*Mr. Ferguson, Welland.*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 897.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 42) To incorporate the Commercial Bank of Manitoba.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Union Trust Corporation of Canada.—(*Mr. Hesson.*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 100.)
- BILL (No. 44) To authorize the Transfer of the Welland Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Bergin.*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°, 271; in Com., 860; recom. and 3°, 886.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 45) To incorporate the Owen Sound Dry Dock Ship-building and Navigation Company, limited.—(*Mr. Allen.*)  
1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 580.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(*Mr. Wells.*)  
1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°, 886; on M. that B. pass, Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) to recom., 887; neg. on a div. and B. passed, 888; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 47) Respecting the Winding-up of the Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Coal and Railway Company, and the Sale of the Property thereof to the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company.—(*Mr. Tepper, Pictou*)  
1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 580.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Atlantic Mutual Marine Insurance Company, limited.—(*Mr. Daly.*)  
1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 665.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 49) To incorporate the Nova Scotia Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(*Mr. Daly.*)  
1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 665.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 50) Respecting the International Railway Company.—(*Mr. Hall.*)  
1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 580.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 51) To amend the Act incorporating the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 52) Further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(*Mr. Mulock.*)  
1°\*, 131; 2°, 460; withdn., 986.
- BILL (No. 53) To authorize the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce the number of their Directors.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)  
1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; *Preamble not proven.*
- BILL (No. 54) Relating to the New Brunswick Railway Company, and to the Railways leased to the said Company.—(*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.*)  
1°\*, 141; 2°, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 1035.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Live Stock Insurance Company.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)  
1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 665.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 56) To empower the Bondholders of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company to vote at meetings of the Company.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)  
1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 271; in Com. and 3°\*, 715; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Small.*)  
1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 1175; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1546.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 58) To incorporate the Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Railway Company.—(*Mr. Taylor.*)  
1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 603.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 59) Respecting the Northern and North-Western Junction Railway Company.—(*Mr. Small.*)  
1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 810.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 60) To increase the Harbour accommodation of the City of Toronto, to extend the Esplanade, and to provide for the control of the use thereof by Railway Companies.—(*Mr. Small.*)  
1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; withdn.

- BILL (No. 61)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(*Mr. Williams.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 665.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 163.)
- BILL (No. 62)** To incorporate the River St. Clair Tunnel Company.—(*Mr. Macmaster.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 199; M. for Com., 603; in Com. and 3°\*, 665; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281.—(47 *Vic.* c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 63)** To consolidate certain Railway Companies therein mentioned under the name of the Eastern Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Macmaster.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 542; withdn.
- BILL (No. 64)** To amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 271; in Com. and 3°\*, 504.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 65)** Respecting the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 504; Order for Com. of W. dschgd. and ref. back to Ry. Com., 977; in Com. and 3°\*, 1175.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 66)** To reduce the Capital Stock of the Maritime Bank of the Dominion of Canada, and to make other provisions respecting the said Bank.—(*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2°\* 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 1214.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 67)** Further to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(*Mr. Bergin.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 271; in Com. and 3°\*, 603.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 68)** Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(*Mr. Gunn.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 563.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 69)** To incorporate the Quebec Railway Bridge Company.—(*Mr. Bossé.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 271; in Com. and 3°\*, 1035.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 70)** To extend the Jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(*Mr. Allen.*)  
1°\*, 162; 2° m., 461; deb. adjd., 462.
- BILL (No. 71)** To provide for the distribution of Assets of Insolvent Debtors.—(*Mr. Curran.*)  
1°\*, 162.
- BILL (No. 72)** To incorporate the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(*Mr. Innes.*)  
1°\*, 198; 2°\*, 542; in Com and 3°\*, 1035.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 73)** Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(*Mr. Platt.*)  
1°\*, 198; 2°\*, 504; M. for Com., 1175; in Com., 1202; Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202; neg., 1214; 3° m., 1214; Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 91) and 3°\*, 1214.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 74)** To incorporate the Ranchers' Bank of Canada.—(*Mr. Ross.*)  
1°\*, 198; 2°, 271; withdn.
- BILL (No. 75)** Respecting the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Company.—(*Mr. Ross.*)  
1°\*, 198; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 810.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 76)** To incorporate the Alberta Bridge Company.—(*Mr. Ross.*)  
1°\*, 198; 2°, 504; withdn.
- BILL (No. 77)** To incorporate the Calgary Water Works Company.—(*Mr. Ross.*)  
1°\*, 198; 2°\*, 504; withdn.
- BILL (No. 78)** To incorporate the Calgary Omnibus, Tramway and Transfer Company.—(*Mr. Ross.*)  
1°\*, 198; 2°\*, 504; withdn.
- BILL (No. 79)** For the Equitable Distribution of Insolvents' Estates.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)  
1°\*, 198.
- BILL (No. 80)** To amend the Act incorporating the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(*Mr. Bell.*)  
1°\*, 231; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 810; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1176.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 81)** Further to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Battleford and Peace River Railway Company.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)  
1°\*, 231; 2°\*, 504; in Com., 979; 3°\*, 979.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 82)** To legalize a certain Agreement between the Village of Parkdale and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and other Railway Companies, and for other purposes.—(*Mr. Wallace, York.*)  
1°\*, 231; 2°, 504; withdn.
- BILL (No. 83)** To incorporate the San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(*Mr. Royal.*)  
1°\*, 231; 2°, 505; withdn., 1169.
- BILL (No. 84)** To incorporate the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac.—(*Mr. White, Renfrew.*)  
1°\*, 260; 2°\*, 504; in Com., 888; 3°\*, 889.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 85)** Respecting the Huron and Erie Railway.—(*Mr. Smyth.*)  
1°\*, 260; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 979.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 86)** Further to amend the Patent Act, 1872.—(*Mr. White, Renfrew.*)  
1°\*, 260.
- BILL (No. 87)** Further to amend the Indian Act, 1880.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
1°, 260; 2°, 1063; in Com., 1397, 1422; 3°\*, 1422; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1653.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 88)** Respecting the Real Estate Loan Company of Canada, limited.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)  
1°\*, 285; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 1035.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- BILL (No. 89)** To amend the Act incorporating the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company,

- and to change the name thereof to the Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company.—(*Mr. Tupper, Pictou.*)  
1°\*, 285; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 810.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(*Mr. Bossé.*)  
1°\*, 285; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 979.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 285; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 1214; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1548.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 92) To incorporate the Traders' Bank of Canada.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)  
1°\*, 304; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 665.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of British America.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1° on a div., 304; 2° m., 897; neg. (Y. 68, N. 105) 931. [For deb. see "Orange."]
- BILL (No. 94) To empower the Sovereign Fire Insurance Company to relinquish their Charter, and to provide for the winding-up of their affairs.—(*Mr. Mackenzie.*)  
1°\*, 304; 2°\*, 542; in Com. and 3°\*, 665.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 95) Relating to the Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa.—(*Mr. Tassé.*)  
1°\*, 304; 2°\*, 504; in Com., 889; 3° on a div., 890.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- BILL (No. 96) For the further amendment of the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)  
1°\*, 457.
- BILL (No. 97) To amend the Criminal Law, and to declare it a Misdemeanour to leave unguarded and exposed holes, openings, &c., in the ice on any navigable or frequented water.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)  
1°\*, 457.
- BILL (No. 98) To amend the Law with reference to Procedure in Criminal Cases, and the Duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions in relation to persons charged with Indictable Offences.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)  
1°\*, 457.
- BILL (No. 99) To consolidate and amend the Acts for the more Speedy Trials of Persons charged with Felonies and Misdemeanours in the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)  
1°\*, 457.
- BILL (No. 100) Further to amend Chap. 10 of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, respecting Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)  
1° on a div., 468.
- BILL (No. 101) To amend the Act intituled An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for other purposes.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)  
Res. prop., 84; M. for Com., 98; Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 359; neg. (Y. 62, N. 132) 414; Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) 415; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 418; neg. (Y. 62, N. 137) 454; Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) neg. (Y. 63, N. 136) 454; Res. in Com., 454-456; M. to conc. in Res., 469; Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 473; neg. (Y. 49, N. 112) 495; Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 497; neg. (Y. 43, N. 104) 503; conc. in and 1° of B., 503; 2° m., 525; agreed to (Y. 111, N. 52) and 2°, 535; in Com., 538; Amt. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) to recom., 567; recom., 568; M. to conc. in Amt. rep. from Com., Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to recom. neg. (Y. 58, N. 122) 568; Amts. (*Mr. Blake*) to recom. neg. on same div., 569; 3° on same div. reversed, 569.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 1.) [For deb. see "Canadian Pacific Railway."]
- BILL (No. 102) To amend the Act 41 Victoria, Chapter 16, intituled An Act respecting the Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.—(*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.*)  
1°\*, 504.
- BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Liability of Carriers by Land.—(*Mr. Coughlin.*)  
1°\*, 504.
- BILL (No. 104) Further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—(*Mr. Ives.*)  
1°\*, 504.
- BILL (No. 105) To provide Banking and Loan Facilities to those engaged in the pursuit of Agriculture.—(*Mr. Orton.*)  
1°, 524.
- BILL (No. 106) To define certain offences against persons employed in Factories.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)  
1°, 524; withdn., 1627.
- BILL (No. 107) For the relief of John Graham—(A) from the Senate.—(*Mr. Jamieson.*)  
1° on a div., 530; 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 665; in Com. on a div., 979; 3° agreed to (Y. 84, N. 56) 980.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 107.)
- BILL (No. 108) To amend the Acts respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)  
1°\*, 598; Res. in Com., 1055; 2° of B., 1056; in Com., 1129; 3°\*, 1131.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 109) To amend and consolidate, as amended, the several Acts relating to the Adulteration of Food and Drugs.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)  
1°, 598; withdn., 1057.
- BILL (No. 110) Respecting the Representation of the Territories in the House of Commons.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)  
1°, 598; 2°, 1058; in Com., 1059.
- BILL (No. 111) Respecting the Independence of Parliament Act of 1878, 41 Victoria, Chapter 5.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. to introd. neg. (Y. 55, N. 101) 624; 1°\*, 625; 2° m., 844; deb. rsmd., 861; 2° agreed to (Y. 105, N. 56) 878; ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec. on a div., 878; B. in Com. of W., 1423; 3° m., 1446; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1446; neg. (Y. 58,

- N. 117) 1448; Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*) neg on same div., 1449; 3° on same div. reversed, 1449.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 112) To Prevent Sunday Excursions.—(*Mr. Charlton.*)  
1°\*, 655.
- BILL (No. 113) To amend the Act 38 Victoria, Chapter 88, respecting Copyrights.—(*Mr. Béchard.*)  
1°\*, 655.
- BILL (No. 114) For the Prevention of Adulteration of Food and Drugs.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)  
1°\*, 655; 2° m., 1132; 2°, 1137; prop. Res. (Public Analysts) 1215; in Com., 1244; M. for Com. on B., 1244; point of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1244; Ruling (*Mr. Speaker*) 1246; in Com., 1246; recom. and 3°\*, 1294.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 115) Respecting Ferries.—(*Mr. Patterson, Essex.*)  
1°, 736.
- BILL (No. 116) To amend An Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships, and the Seamen's Act, 1873.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)  
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°\* of B., 763; 2°, 1057; in Com., 1131; 3°\*, 1175.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 117) To amend the Act respecting Enquiries and Investigations into Shipwrecks and other matters as to the Powers of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in certain cases reported to him under it.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)  
Res. prop., 763; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 764; 2° and in Com., 1131; 3° m., 1170; 3°, 1293.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 118) To modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)  
Res. prop., 764; in Com., and 1°\* of B., 765; withdn., 1652.
- BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Sale of Coal.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)  
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°\* of B., 765; withdn., 1618.
- BILL (No. 120) To amend the Weights and Measures Act of 1879.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)  
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°\* of B., 765; 2°, 1059; in Com., 1131, 1242; Order for 3° dschgd., B. recom., amended and 3°\*, 1294.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 121) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, by reducing the Fees payable on renewal of Engineers' Licenses.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)  
Res. prop. and in Com., 765; 1°\* of B., 766; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1058.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 122) To amend the Acts 40 Victoria, Chapter 49, and 45 Victoria, chapter 24, being Acts relating to Permanent Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in Ontario—(B) from the Senate.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 822; 2°, 986; in Com. and 3°\*, 1282.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 123) To Amend the Customs Act, 1883.—(*Mr. Bowell.*)  
1°, 885; 2°, 1059; in Com., 1060; 3°\*, 1129.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 124) Respecting Fortifications and Military Buildings and their Maintenance and Repair.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)  
1°, 965; 2°, 1061; in Com., 1063; 3°\*, 1129.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 125) For giving effect to an Agreement therein mentioned between the Government of the Dominion and that of Nova Scotia.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)  
Res. prop., 825; M. for Com., 878; in Com., 883; conc. in and 1°\* of B., 987; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1131.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Vancouver Island Railway, the Esquimalt Graving Dock, and certain Railway Lands of the Province of British Columbia, granted to the Dominion.  
Res. prop., 67; M. for Com., 1023; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1039; 2°\* and in Com., 1137; 3° m., 1171; Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1172; neg., 1176; Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) 6 m. h. neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176; 3°\*, 1176.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 6 )
- BILL (No. 127) To amend the Criminal Law.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)  
1°\*, 1053.
- BILL (No. 128) Further to amend The General Inspection Act, 1874.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)  
Res. prop. and in Com., 1055; 1°\* of B., 1056; 2°\* and in Com., 1394; 3°\*, 1422.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 129) To amend the Act respecting the treatment and relief of Sick and Distressed Mariners.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)  
Res. prop., and 1°\* of B., 1126; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1360.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 130) To amend the Civil Service Acts of 1882 and 1883.—(*Mr. Chapleau.*)  
M. to introd., 1169; 1°\*, 1170; 2°\*, 1360; Res. (Assistant Post Office Inspectors, &c.) in Com., 1360; Res. rep. and B. in Com., 1388, 1422; 3°\*, 1422; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1652.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 131) To amend an Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 1241; 2°, 1281; in Com. and 3°\*, 1386.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 132) To amend the Act 37 Victoria, Chapter 42, intituled An Act to extend to the Province of British Columbia certain of the Criminal Laws now in force in other Provinces of the Dominion—(G) from the Senate.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
1°\*, 1320; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°\*, 1583.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 133) To amend the Act 38 Victoria, Chapter 54, intituled an Act to extend to the Province of Manitoba the Act for the more Speedy Trial, in certain cases,

- of Persons charged with Felonies and Misdemeanours, in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec—(F) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1321; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1581; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1583.—(47 Vic., c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 134) Respecting the Public Works of Canada—(H) *from the Senate.*—(Sir Hector Langevin.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1321; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1445, 1586; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1587; recom. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1609.—(47 Vic., c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 135) Further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and the Acts amending it.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 1322; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1576; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1577; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1591; recom., 1594; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1595.—(47 Vic., c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 136) To amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878—(C) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1386; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1618; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1619; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1621; Amt. to recom. (Mr. Ives) neg. (Y. 55, N. 93) 1621; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1621.—(47 Vic., c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 137) Further to amend the Act respecting the Duties of Justices of the Peace out of Session, and in relation to Summary Convictions and Orders—(I) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1386; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1618.—(47 Vic., c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 138) To amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1878—(D) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1386; prop. Res., 1590; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1622; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1640.—(47 Vic., c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 139) Respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Beatty.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1386; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1465; M. for Com., 1515; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 1516.—(47 Vic., c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 140) Respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—(Mr. McLelan.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1386; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1602; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1609; Amt. 6 m. h. (Sir Richard Cartwright) neg. (Y. 54, N. 100) 1609; 3<sup>o</sup> on same div. reversed, 1609.—(47 Vic., c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 141) Respecting a Reformatory for certain Juvenile Offenders in the County of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia—(E) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*—; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1621.—(47 Vic., c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 142) Further to amend the present Tariff of Duties of Customs.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1443; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1621.—(47 Vic., c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 143) To amend the Liquor License Act of 1883.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
Res. prop., 1422; in Com., 1476; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1478; 2<sup>o</sup> and M. for Com. 1595; in Com., 1597; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1636; Amt. to recom. (Mr. McCraney) agreed to (Y. 75, N. 62) 1636; Amt. (Mr. Girouard) neg. (Y. 49, N. 88) 1636; recom., 1637; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1640; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1653.—(47 Vic., c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 144) Respecting the Territory in Dispute between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario—(K) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\* —; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1634; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1645.—(47 Vic., c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 145) Further to amend the Act 45 Victoria, Chapter 23, intituled An Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations—(J) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\* —; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1645.—(47 Vic., c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 146) To provide for the Salary and Travelling Allowances of an additional Puisné Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Manitoba.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
Res. prop., 1422; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1549; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1622; recom. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1627.—(47 Vic., c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 147) To authorize certain subsidies and grants for and in respect of the construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)  
Res. prop., 1444; M. for Com., 1479; in Com., 1486; M. to conc. in Res., 1517; Amt. (Mr. Blake) 1530; deb. adjd., 1543; rsmtd., 1549; Amt. (Mr. Auger) 1552; neg. (Y. 56, N. 110) 1572; Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 55, N. 111) 1573; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1574; neg. (Y. 52, N. 109) 1576; Res. conc. in (Y. 128, N. 35) 1576; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1576; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 1624; recom. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1640.—(47 Vic., c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 148) To authorize an advance to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners towards the completion of their Tidal Dock.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)  
Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1581; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1618.—(47 Vic., c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 149) To authorize an advance to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners towards the completion of their Graving Dock.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)  
Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1581; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1618.—(47 Vic., c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 150) To extend the limitation of time under the Act 43rd Victoria, Chapter 7, intituled: An Act for the final settlement of claims to lands in Manitoba by occupancy, under the Act 33 Victoria, Chapter 3—(N) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1586; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1640.—(47 Vic., c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 151) To authorize the Transfer of Prisoners from one Gaol to another in certain cases—(M) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1586; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1645.—(47 Vic., c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 152) To amend the North-West Territories Act, 1880—(L) *from the Senate.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1586; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1651.—(47 Vic., c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 153) Further to amend the Post Office Act, 1875.—(Mr. Carling.)  
*Not introduced.*
- BILL (No. 154) To readjust the yearly subsidies to be allowed by Canada to the several Provinces now included in the Dominion.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)  
Res. prop., 1215; M. for Com., 1583; in Com., 1584; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1610; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1645.—(47 Vic., c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 155) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respec-

tively the 30th June, 1884, and the 30th June, 1885, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service. Res., 1°\* of B., 2°\* and 3°\*, 1651.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

**BILL (No. 156)** To authorize the raising by way of Loan, of certain moneys required for the Public Service.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*.)

Res. prop., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1°\* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1645.—(47 *Vic.*, c. 3.)

**BILLS ASSENTED TO:** 664, 1654.

**BLACKEY, A. H., EMPLOYMENT OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 966.

**BLACK ROD, GENTLEMAN USHER:** Messages summoning Commons to Senate, 1,664, 1654.

**BLANCHET, Hon. J. G. B.:** Notification of Resignation (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.

**Board of Ry. Commissioners for Canada B. No. 8** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 31.

**Board of Trade, Toronto, and Corn Exchange Association amalg. B. No. 14** (*Mr. Beatty*). 1°\*, 43; 2°\*, 88; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

**BOND, GRINDING IN:** M. for O.C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

**BONDHOLDERS OF THE ST. L. & O. RY., VOTING AT MEETINGS.** See B. 56.

**BONUSES TO RYS., PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL:** Ms. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616; (*Mr. Landerkin*) 1200.

**BOTHWELL CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judgment of Supreme Court, 524.

**BOUCHER DE LA BRÛÈRE, PRINTING CIVIL SERVICE LIST:** in Com. of Sup., 1374; conc., 1464.

**BOUNDARIES BETWEEN B. C. AND N.W.T.:** Ques. (*Mr. Reid*) 261.

**BOUNDARIES, MAN., EXTENSION OF:** M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.

**BOUNDARY, LEGAL EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH:** in Com. of Sup., 1379.

**BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, OWNERS OF AND TONNAGE OF VESSELS APPLYING FOR SAME AND REFUSED:** M. for Stmnt.\* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 67; Ques., 603; Claims paid (*Mr. Fortin*) 140; Payment of: Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 655.

**BOUNTY TO MANUFACTURERS OF IRON:** M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

**BOW RIVER TIMBER LANDS, SALE OF:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.

**BRANDON, ERECTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT:** Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 1110.

**BRASSARD AND BUSHELL, MESSRS., SERVICES OF:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.

**BRAZIL, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH:** M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.

**BREAKWATER, INGONISH, COR. AND ENGINEER'S REPS., &c.:** M. for copies (*Mr. Campbell, Victoria*) 89.

**BREAKWATER, POINT ESCUMIÃO:** M. for Papers (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.

**BREAKWATER, ST. PETER'S, P.E.I., CONTRACT FOR:** M. for copies\* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.

**BRIDGE COMPANIES.** See respective headings.

**BRITISH ASSOCIATION, MEETING IN MONTREAL:** in Com. of Sup., 1310.

## BRITISH COLUMBIA:

**Arrangement with, B. No. 126.** Mess. from His Ex., 27; prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 67; M. for Com. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1023; in Com., and 1°\* of B., 1039; 2°\* and in Com., 1137; 3° m., 1171; Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1172; neg., 1176; Amt. (*Mr. Homer*) 6m. h., neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176; 3°\*, 1176. (47 *Vic.*, c. 6.) [For Deb. see "Agreement."]

Boundary between, and N.W.T.: Ques. (*Mr. Reid*) 261.

Cabinet, Representation: Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 505.

"C" Battery: in Com. of Sup., 1164.

C. P. R. (revote): in Com. of Sup., 1048.

Chinese Immigration, Prohibition of: Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 974; Amt. (*Mr. Allen*) 1285.

County Court Judge. See "Cariboo."

Departmental Officers: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.

Differences between, and Dom.: Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2.

Dry Dock: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. Gordon*) 85.

Excise: in Com. of Sup., 1316.

**Extension of Criminal Laws to, B. No. 132** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1320; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°\*, 1583. (47 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

Emigrant Sheds at Victoria: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.

Esquimalt Naval Station: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285; M. for Ret., 515.

Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 1235.

Gas Inspection: Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 506.

Geological Survey: Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 505.

Graving Dock at Esquimalt: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.

Health Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 1095.

Immigration Agent and Quarantine Officer, Vancouver Island: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336; Delay in Appointment, 736.

Indians, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1372; conc., 1617.

Indian Troubles at Metlakatla: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.

Lighthouses and Fog-alarms: in Com. of Sup., 1233.

Mail Service: Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605; Tenders for: (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1126.

Masters and Mates' Certificates: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 606.

Meteorological Observations: in Com. of Sup., 1255.

Mounted Police Force: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.

Naval Brigade and Torpedo Corps: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.

Naval Station at Esquimalt: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285; M. for Ret., 515.

Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1338.

Postmaster at Victoria: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605; in Com. of Sup., 1320.

## BRITISH COLUMBIA—Continued.

- Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 1198, 1319, 1606.  
 Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1198.  
 Rifle Associations, Further aid to : Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.  
 School of Gunnery, Fortifications and Militia : Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285 ; in Com. of Sup., 1164.  
*Sir James Douglas*, Steamer, Expenditure on : Ms. for Stmnts. : (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514 ; Officers and Crew, Rank, Pay, &c., 514 ; Repairs, &c. ; M. for Cor.,\* 1200 ; in Com. of Sup., 1227.  
 Steamboat Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 1256.  
 Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 1318.  
 Torpedo Corps and Naval Brigade, B. C. : Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.  
 Waters, H.M. Ships of War in : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 515.  
 Weights and Measures and Gas : in Com. of Sup., 1318.
- BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT, CASES DECIDED UNDER, PUBLICATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 1378.
- BROOKE, Mr. : Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1336.
- BUDGET, THE : Speech of Finance Minister (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 569. [For Deb. see "WAYS AND MEANS."]
- BUILDINGS, PUBLIC, COST OF, &c. : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 41 ; in Com. of Sup., 1191-1199, 1335, 1604.
- Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 122 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 822 ; 2°, 986 ; in Com. and 3°\*, 1282. (47 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- Building Societies and Trading Corporations, Insolvent Banks, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 145 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*— ; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1645. (47 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- BUOY, AUTOMATIC, IN LOCKPORT HARBOUR : Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603.
- BUOYS AND BEACONS, MONTREAL HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1369.
- BURLINGTON CANAL. See "CANALS."
- BURPEE, J. L. : Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1333.
- CABINET REPRESENTATION FOR B. C. : Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 505.
- Cable, Commercial, Co.'s B. No. 19 (*Mr. Rykert*). 1°\*, 67 ; 2°\*, 89 ; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- CALLANDER AND GRAVENHURST RY. SUBSIDY : M. for Cor., &c. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40.
- Calgary Omnibus, Tramway and Transfer Co. Incorp. B. No. 78 (*Mr. Ross*). 1°\*, 198 ; 2°\*, 504 ; withdn.
- Calgary Water Works Co. Incorp. B. No. 77 (*Mr. Ross*). 1°\*, 198 ; 2°\*, 504 ; withdn.
- CALGARY, SUPPLY FARM No. 20, SALE OR LEASE OF : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 44 ; Ques. 285.
- CAMERON, Mr. D. M. : Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- CAMERON, Mr. M. C. : Election sustained on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1.
- CANADA AND WEST INDIES AND BRAZIL SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 1299 ; conc., 1453.
- CANADA, G.T.R. DEORYING CREDIT OF : M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton*) 762.

- CANADA AND ANTWERP SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 1301.
- Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1386 ; 2° m., 1618 ; 2° and in Com., 1619 ; 3° m., 1621 ; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ives*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 93) 1621 ; 3°\*, 1621. (47 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- Canada Temperance Act, 1878, further Act Amt. B. No. 104 (*Mr. Ives*). 1°\*, 504.
- Canada Temperance and General Life Assurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 28 (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*). 1°\*, 83 ; 2°\*, 173 ; in Com. and 3°\*, 580. (47 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- CANADIAN EXPRESS CO., TRANSPORT OF MILITIA SUPPLIES : M. for copies\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 523.
- CANADIAN IMMIGRATION : Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 44.
- CANADIANS, REPATRIATION OF : Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 965.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY :
- Acquisition by Co. of Stock of other Rys. : M. for Stmnt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
- Agreement : Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- Allowances to Manufacturers of Goods required by Co. : M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
- Arbitrations arising out of claims for construction, &c. : M. for copy\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
- Atlantic and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Charter : M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 223.
- Bridge over Red River at Emerson : in Com. of Sup., 1348.
- British Columbia, revote : in Com. of Sup., 1048.
- Callander, cost to Co. of 40 miles west, and payments to Construction Co. for work done west to Sudbury Junction, &c., Port Arthur eastward, and cost of Algoma Mills Branch : M. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Blake*) 219.
- Canadian North-West Land Co.'s Stock : M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 223.
- Cash Deposit with Government : Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72 ; as to deposit of Securities, 72.
- Cost of : Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 603.
- Construction Co., Payments to, on account of line from 45 miles east of the Saskatchewan westward ; cost to Co. of line from above point to Summit of the Rockies ; estimated cost to complete line between Callander and Port Arthur ; also between Rocky Mountains and Kamloops : M. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Blake*) 220.
- Construction Contract and Subsidy Accounts, Payments to Co. : Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1055.
- Contracts made by Co. for construction : M. for copies\* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
- Engineers, Inspecting, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1348.
- Extension from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec Subsidy : prop. Res., 1444 ; in Com., 1492.
- Floating Debt, Payments to Co. on Account of : Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1054.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—Continued.

Funded Debt of Co.: Ques. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 337.

Georgian Bay Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1349.

Guarantee by Govt. of interest on Stock of Co.: Mess. from His Ex., 56.

Guarantee to Co.: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72; as to further Repts. on same, 72; M. for copies of Cor., &c., 79; Reports, &c., respecting, and modifications of same: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.

Immigration to Man. and the N. W., Promotion of, by Co., Amount expended: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 83.

Lake Superior and Nipissing Divisions, Cost of: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 458.

Lands sold within Ry. Belt, Price of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wright*) 77.

Loan, Application for further: contradiction of Stmt. in *Globe* newspaper (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1321.

**Loan B. No. 101** (*Sir Charles Tupper*) prop. Res., 84; M. for Cor. (speech) 98; (*Mr. Blake*) 113; Deb. adjd., 131; rsm. (*Mr. Ives*) 163; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 173; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 180; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 186; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 189; (*Mr. Davies*) 231; (*Mr. Foster*) 242; (*Mr. Fairbank*) 255; (*Mr. Curran*) 305; (*Mr. Fisher*) 309; (*Mr. Girouard*) 315; (*Mr. Fleming*) 317; (*Mr. Ferguson, Welland*) 320; (*Mr. McMullen*) 322; (*Mr. Stairs*) 326; (*Mr. Landerkin*) 328; (*Mr. Brecken*) 331; (*Mr. Lister*) 337; (*Mr. Orton*) 343; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 347.

Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 359; Deb. (*Mr. Ryleert*) 359; (*Mr. Armstrong*) 373; (*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland*) 376; (*Mr. Charlton*) 379; (*Mr. Dawson*) 392; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 395; (*Mr. Ross*) 404; (*Mr. Mulock*) 409; (*Mr. Laurier*) 411; Amt. neg. (Y. 62, N. 132) 414.

Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) 415; (*Mr. Blake*) 415; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 418; Deb. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 419; (*Mr. Vail*) 424; (*Mr. McNeill*) 426; (*Mr. Auger*) 430; (*Mr. Sproule*) 432; (*Mr. Platt*) 437; (*Mr. Houde*) 441; (*Mr. Gillmor*) 442; (*Mr. Homer*) 448; (*Mr. Cook*) 448; (*Mr. O'Brien*) 453; Amt. to Amt. neg. (Y. 62, N. 137) 454; Amt. neg. (Y. 63, N. 136) 454.

Res. in Com., 454-456.

Ms. for Res. to take precedence, 198, 304; Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 107) 304; Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 108) 305.

M. that conc. in Res. take precedence, 468.

M. for conc., 469.

Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 469; Deb. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 473; (*Mr. Casey*) 477; (*Mr. Pope*) 483; (*Mr. Trow*) 484; (*Mr. Ferguson, Leeds and Grenville*) 486; (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 491; (*Mr. Scott*) 493; (*Mr. Kirk*) 494; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 494; Amt. neg. (Y. 49, N. 112) 495.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—Continued.

Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 495; Deb. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 497; (*Mr. King*) 498; (*Mr. Daly*) 502; (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 502; Amt. neg. (Y. 43, N. 104) 503. Res. conc. in, 503.

B. introduced and 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 503; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 525; (*Mr. Blake*) 525; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 529; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 532; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 534; 2<sup>o</sup> agreed to (Y. 111, N. 52) and 2<sup>o</sup>, 535; M. for Com., 535; in Com., 538; recom., 567, 568; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to recom. neg. (Y. 58, N. 122) 568; Amts. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on same div., 569; 3<sup>o</sup> on same div. reversed, 569; Royal Assent, 664. (47 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

Loan of \$4,000,000, prop., Deprtl. Orders, &c.: M. for copies\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.

Location, Maps showing, and Branches: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 53.

Mileage cost of line 615 miles West of Winnipeg to 49 miles East of the Saskatchewan, and contracts for same: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 221.

Moberly and McCallum, Messrs., Memorial of, re Bonus to Prince Arthur's Landing and Kaministiquia Ry.: M. for copy\* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.

Modification of Arrangement between Co. and Govt.: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72.

North American Contracting Co., Instrument of Incorporation, &c.: M. for copy\* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.

North American Contracting Co., Statements concerning: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 222.

Official or Public Memoranda of Co. as to its position, &c.\*: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 66.

**Ontario and Quebec Ry. Lease confirmation B. No. 32** (*Mr. Abbott*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 83; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 173; M. for Com., 810; objection (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) Ques. of Priv., 810; M. to substitute name of *Mr. Haggart* for promoter, agreed to, 843; in Com., 857; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 859; Amt. (*Mr. Wallace*) 859; neg. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 860; B. passed, 886. (47 *Vic.*, c. 54.)

Payments or advances to Co. on any account: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 1055.

Postal Subsidy: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72; M. for Papers, 79.

Postal Subsidies and Transport Services: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.

Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River: in Com. of Sup., 1046.

Receipts and Expenditure of Co. for different services: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.

Red River and Cross Lake: in Com. of Sup., 1350.

Returns by Co. under the Consolidated Ry. Act: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.

Revote: in Com. of Sup., 1048.

St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry., Expenditure on by Co.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 516.

St. Lin Branch or Laurentian Ry., Purchase of, by Co.: (*Mr. Blake*) 223.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—Continued.

- Section B, Arbitrators or Commissioners on: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 1386.
- Section B, Transfer of Contract: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 77; further sums paid Contractors: M. for Estimate, 77; Award of Arbitrators, &c.: M. for copy,\* 1200; in Com. of Sup., 1630; conc., 1646.
- Shareholders and Stock held, Names of: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 513.
- Sifton & Ward, Red River and Cross Lake: in Com. of Sup., 1350.
- Smith & Ripley, Georgian Bay Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1349.
- South Eastern Ry. Co.'s Securities: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 223.
- Speech from the Throne: Reference in, 2.
- Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1049; conc., 1449.
- Steamers from Owen Sound: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 458.
- Stock of Co., Issue of, and price received: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 224.
- Subscribed Stock of Co. prior to increase of its Capital: M. for Stmtnt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
- Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 1049.
- Summit of Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, Cost of: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 458.
- Tariff of Rates on: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
- Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger: in Com. of Sup., 1460.
- Town Reserves along line: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- Union Jacques Cartier Ry., Opening of, to Co. (*Mr. Houde*) 41.

## CANALS:

- Beauharnois: in Com. of Sup., 1353; conc., 1463.
- Carillon, Dam and Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 1052; Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, 1351.
- Cornwall, Enlargement of: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.
- Cornwall: in Com. of Sup., 1050; (Drain between Town and Canal) 1053.
- Galops: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Holden, Clara S., Compensation to: in Com. of Sup., 1352.
- In Com. of Sup.: 1050-1053, 1350-1354, 1608; conc., 1460-1463, 1612-1617.
- Lachine: in Com. of Sup., 1050.
- Lachine, Contract for new Basins: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.
- Lachine, Wharfingers, Jurisdiction of: Ques. (*Mr. Auger*) 1387.
- Marohand, L. W., Professional Services: in Com. of Sup., 1353; conc., 1463.
- Miscellaneous: in Com. of Sup. 1053.
- Murray: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator: in Com. of Sup., 1351, 1618.
- Perley, H. F., Services on St. Peter's Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.

## CANALS—Continued.

- Raceway between Feeder and Chippewa River (Welland): in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Rapide Plat Lock: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Rideau, Land Damages between Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills: in Com. of Sup., 1354.
- Ste. Anne's: in Com. of Sup., 1052.
- St. Lawrence River and Canals: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- St. Peter's: in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.
- Salaries and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 1261.
- Schooners *St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*: in Com. of Sup., 1352; conc., 1461, 1612.
- Tay: in Com. of Sup., 1053.
- Trent River Nav., Locks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Unpaid Labourers (Welland Canal): in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.
- Welland: in Com. of Sup. 1051.
- Williamsburg: in Com. of Sup., 1352.
- CABAQUET AND SHIPPIGAN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.
- Cariboo County Court Judge Provision B. No. 37 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 69; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 85; 2°\* and in Com., 542; 3°\*, 625. (47 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- Carriers by Land B. No. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 27.
- Carriers by Land, Liability of, B. No. 103 (*Mr. Coughlin*). 1°\*, 504.
- CARLETON, N. B., POST OFFICE: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 966.
- CARNIVAL, MONTREAL, ADJOURNMENT FOR: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 83.
- CARON, CLOVIS, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1200.
- CARTWRIGHT, Hon. Sir R. J.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- CASUALTIES, &C., ON THE INTERCOOL. RY.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 79.
- CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1010.
- CATTLE TRADE, LIVE, WITH GREAT BRITAIN: M. for O. C. &c.\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
- CAVALRY AND INFANTRY SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 1165.
- CENSUS: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72, 766; in Com. of Sup., 1091; Second Vol. presented, 1322.
- Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 73 (*Mr. Platt*). 1°\*, 198; 2°\*, 504; M. for Com., 1175; in Com., 1202; Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202; neg., 1214; 3° m., 1214; Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 91) 1214; 3°\*, 1214. (47 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. B.: in Com., Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1202; Deb. (*Mr. Platt*) 1203, 1212; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 1204, 1210; (*Mr. Bowell*) 1204, 1213; (*Mr. Mulock*) 1208; (*Mr. Colby*) 1208; (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1211; (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1211; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1212; neg., 1214; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 91) 1214.
- CENTRAL RY., N.B., SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1509.

- Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. No. 116** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°\* of B., 763; 2°, 1057; in Com., 1131; 3°\*, 1175. (47 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES ACT, NON-ENFORCEMENT OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 85.
- CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 606.
- CERTIFICATES OF MASTERS AND MATES, REFUSAL OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS TO GRANT:** Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1444.
- CHABOT, L. & C., PETITIONS TO DOM. ARBITRATORS:** M. for copies\* (*Mr. Amyot*) 28.
- CHAPLEAU, S. E. ST. ONGE:** Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 80; **APPOINTMENT OF, AS SHERIFF IN THE N. W.:** M. for O. C., &c., 145; **FURTHER APPOINTMENT OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 1387.
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT:** in Com. of Sup., 825-832.
- CHASTITY, OFFENCES AGAINST.** See Criminal Law Amt., Bs. Nos. 2 and 6.
- CHATEAUVERT, E.:** Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1335.
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 616.
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION INTO B. C., PROHIBITION OF:** Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 974; Deb. (*Mr. Gordon*) 976; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 1282; Aml. (*Mr. Allen*) 1285; (*Messrs. Homer, Robertson and Gordon*) 1285; (*Messrs. Barnard, Fairbank, Foster, Wood and Hesson*) 1286; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1287; (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 1287; (*Mr. Gordon*) 1288.
- CIVIL GOVERNMENT:** in Com. of Sup., 832-843, 987, 988, 1300-1337, 1466-1474, 1627; conc., 1440, 1610.
- CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT.:** Ques. (*Mr. Small*) 655.
- Civil Service Acts, 1882 and 1883, Amt. B. No. 130** (*Mr. Chapleau*). M. to introd., 1169; 1°\*, 1170; 2°\*, 1360; Res. (Assistant Post Office Inspectors, &c.) in Com., 1360; rep. and B. in Com., 1388, 1422; 3°\*, 1422; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1652. (47 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- CIVIL SERVICE BOARD:** in Com. of Sup., 988, 1336; conc., 1459, 1610.
- CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION FUND:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF CONSTRUCTION (INTERCOL. RY.) PAYMENT OF:** in Com. of Sup., 1628.
- CLAIMS FOR LOSSES ON INTERCOL. RY.:** Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 655.
- CLAIMS OF PROV. OF QUEBEC AGAINST DOM.:** M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Coursol*) 79.
- CLARE, MR.:** Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 835.
- CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS:** in Com. of Sup., 1020, 1343.
- CLOTHING FOR THE MILITIA, MANUFACTURE OF, TENDERS:** M. for copies\* (*Mr. Vail*) 1201.
- COAL CARRIED ON INTERCOL. RY. AND BY WATER FROM N. S.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 65.
- COAL CARS, INTERCOL. RY., ADDITIONAL:** in Com. of Sup., 1627.
- COAL COMPANIES.** See respective headings.
- COAL ENTERED EX-WAREHOUSE, FREE OR FOR EXPORT:** M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
- COAL LANDS IN THE N.W., SALES AND LEASES:** M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- COAL OIL BARRELS, SEIZURE OF, AT SANDWICH, &c.:** M. for Papers (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.
- Coal, respecting the Sale of, B. No. 119** (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°\* of B., 765; withdn., 1618.
- COKER, Mr.** See "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."
- COLCHESTER REEF LIGHTHOUSE:** Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86, 199.
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES:** in Com. of Sup., 1256-1261, 1316-1318, 1382, 1383, 1608; conc., 1453, 1456, 1457, 1458.
- COLONIZATION Co.'s** See respective headings.
- COLONIZATION PLANS NOS. 1 AND 2, APPLICATIONS UNDER:** M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- "COLUMBIA," LOSS OF THE.** See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- Commercial Bank of Manitoba Incorp. B. No. 42** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- Commercial Cable Co.'s B. No. 19** (*Mr. Rykert*). 1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- COMMERCIAL TREATY BETWEEN CANADA AND FOREIGN POWERS:** M. for copies of O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- COMMISSIONER OF STANDARDS, ALLOWANCE TO:** in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- COMMISSION ON INTERCOL. RY. CLAIMS, SITTINGS OF:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.
- COMMISSIONER TO ENGLAND.** See "HIGH COMMISSIONER."
- Commissioners, Railway, Board of, for Canada, B. No. 8** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 31.
- COMMISSIONERS UNDER LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883:** Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 453.
- COMMITMENT OF A BILL:** Ques. of Procedure, 131.
- COMMITTEES, ADDITION OF NAMES TO:** 569.
- COMMITTEES:**
- Agricultural Industries, Encouragement of: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Foster*) 74.
  - Debates, Official Rep.: M. for Com. to Supervise, 28.
  - Hudson Bay, Navigation of: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Royal*) 203.
  - Library: M. for Joint Com. to assist *Mr. Speaker*, 31.
  - Mining and Metallurgy: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Hall*), 515.
  - Printing: M. for Joint Com. of both Houses, 31.
  - Select Standing: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 2; M. for Com. to prepare Lists, 28; Lists presented, 29; conc. in, 31.
- Commons, House of, Election of Members of, consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 5** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 28; withdn., 1290.
- COMMONS.** See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- COMMITTEE ON TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS, EXPENSES OF:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.
- COMPTROLLER, N. W. MOUNTED POLICE:** Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 840.

- CONCURRENCE. See "SUPPLY."
- CONFEDERATION, EXPENDITURE FOR PUBLIC WORKS SINCE: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.
- CONFEDERATION, HISTORICAL PICTURE COMMEMORATING: in Com. of Sup., 1309.
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE CHARGEABLE TO: Ms. for Ret.\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28, 140, 1200.
- CONSOLIDATED STATUTES, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1202; conc., 1453.
- Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 52** (*Mr. Mulock*). 1°\*, 131; 2°, 460; withdn., 986.
- Consolidated Ry. Act further Act Amt. B. No. 135** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°, 1322; 2° m., 1576; 2° and in Com., 1577; 3° m., 1591; recom., 1594; 3°\*, 1595. (47 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- CONSOLIDATED RY. ACT, 1879, RY. CO.'S RETURNS UNDER: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
- CONSOLIDATION OF THE STATUTES. See "Statutes."
- CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES, APPOINTMENT OF A FRENCH CANADIAN: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 73.
- CONSOLIDATED STATUTES, COST OF TYPE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1379; conc., 1464.
- CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1344.
- CONTINGENCIES, &c., ARTILLERY AND RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1158.
- CONTINGENCIES, DEPARTMENTAL: in Com. of Sup., 843.
- Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to, Act Amt. B. No. 12** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 40; Order for 2° read., 80; 2° m (*Mr. Casgrain*) 292; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; M. for Com. of W., 813; in Com., 815; *killed in Com. of W.*, 819; M. to restore to Order Pap. neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.
- CONVERTED ELECTIONS. See "Elections," and respective Districts; also "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- Copyrights Act Amt. B. No. 113** (*Mr. Béchard*). 1°\*, 655.
- CORBETT, JOHN, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 199.
- CORN AND CORN MEAL, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 36.
- Corn Exchange Association, Toronto, and Board of Trade amalg. B. No. 14** (*Mr. Beatty*). 1°\*, 43; 2°\*, 88; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- CORNWALL AND PERTH RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1507.
- COTTON DUCK, DRAWBACK ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Kirk*) 624.
- COUNTY JUDGE OF ELGIN, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Wilson*) 59. See "Hughes."
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 603.
- COX, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHEATLEY, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
- CRANE ISLAND, WHARF AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 516; Ques., 736.
- Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, Further Act Amt. B. No. 96** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 457.
- Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in, B. No. 3** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 27; 2° m., 93; Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., 93; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 97; 2°, 97; ref. to Sel. Com. on a div., 98; M. for Com. of W., 271; in Com., 285, 669; Amt. (*Mr. Bossé*) that Com. rise, agreed to, 671; M. to restore to Order Paper, 705; neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.
- Criminal Cases, Procedure in, Indictable Offences, B. No. 98** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 457.
- Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 127** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 1053.
- Criminal Law Amt., Incest, Punishment of, B. No. 2** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 27; 2° m., 79; 2°, 92; M. to ref. to Sel. Com. 97; M. for Com. of W., 819.
- Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c., B. No. 6** (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°\*, 28; 2° m., 141; in Com., 286; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to recom. agreed to (Y. 79, N. 70) 666; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) to recom., 666; M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to adjn. deb., 668; agreed to (Y. 96, N. 63) 669; rsmd., 980; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Bossé*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 69, N. 74) 980; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) neg. and 3°, 980; *killed in Sen.*
- Criminal Law Amt., unguarded and exposed holes, openings, &c., in the Ice B. No. 97** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 457.
- Criminal Laws, Extension to B. C., B. No. 132** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1320; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°\*, 1583. (47 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1089.
- CUBA, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- CULLING TIMBER, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1317; conc., 1457.
- CUMBERLAND COAL AND RAILWAY Co. See "Spring Hill."
- CUMBERLAND, SEAT FOR. See "Minister of Railways."
- Customs Act, 1883, Amt. B. No. 123** (*Mr. Bowell*). 1°, 885; 2°, 1059; in Com., 1060; 3°\*, 1129. (47 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- CUSTOMS:
- Amherstburg Custom House, Sale of Land for: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Lister*) 83.
  - Appraisers: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 285.
  - Brassard and Bushell, Services of, at Windsor: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.
  - Collector at Napanee: M. for Papers and Cor. (*Mr. Allison, Lennox*) withdn., 208.
  - Corn and Corn Meal, Imports and Exports: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson*) 36.
  - Dept. of: in Com. of Sup., 841.
  - Drawbacks, Claims for, on Goods manufactured for Export: M. for copies (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.
  - Examination of Baggage at St. Vincent: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1444.
  - Excise Duties collected on Intoxicating Liquors Imported: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 67.

## CUSTOMS—Continued.

- Freight Charges, Duty on: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.  
 Grinding in Bond: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.  
 Imports, Stmt. of: M. for Ret. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.  
 Jacques, Jas. H., Appointment of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.  
 Officials, Increase of, at Ports in Inverness, N. S.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 462.  
 Port Mulgrave as an Out-port: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 285.  
 Pine and Spruce Logs, Export Duty on: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 655.  
 St. Croix Cotton Factory, Importation of Machinery for: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Innes*) 808.  
 Salaries, &c., of the several Ports: in Com. of Sup., 1316; conc., 1456, 1464.  
 Windsor Custom House, Appointments in: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.  
 [See "DRAWBACKS."]  
 DALHOUSIE BRANCH, INTERCOL. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1344.  
 DANGEROUS WEAPONS, CARRYING OF: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 453.  
 D'ANJOU, JOSEPH, CLAIM OF: Ques. (*Mr. Billy*) 798.  
 DALTON, MR., TRANSFER OF: in Com. of Sup., 841.  
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL REPORTING OF: Com. to Supervise appointed, 28; names added, 43; Translation of: Ques. (*Mr. Lesage*) 86; M. to conc. in First Rep., 260; Second Rep. presented, 704; M. to conc. in, 833; Third and Fourth Reps. presented, 1022; M. to conc. in, 1100; Fifth Rep. presented, 1240; M. to conc. in, 1270; Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) neg. (Y. 61, N. 101) 1271; in Com. of Sup., 1340.  
 DE BEAUJEAU, MR. R.: Notification of Resignation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.  
 Debtors, Insolvent, Assets of, B. No. 71 (*Mr. Curran*). 1°\*, 162.  
 DEEDS, REGISTRATION OF IN THE N. W.: prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1635.  
 DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS, PUBLICATION OF, IN NEWSPAPERS remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 141.  
 DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS IN B. C.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.  
 Department of Marine and Fisheries B. No. 140 (*Mr. McLelan*). 1°\*, 1386; 2° and in Com., 1602; 3° m., 1609; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 54, N. 100) 1609; 3° on same div. reversed, 1609. (47 *Vic.*, c. 18.)  
 DEPOSITS OF GOVT. MONEY IN BANKS: M. for Stmt.\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.  
 DERBY STATION AND INDIANTOWN (I. C. R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.  
 DESERTERS FROM U. S. ARMY, ARRESTED ON CANADIAN TERRITORY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86; M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.  
 DEWDNEY, LIEUT.-GOV., ABSENCE OF: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.  
 DINGMAN, MR.: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 841.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS, &c.: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.

Disputed Territory, Dom. of Can. and Prov. of Ont., B. No. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*—; 2° and in Com., 1634; 3°\*, 1645. (47 *Vic.*, c. 24.)

DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88; on M. for 3° of B. 144 (*Mr. Dawson*) 1640.

Distribution of Insolvents' Estates, B. No. 79 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°\*, 198.

## DIVISIONS:

*British Columbia, Agreement with*, B. 126 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3°, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Homer*) neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176.

*Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan* B. 101 (*Sir Charles Tupper*): on M. for Com. on Res., Amt. for Select Com. to enquire into condition of Co. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 359, neg. (Y. 62, N. 132) 414; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Vail*) 415; Amt. to Amt. respecting Subsidies to Provinces (*Mr. Blake*) 418, neg. (Y. 62, N. 137) 454; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Vail*) neg. (Y. 63, N. 136) 454; on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. Lines south of C. P. R. in Manitoba (*Mr. Watson*) 473, neg. (Y. 49, N. 112) 495; Amt. restricting Co. as to Terminus (*Mr. Weldon*) 497, neg. (Y. 43, N. 104) 503; on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for B. to take precedence (Y. 112, N. 47) 524; M. for 2° carried (Y. 111, N. 52) 535; Amt. pledging Securities and Railways to Govt. as additional security (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 58, N. 122) 569; Amt., Contracts to be let conditionally and on approval of Govt., neg. on same div., 569; Amt., Expenditure subject to audit of Auditor-Gen., neg. on same div., 569; 3° agreed to on same div. reversed, 569.

*Canada Temperance Act*, 1878, Amt. B. 136 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 93) 1621.

*Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s* B. 73 (*Mr. Platt*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 91) 1214.

*Contracts, Public, Fraud in relation to*, B. 12 (*Mr. Casgrain*): M. to restore to Order Paper, neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.

*Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in*, B. 3 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*): on M. for 2°, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 97; M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 86, N. 81) 284; M. to restore to Order Paper (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.

*Criminal Law Amt., Incest, &c.* B. 2 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*): M. for Com. of W., 818; neg. (Y. 65, N. 86) 819.

*Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c.* B. 6 (*Mr. Charlton*): M. to recom. agreed to (Y. 79, N. 70) 666; M. to adjn. deb. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) agreed to (Y. 96, N. 63) 669; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Bossé*) neg. (Y. 69, N. 74) 980.

*Cumberland, Seat for*; Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 547; Amt. to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 549; carried (Y. 122, N. 57) 566.

## DIVISIONS—Continued.

- Debates, Official Rep.*: on M. to conc. in Fifth Rep. of Com., Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) neg. (Y. 61, N. 101) 1271.
- Dual Representation B. 13 (Mr. Ouimet)*: M. for 2° neg. (Y. 59, N. 102) 144, 145.
- Exchange Bank of Canada*: Res. censuring Govt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 161.
- Graham, John, Divorce B. 107 (Mr. Jamieson)*: M. for 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 665; M. for 3° agreed to (Y. 84, N. 56) 979, 980.
- High Commissioner to England*: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 95) 1046.
- Immigration and Emigration*: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 50, N. 101) 1088.
- Independence of Parliament Act Amt. B. 111 (Sir John A. Macdonald)*: on M. for leave to introduce, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 101) 624; Main Motion agreed to on same div. reversed, 625; M. for 2° agreed to (Y. 105, N. 56) 878; on M. for 3°, Amt., (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 58, N. 117) 1448; Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*) neg. on same div., 1449; 3° on same div. reversed, 1449.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 143 (Sir John A. Macdonald)*: on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. McCraney*) agreed to (Y. 75, N. 62) 1636; Amt. (*Mr. Girouard*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 88) 1636.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal*: Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for precedence (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) neg. (Y. 70, N. 102) 824; Amt. Ques. of competency of Parlt. to pass Act referred to Supreme Court or Privy Council (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 937; agreed to (Y. 117, N. 63) 963, 964.
- Marine and Fisheries Dept. B. 140 (Mr. McLelan)*: on M. for 3°, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 54, N. 100) 1609.
- Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench*: M. for Papers, &c. (*Mr. Laurier*) 133; neg. (Y. 47, N. 89) 140.
- North-West Grievances*: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) neg. (Y. 57, N. 116) 1157.
- Orange, Loyal, Association of British America incorp. B. 93 (Mr. Cameron, Victoria)*: M. for 2°, neg. (Y. 68, N. 105) 931.
- Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic*: on prop. Res. (*Mr. Foster*) Amt. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 107) 1221; Main Motion, as amended, agreed to (Y. 122, N. 40) 1126.
- Privileges and Elections*: M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com. agreed to (Y. 107, N. 55) 1291.
- Public Expenditure*: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Charlton*) neg. (Y. 57, N. 111) 1333.
- Reciprocity*: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Davies*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 105) 1190.
- Section B, C. P. R., Award of Arbitrators to contractors*: conc. in. Res. rep. from Com. of Sup. agreed to (Y. 82, N. 34) 1651.

## DIVISIONS—Continued.

- Subsidies to Rys., authorization B. 147 (Sir Charles Tupper)*: on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1530; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552; neg. (Y. 56, N. 110) 1572; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 111) 1573; Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1574; neg. (Y. 52, N. 109) 1576; Main Motion agreed to (Y. 128, N. 35) 1576.
- Ways and Means*: on conc., Amt. respecting duty on Crockery, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 17, N. 39) 797.
- Divorce, John Graham, B. No. 107 (Mr. Jamieson)**. 1° on a div., 580; 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 665; in Com. on a div., 979; 3° agreed to (Y. 84, N. 56) 980. (47 *Vic. c.* 107.)
- DOMINION ARBITRATORS, CLAIMS BEFORE: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260, 965.
- DOMINION ARBITRATORS, PETS. OF E. GOSSELIN AND L. & C. CHABOT: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Amyot*) 28; E. Dorion\* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88; M. Leclerc\*, 88.
- DOMINION EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1093; Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.
- DOMINION GRANGE, MEMORIAL OF: M. for copy, &c.\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.
- Dominion Lands Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 138 (Sir John A. Macdonald)**. 1°\*, 1386; prop. Res. 1590; 2° and in Com., 1622; 3°\*, 1640. (47 *Vic., c.* 25.)
- DOMINION LANDS:
- Agents for Assiniboia and Calgary: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27.
- Agricultural, Mineral, Timber and Pasture Lands and Town Sites, Sales since 1881: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- Coal Lands, Sale of; in the N.W.: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- C. P. R., Homestead and Preemption, South of: M. for O.C.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
- Claims, Settlement of: in Com. of Sup., 1385.
- Claims, Settlement of, in Man. B. No. 150 (Sir John A. Macdonald)**. 1°\*, 1586; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1640. (47 *Vic., c.* 26.)
- Colonization Plans, Nos. 1 and 2, Applications under: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- Examiner under Act at Brandon: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 1109.
- Homesteads, Entries for: M. for Rets.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- Homestead and Preemption, Withdrawal of Lands from south of main line C. P. R., Settlers and Squatters', Claims, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
- In Com. of Sup., 1384, 1385.
- Jack Head River Timber Limits: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.
- Lakes Huron and Superior, Region North of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.
- Land Companies. *See* respective headings.
- Mile Belt, Withdrl. of Homestead and Preemption Lands within: M. for O. C.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
- Pasture Land Leases, granted in 1883: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.

## DOMINION LANDS—Continued.

- Region North of Lake Superior: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.
- Regina, Moose Jaw, &c., Town Reserves, Withdrawal of, from Homestead and Preemption: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- Regulations respecting Agricultural, Timber, Pasture, Mineral Lands and Town Sites: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- Sales, during 1883, total acres, average price, and amount: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- Sales, Purchases and Rebate: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Livingstone*) 523.
- Sales, within C. P. R. Belt: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wright*) 77.
- Settlers' Lands, Payments on: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.
- Settlers' or Squatters' Claims on Town Reserves along line of C. P. R.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75; within Mile Belt,\* 79.
- Supply Farm No. 20, Fish Creek, Sale of: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27; Ms. for Rets., 44, 48; Ques., 285.
- Supply Farm, Pincher Creek: Ques., 200; M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.
- Surveys, Man. and N. W. T. in 1883, acres: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- Timber Lands or Limits sold since March, 1883, near Bow River: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 73; M. for Ret., 90.
- Timber Licenses, Cancellation of, on Indian Reserves: M. for copies of O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
- Town Reserves in the N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- Town Site Reservation at Fort MacLeod: M. for O. C. &c.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 624.
- Town Sites, Sale of: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- DOMINION RIFLE ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 1159, 1160.
- DOMINION POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 997, 1338.
- DOMINION, PUBLIC DEBT OF THE: Ques. (*Mr. Charlton*) 736.
- DOMINION EXPENDITURE: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1332; neg. (Y. 57, N. 111) 1333.
- DOMINION STATUTES, DISTRIBUTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 797.
- DOMINION SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Laurier*) 1200. See "Subsidies."
- DOMINION STEAMERS:
- Inspector's Reps. upon Steamers *St. Lawrence, Prince of Wales* and *Northern Light*: M. for copies (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
- Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1227.
- O'Brien, Jotham, Contract, &c. for building *Princess Louise*: M. for copy (*Mr. Weldon*) 35; amount paid on same, &c, M. for Stmt.,\* 623.
- Princess Louise*, Steamer to replace, Tenders, &c., M. for copies\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 820.
- Scott, Capt. R. M., Rep. of, on loss of *Princess Louise*: M. for copy (*Mr. Weldon*) 40.
- Sir James Douglas*, Steamer, Expenditure on: Ms. for Stmtts. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514; Officers and

## DOMINION STEAMERS—Continued.

- Crew, Rank, Pay, &c., 514; Repairs, &c., M. for Cor.\*, 1200; in Com. of Sup., 1227.
- DONALDSON, MR., APPOINTMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 833.
- DORION, EUSTACHE, CLAIM OF: M. for copy\* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88.
- DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1000.
- DRAWBACKS:
- Cotton Duck used for Sails, Amounts paid and to whom: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Kirk*) 624.
- Goods manufactured for Export, Claims presented: M. for copies (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.
- Goods required by C. P. R., Claims: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
- Shipbuilding Materials, Claims presented: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
- Sugar, refined in Canada, Memorial, &c., asking for: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
- Wheat, Flour, &c.: M. for copies of Claims (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.
- DREDGES AND DUMPING SCOWS: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Jackson*) 1201.
- DREDGES AND TUG, CONSTRUCTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 603.
- DRILL PAY AND INCIDENTAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1098.
- DRILL INSTRUCTION, ALLOWANCE FOR: in Com. of Sup., 1096.
- DRILL SHED, MONTREAL, CONTRACT FOR REBUILDING: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966; M. for copies, 1201.
- DRILL SHEDS AND RIFLE RANGES: in Com. of Sup., 1160.
- DRY DOCK, B.C.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
- Dual Representation Repeal B. No. 13 (*Mr. Oumet*). 1°\*, 40; M. for 2° neg. (Y. 59, N. 102) 144.
- DUART, POSTMASTER AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 509; Ques., 1053; Complaints against appointment: M. for Pet.,\* 1201.
- DUCKETT, MRS. EDWARD, REVOTE: in Com. of Sup., 1343.
- DUTY ON FREIGHT CHARGES: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
- DUVAL, G., PRÉCIS WRITER, SUPREME COURT: in Com. of Sup., 1474.
- DYKE, MR., EMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 1305, 1408.
- Eastern Extension Ry., Acquisition of, B. No. 125 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 825; M. for Com., 878; in Com., 883; conc. in and 1°\* of B., 987; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1131. (47 Vic., c. 5.)
- Eastern Railway Co. of Can. B. No. 63 (*Mr. Macmaster*). 1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 542; withdn.
- ELLSWORTH, ARREST OF, BY U. S. SOLDIERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.
- ELEVATOR AT HALIFAX: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 603.
- ELECTORAL FRANCHISES, ASSIMILATION OF. See "Franchise."
- Electoral Franchise B. No. 7 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 31.
- Election of Members to House of Commons consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 5 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 28; withdn., 1290.

## ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED :

- Albert: Judge's Rep., 1.  
 Berthier: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1443.  
 Bothwell: Judgment of Supreme Court, 524.  
 Huron, West: Judge's Rep., 1.  
 Kent Ont.: Judge's Rep., 1; Election and Return of Member, 198.  
 Lennox: Judge's Rep., 1.  
 Lunenburg: Judge's Rep., 1.  
 Megantic: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1321.  
 Middlesex, West: Judge's Rep., 1.  
 Montcalm: Judgment of Supreme Court, 337.  
 Simcoe, South: Judge's Rep., 1.  
 Soulanges: Judgment of Supreme Court, 735.
- ELGIN, COUNTY JUDGE OF: M for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Wilson*) 59; remarks, 967; Ques., 1109; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.
- ELGIN ROAD STATION, L'ISLET: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 199.
- EMIGRANT BUILDING AND QUARANTINE AT LÉVIS: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.
- EMIGRANT SHEDS AT VICTORIA, B.C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.
- EMIGRATION STATISTICS, CANADA AND U. S.: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1199.
- ENGLAND, EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF GOVT. IN: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.
- ENGINEERS, INSPECTING, C. P. R., SALARIES AND EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1348.
- Engineers Licenses, Reduction of Fees, Steam-boat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 121** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop. and in Com., 765; 1°\* of B. 766; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1058. (47 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- "ENTERPRISE," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- ERIE AND HURON RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1507.
- ESCHEAT, MATTERS OF, SHORTHAND WRITERS' NOTES, &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 74.
- ESPLANADE, EXTENSION. See Toronto.
- ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY.: Ques. (*Mr. Gordon*) 85.
- Esquimalt Graving Dock B. No. 126** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 67; M. for Com., 1023; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1039; 2°\* and in Com., 1137; 3° m., 1171; Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1172; neg., 1176; 3°\*, 1176. (47 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- ESSAYS, &c., ON AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.
- ESTIMATES, THE: Mess. from His Ex. transmitting same for 1884-85, 145; ref. to Com. of Sup., 145; Suppl. Est., 1883-84, 1240; Suppl. Est., 1884-85, 1439; Further Suppl. Est., 1884-85, 1576.
- EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS, PORT OF LANDING OF: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 89.
- Evidence, Law of, in Criminal Cases B. No. 3** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 27; 2° m., 93; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) 93; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 97; 2°, 97; ref. to Sel. Com. on a div., 98; M. for Com. of W., 271;

**Evidence, Law of—Continued.**

- in Com., 285, 669; Amt. that Com. rise, (*Mr. Bossé*) agreed to, 671; M. to restore to Order Paper, 705; neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.
- Evidence in Criminal Cases, Law of, further Act Amt. B. No. 96** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 457.
- EXAMINER UNDER DOM. LANDS ACT AT BRANDON: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 1109.
- EXCHANGE BANK, GOVT. DEPOSITS IN: M. for Stmt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 35; Res. censuring Govt. 155; neg. (Y. 60, N. 97) 161.
- EXCHANGE BANK, SECURITY FOR ADVANCE TO: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 199, 261, 336.
- EXCISE OFFICERS AT PERTH AND QUEBEC: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 132.
- EXCISE, SALARIES, &c., OF OFFICERS AND INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 1316, 1608.
- Excursions, Sunday, Prevention of, B. No. 112** (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°\*, 655.
- EXHIBITION. See respective headings.
- EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC WORKS IN EACH OF THE PROVS. SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.
- EXPENDITURE, DEPTL., ON SESSIONAL RETURNS: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.
- EXPENDITURE, PUBLIC: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1322; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1326; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1328; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1332; neg. (Y. 57, N. 111) 1333.
- EXPIRING LAWS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
- EXPLORATORY EXPEDITION TO HUDSON BAY AND STRAITS: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 132. See "Hudson Bay."
- EXPORT DUTY ON PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 655.
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, STMT. OF, distinguishing products of Canada from those of other Countries: Ms. for Rets.\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28, 1200.
- EXPORTS, SUMMARY STMT. OF: M. for Ret.\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
- EXPRESS CO.'S AGREEMENT WITH INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Weldon*) 77.
- FABRE, HON. HECTOR, RETENTION OF SERVICES: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 337; Salary and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 1203; conc., 1453.
- FACTORY ACT AMT.: Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2.
- FACTORY BILL, COR. WITH THE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OR TRADES AND LABOUR COUNCIL: M. for copies, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
- Factories, definition of Offences against persons employed in, B. No. 106** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1°, 524; withdn., 1627.
- FAIRFORD RIVER, LAKE MAN., IMPROVEMENT OF: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Orton*) 208.
- FALCONER, JAMES, FOR LAND DAMAGES, INTERCOL. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1346.

- Felonies and Misdemeanours Law, extension to Manitoba B. No. 133** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1321; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°\*, 1583. (47 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- Felonies and Misdemeanours, Speedy Trial of, B. No. 99** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 457.
- FERGUSON, WM., PURCHASE OF LAND, INTERCOL. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1347.
- Ferries, respecting, B. No. 115** (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*). 1°\*, 736.
- FERRY OR BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, INTERCOL. RY.: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.
- FINANCE MINISTER'S MISSION TO ENG.: M. for Papers (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 86.
- FINANCE, DEPT. OF, AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 841.
- FISH CREEK, SUPPLY FARM No. 20: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 44. See "Dominion Lands."
- FISHERIES:
- Amts. to Fishery Act, Pets. for: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 299.
  - Award and Claims of P. E. I.: Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1273; Deb. (*Mr. Brecken*) 1277; (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1278; (*Mr. Tupper*) 1279; (*Mr. Hackett*) 1280.
  - Bounty, Claims paid under: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Fortin*) 140.
  - Bounty in aid of: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 67.
  - Bounty, Payment of: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603; (*Mr. McIsaac*) 655; Distribution of: in Com. of Sup., 1369; conc., 1617.
  - Exhibition. See "International."
  - In Com. of Sup., 1234, 1369; conc., 1617.
  - Ogden, Alfred, Employment of: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 798; (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 965.
  - Overseer for Digby Co.: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 89.
  - Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1234.
  - Regulations under Act Prohibiting Fishing in Ont. Waters: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mulock*) 71; Fines under: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 201.
  - Washington Treaty, Fishery Clauses of the: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Davies*) 1200.
- "FITZGERALD," LOSS OF THE BARQUE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
- FLAG TREATY, U. S. AND SPAIN: ON M. for Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Vail*) 1361.
- FLOUR AND WHEAT, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.
- Food and Drugs, Adulteration of, Act Amt. B. No. 109** (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°, 598; withdn., 1057.
- Food and Drugs, Adulteration of, prevention B. No. 114** (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°\*, 655; 2° m., 1132; 2°, 1137; Res. prop. (Public Analysts) 1215; in Com., 1244; M. for Com. on B., 1244; point of Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1244; ruling (*Mr. Speaker*) 1246; in Com., 1246; recom. and 3°\*, 1294. (47 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- FORESTRY EXHIBITION AT EDINBURGH: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.
- Fortifications and Military Buildings, B. No. 124** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°, 965; 2°, 1061; in Com., 1063; 3°\*, 1129. (47 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- FORTIFICATIONS, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY AND MILITIA, B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.
- FORT MACLEOD AND MEDICINE HAT MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506.
- FORT MACLEOD, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506; M. for O. C., &c.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 619; Town Site Reservation, 624.
- FORT SIMPSON, INDIAN TROUBLES: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.
- FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVE, CANCELLATION OF TIMBER LICENSES: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
- FRANCE AND CANADA, POSTAL ORDERS BETWEEN: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 967.
- FRANCE AND QUEBEC SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 1300.
- FRANCE, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- FRANCHISES, ELECTORAL, ASSIMILATION OF: Reference to in Speech from the Throne, 2.
- Franchise, Electoral, B. No. 7** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 31.
- Fraud in relation to Public Contracts Act Amt. B. No. 12** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 40; Order for 2° read, 80; 2° m. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 292; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; M. for Com. of W., 813; in Com., 815; killed in Com. of W., 819; M. to restore to Order Paper neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.
- Fraud, Prevention of, in Sale of Agricultural Fertilizers, B. No. 38** (*Mr. Massue*). Res. and 1° of B., 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; in Com. of W. and 3°\*, 669. (47 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- Fraud, Prevention of, in Sale of Patent Rights B. No. 26** (*Mr. Mulock*). 1°, 71; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 145; in Com. of W., 285; 3°, 460. (47 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- FREIGHT CHARGES ON INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Innes*) 807.
- FREIGHT CHARGES, DUTY ON: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
- FRENCH REPRESENTATION IN THE SENATE: Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 1549.
- FRONTIER POLICE, SOUTH-WESTERN ONTARIO: Ques. (*Mr. Haggart*) 1054.
- FUNDED DEBT, 1883 (C. P. R. LOAN): Ques. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 337.
- GABOURY, J. E., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.
- GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- GALT, MR. JUSTICE: Rep. on Kent Controverted Election, 1.
- GALT, SIR A. T., CLAIMS OR ALLOWANCES ON ACCOUNT OF, AS HIGH COMMISSIONER: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.

- Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 58.** (*Mr. Taylor*). 1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 603. (47 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- Gas and Gas Meters, Inspection of, Acts Amt. B. No. 108** (*Mr. Costigan*). 1°\*, 598; Res. in Com., 1055; 2° of B., 1056; in Com., 1129; 3°\*, 1131. (47 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- GAS FLOATING LIGHTS BELOW QUEBEC:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Valin*) 217.
- GAS INSPECTION IN B. C.:** Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 506.
- GAS, NATURAL, IN MONTMAGNY AND ST. MAURICE COUNTIES:** Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 85.
- GATINEAU VALLEY RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO:** prop. Res., 1445; in Com., 1499.
- "GAZETTE" (MONTREAL) SUMS PAID TO FROM 1874 TO 1883:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY IN B. C.:** Ques. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 505.
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY:** in Com. of Sup., 1261; conc., 1450.
- General Inspection Act further Act Amt. B. No. 128** (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop. and in Com., 1055; 1°\* of B., 1056; 2°\* and in Com., 1394; 3°\*, 1422. (47 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE Co.** See "Canada Temperance."
- GENTLEMAN USHER.** See "Black Rod."
- GIROUARD, Mr. G. A.:** Notification of Resignation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- "GLENDON," STEAMER TO REPLACE:** in Com. of Sup., 1227.
- "GLOBE" NEWSPAPER:** Contradiction of Stmt. respecting application for further Loan by C. P. R. Co. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1321.
- GOLD MINING IN THE N. W., ACT RELATING TO:** Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 43; M. for Ret., 512.
- GOOD FRIDAY:** Adjournment for (M.) 1476.
- GOODWIN, JAS., CLAIM OF, FOR ERECTING WALL AROUND GROUNDS:** Ques. (*Mr. Fleming*) 604; M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 1199.
- GOOSE ISLAND, LIGHTHOUSE ON:** Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 655.
- GOSSELIN, EUGÈNE, PETITION OF, TO DOM. ARBITRATORS:** M. for copies\* (*Mr. Amyot*) 28.
- GOVERNMENTAL EXPRESS SYSTEM:** Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.
- GOVERNMENT BUSINESS:** C. P. R. Res. precedence, 198; Franchise B., 469; State of, 1170, 1241; Ms. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to take in Thursdays, 625; Mondays, 1023; Wednesdays, 1549; Saturdays, 1322.
- GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN EXCHANGE BANK:** M. for Stmt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 35.
- GOVERNMENT DREDGE FOR MANITOBA, BUILDING OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 210.
- GOVERNMENT HERD IN THE N. W.:** Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.
- GOVERNMENT LANDS IN RICHELIEU CO., SALE OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 1109; M. for Ret., 1126.
- GOVERNMENT MEASURES ABANDONED:** remarks (*Mr. Mills*) 1653.
- GOVERNMENT MILLS IN THE N. W. T., SALE OR LEASE OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 199; M. for Ret., 507.
- GOVERNMENT MONEY ON DEPOSIT IN BANKS:** M. for Stmt.\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
- GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANKS:** in Com. of Sup., 828.
- GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.** See "Dominion."
- GOVERNMENT WORKSHOPS ON INTERCOL. RY., ROLLING STOCK BUILT IN:** M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.
- GOVERNOR, DEPUTY:** Summoning Commons to Senate and Royal Assent to C. P. R. Loan B., 664.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL:**  
Commons, Summoning of to Senate, 2, 1654.  
Speech from the Throne on opening of Parliament, 2;  
Reply to Address, 304.  
Speech from the Throne proroguing Parliament, 1655.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S COMMISSION, OATH, &c.:** M. for copies (*Mr. Casgrain*) 521.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S OATH:** M. for copy\* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS, PAYMENTS UNDER:** M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY:** Communications from, read (*Mr. Speaker*) 655, 1652.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE:** in Com. of Sup., 832.
- Graham, John, Relief B. No. 107** (*Mr. Jamieson*). 1° on a div., 580; 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 65) 665; in Com. on a div., 979; 3° agreed to (Y. 84, N. 56) 980. (47 *Vic.*, c. 107.)
- GRAND MANAN, N.B., AND MAINLAND MAIL SUBSIDY:** in Com. of Sup., 1298.
- GRAND PILES AND LAC DES ISLES RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.
- GRAND SOUTHERN RY., CONVEYANCE OF MAILS:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. No. 21** (*Mr. Curran*). 1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 89; M. for Com. of W., 890; deb. adjd., 897; rsmd., 977; in Com. and 3°, 978. (47 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- GRAND TRUNK RY. Co.'s B. 21:** Deb. on M. for Com. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 890; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 891; (*Mr. Curran*) 891; (*Mr. Mitchell*) 892; (*Mr. Blake*) 894; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 895; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 896; (*Mr. Mills*) 896; (*Mr. Stairs*) 897; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 977; Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1511; remarks, 1608, 1635.
- GRAND TRUNK RY. CROSSING IN MONTREAL:** Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 1387.
- GRAND TRUNK RY. STOCKHOLDERS:** M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1200.
- GRANT, Mr., SUPERANNUATION:** in Com. of Sup., 842.
- GRAVENHURST AND CALLANDER RY. SUBSIDY:** M. for copies of Cor., &c. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40; Ques. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 604.
- GRAVING DOCK AT ESQUIMALT, PAYMENT ON ACCOUNT OF:** M. for O. C. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514.
- Graving Dock at Lévis, further advance B. No. 149** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1581; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1618. (47 *Vic.*, c. 10.)

- Great American and European Short Line Ry. Co. change of Name B. No. 89** (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 285; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 504; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 810. (47 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RY.:** Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 57.
- Great Northern Ry. Co. B. No. 90** (*Mr. Bossé*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 285; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 504; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 979. (47 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. Co., SUBSIDY TO:** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.
- GRENVILLE CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 1053.
- GRINDING IN BOND:** M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
- GRIFF AND SAW MILL SOUTH OF CALGARY, SALE OR LEASE OF:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 507.
- GUARANTEE BY GOVT. TO C. P. R.:** Mess. from His Ex., 56.
- Guelph Junction Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 72** (*Mr. Innes*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 198; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 542; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1035. (47 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- GUEBIN, Mr., EXPLORATION ON THE YAMASKA RIVER:** M. for copies of Rep.\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
- HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN *vid* YARMOUTH, SUBVENTION:** in Com. of Sup., 1298; conc., 1453.
- HALIFAX AND ST. PIERRE, SUBVENTION:** in Com. of Sup., 1301.
- HALIFAX, CITY AND COUNTY:** Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- HALIFAX, ELEVATOR AT:** Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 603.
- HALIFAX EXTENSION, Intercol. Ry.:** in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1344.
- Halifax Mutual Marine Insurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 27** (*Mr. Daly*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 83; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 173; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- Halifax Steam Navigation Co. Incorp. B. No. 24** (*Mr. Stars*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 71; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 89; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 580. (47 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- HALIFAX STREET RY. Co. vs. THE QUEEN:** in Com. of Sup., 1345.
- HALL, Mr. (INLAND REVENUE) PROMOTION OF:** in Com. of Sup., 841.
- HALL, Mr. (INTERIOR):** Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 838.
- Hamilton and North-Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65** (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 162; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 504; Order for Com. of W. dschgd. and ref. back to Ry. Com., 977; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1175. (47 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- HARBOUR ACCOMMODATION.** See Toronto, and respective headings.
- HARBOUR OF REFUGE, PORT STANLEY:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 519.
- HAY, U. S. CUSTOMS DUTIES ON:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Irvine*) 519.
- HEWITT, COL.:** Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 837, 1163.
- HERRING, NEWFOUNDLAND, INSPECTION OF:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.
- HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COST OF:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.
- HEALTH STATISTICS:** in Com. of Sup., 1094; conc., 1440.
- HEALTH OFFICERS, PUBLIC:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 88.
- HEARN, Jos., SUPERANNUATION OF:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Kirk*) 1110; deb. rsmd., 1289.
- H. M. SHIPS OF WAR IN B. C. WATERS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 515.
- HIGH COMMISSIONER:**
- Appointment of present and duties of Min. of Rys. during absence, &c.: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
- Claims or Allowances, on account of (Sir A. T. Galt and present Incumbent) payments to, &c.: M. for Cor., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.
- Commercial Treaties, Reports of: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 56.
- Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 987, 1336; conc., 1440.
- House and Furniture for: in Com. of Sup., 1367.
- Immigration to Canada, Reports of: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
- Letter and Cablegrams of Min. of Agriculture, re labour in Canada: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 799.
- Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Mills*) 1639.
- [See "Minister of Railways."]
- HIGGINS, Mr., SUPERANNUATION:** in Com. of Sup., 841.
- HODGE vs. THE QUEEN, JUDGMENT AND SHORTHAND WRITERS' NOTES BEFORE JUDICIAL COM. OF PRIVY COUNCIL:** M. for copies\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- HOLT, E. B.:** Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1334.
- HOME FARMS, RESPECTING:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 59.
- HOME OR SUPPLY FARM ON PINCHER CREEK, SALE OF, &c.:** M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.
- HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION LANDS SOUTH OF THE C. P. R.:** M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
- HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION LANDS WITHDRAWN FROM THE MILE BELT:** M. for O. C.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
- HOMESTEADS, PUBLIC LANDS ENTERED AS:** M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- HOPEWELL AND ALMA RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.
- HOUSE OF COMMONS:**
- Accountant, Receipts and Disbursements of, 31.
- Albert Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- Berthier Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1443.
- Bothwell Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr. Speaker*) 524.
- Catndal, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1475.
- Colby, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1339.
- Governor Gen.'s Secretary: Communications from, read, 655, 1652.
- Hour of Meeting: remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 376.
- Huron, West, Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- Kent Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- Labrosse, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1608.
- Lennox Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- Library of Parliament: Rep. presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 3.
- See "Library."

## HOUSE OF COMMONS—Continued.

- Lunenburg Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.  
 Members Introduced, 1, 27, 200, 335.  
 Megantic Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1321.  
 Mitchell, Hon. P., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1608.  
 Middlesex, West, Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.  
 Montcalm Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr. Speaker*) 337.  
 New Members, Return of, 1, 200, 335.  
 Official Rep. See "Debates."  
 Opening: Communication from Gov. Gen. by Black-Rod, 1; Speech from the Throne, 2.  
 Prorogation: Communication from Gov. Gen's Sec., 1652; Speech from the Throne, 1654.  
 Receipts and Disbursements of Accountant, 31.  
 Robertson, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1476.  
 Royal Assent to Bills, 664, 1654.  
 Rykert, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1608.  
 Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1476.  
 Select Standing Coms.: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 2. See "Committees."  
 Senate, Summoned to, by Mess, 1, 644, 1654.  
 Simcoe, South, Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.  
 Soulanges Elec.: Judgment of Supreme Court read (*Mr. Speaker*) 735.  
 Vacancies, Notification of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.  
 Vail, Hon. Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1339.  
 Writs of Election, Warrants issued for, 1.  
 [See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."]
- House of Commons, Election of Members of, consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 5** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 28; withdn., 1290.
- HUDSON BAY AND STRAITS, EXPLORATORY EXPEDITION TO: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 132; in Com. of Sup., 1379, 1607; conc., 1617.
- HUDSON BAY, NAVIGATION: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Watson*) 71; M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Royal*) 203; Deb. (*Mr. Dawson*) 204; (*Mr. Watson*) 205; (*Mr. Casey*) 206; (*Mr. Orton*) 206; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 207; (*Mr. Blake*) 207; Com. appointed, 208.
- HUGHES, D. J. (COUNTY JUDGE OF ELGIN) CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Wilson*) 59; remarks, 967; Ques., 1109; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.
- HUNTER'S ISLAND, LAND OR TIMBER SALES: Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 965; (*Mr. Bain*) 1054.
- Huron and Erie Ry. Co.'s B. No. 85** (*Mr. Smyth*). 1°\*, 260; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 979. (47 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- HURON, SOUTH: Announcement of Vacancy in Representation (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- HURON, WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
- HUTCHINSON, GEO., ALLOWANCE TO: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.
- Ice, unguarded and exposed Openings, &c., Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 97 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 457.
- IMMIGRANTS, APPLICATION FOR SERVICES OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 510.
- IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN ONT. IN THE YEARS 1879 to 1883, RESPECTIVELY: M. for Ret.\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
- IMMIGRATION AGENTS, NUMBER, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.
- IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION: Select Standing Com. on, 31.
- IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1404-1422, 1602; conc., 1464.
- IMMIGRATION, REPS. OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER ON: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
- IMMIGRATION: Res. in Amt. to Com. Sup. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 1063; Deb. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1071; (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1074; (*Mr. Curran*) 1077; (*Mr. Blake*) 1078; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1084; (*Mr. Charlton*) 1066; neg. (Y. 50, N. 101) 1088.
- IMMIGRATION TO MAN. AND THE N. W., AGREEMENTS BETWEEN GOVT. AND C. P. R.: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 83.
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF WHEAT, FLOUR, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.
- IMPORTS, SUMMARY STMT. OF: M. for Ret.\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
- IMPROVEMENT FUND, MONEY DUE TOWNSHIP OF WALLACE: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 200.
- IMPROVEMENT FUND, LAND, ONTARIO: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1215.
- Incest, Punishment of (Criminal Law Amt) B. No. 2** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 27; 2° m., 79 2°, 92; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 97; M. for Com. of W., 819.
- Independence of Parliament Act B. No. 111** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). M. to introd., 624; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 101) 624; 1°\*, 625; 2° m., 844; deb. rsmd., 861; 2° agreed to (Y. 105, N. 56) 878; ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec. on a div., 878; B. in Com. of W., 1423; 3° m., 1446; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1466; neg. (Y. 58, N. 117) 1448; Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*) neg. on same div., 1449; 3° on same div. reversed, 1449. (47 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT B 111: Deb. on M. for 2° (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 844; (*Mr. Girouard*) 850; (*Mr. Lister*) 853; (*Mr. Mills*) 855, 861; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 863; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 865; (*Mr. Beaty*) 865; (*Mr. Davies*) 868; (*Mr. Chapleau*) 872; (*Mr. O'Brien*) 874; (*Mr. Weldon*) 875; (*Mr. Brecken*) 876; agreed to (Y. 105, N. 56) 878.
- Indian Act, 1880, further Act Amt. B. 87** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 260; 2°, 1063; in Com., 1397, 1422; 3°, 1422; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1653. (47 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- INDIAN HARBOUR AND NEW HARBOUR, N. S.: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.

## INDIANS :

- Agent at Penetanguishine: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 31; Parry Sound, 1548.
- Agent's Office, Toronto, Closing of: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cook*) 269; deb. rsmd., 294.
- Dept. of: in Com. of Sup., 840, 1336, 1467, 1474.
- Deptl. Rep. presented, 68.
- In Com. of Sup., 1263-1269, 1372, 1673, 1608; conc., 1450, 1610.
- Instruction Farms, Respecting: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 59.
- Islands in Lake Ont.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
- Metlakatla and Fort Simpson, B. C., Troubles at: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.
- Reserves, Fort William, Timber Licenses: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
- Self Government, Conferring Municipal Powers on, B. No. 22** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 67; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 538; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 539; 3<sup>o</sup>, 625. (47 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- Supplies for Man. and N. W. T., Tenders and Advertisements: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
- Troubles in B. C.: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.
- Wyandottes, Distribution of Moneys to: Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 966; Claims to Pajot Farm: M. for Ret.\* 1201.
- Indictable Offences Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 98** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 457.
- INLAND REVENUE ACT, NON-ENFORCEMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 85.
- INLAND REVENUE, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 841, 1335.
- INLAND REVENUE, RESIGNATION OF MINISTER: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 505; on correction, 513; Explanations asked, 525.
- INLAND REVENUE RETS AND STATISTICS: presented, 27.
- INLAND REVENUE WAREHOUSE AT ST. JOHN, N.B.: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1214.
- INLAND TRANSPORT: Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2.
- Insolvent Banks, Ins. and Loan Co.'s, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 145** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>\* —; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1645. (47 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- Insolvent Debtors' Assets, Distribution of, B. No. 71** (*Mr. Curran*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 162.
- Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. No. 79** (*Mr. Beaty*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 198.
- Inspection Act, General, further Act Amt. B. No. 128** (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop. and in Com., 1055; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1056; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 1394; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1422. (47 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- INSPECTION OF BANK RETURNS: Ques. (*Mr. Massue*) 44, 1444.
- Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Acts Amt. B. No. 108** (*Mr. Costigan*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 598; Res. in Com., 1055; 2<sup>o</sup> of B., 1056; in Com., 1129; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1131. (47 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- INSPECTION OF NEWFOUNDLAND HERRING: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.

- INSPECTION OF P. E. I. STEAMBOATS: M. for Papers (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
- INSPECTION OF VESSELS ON LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 606.
- Insurance Act, 1877, Consolidated, modification of Application of B. No. 118** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 764; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 765.
- INSURANCE COMPANIES. See respective headings.
- ISLANDS LEASED IN LAKE ONT.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
- INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
- Accommodation at St. John: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1344.
- Award of Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 1628.
- Casualties, with loss of Life, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 79.
- Claims arising out of Construction: in Com. of Sup., 1628.
- Claims for Losses: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 655.
- Coal, carried, Tonnage, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 65.
- Commissioners, Board of, Matters referred: M. for O. C., &c.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.
- Commissioners appointed to investigate Claims, &c.: M. for O. C.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
- Commissioners, Board of, number of Sittings, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.
- Construction Account: in Com. of Sup., 1345.
- Dalhousie Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1344.
- Eastern Extension, Claim of N. B.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 736.
- Employés on Intercol. Ry. and P. E. I. Ry.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Davies*) 298.
- Falconer, James, land damages: in Com. of Sup., 1346.
- Ferguson, Wm., purchase of land: in Com. of Sup., 1347.
- Ferry or Bridge at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.
- Freight Charges: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Innes*) 807.
- Freight Charges: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Innes*) 807.
- Hadlow and Rivière du Loup, Sales of Buildings between, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Biondeau*) 624.
- Halifax St. Ry. Co. vs. The Queen: in Com. of Sup., 1345.
- Halifax Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1344.
- MacDonell, Alex., Award of Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 1346.
- Miscellaneous: in Com. of Sup., 1050.
- New Brunswick Govt., Refund to: in Com. of Sup., 1627.
- Nova Scotia, Ry. matters in, Cor. between Local Govt. and Dept. of Rys. and Canals: M. for copies\* (*Mr. McDonald*) 65.
- Office at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.
- Officials, in service of Govt., Salaries, &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 298; Names, &c.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Landry Montmagny*) 303.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Continued.*

- Passes granted from Jan. 1874 to Jan. 1884: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Montplaisir*) 1201.
- Pullman Car and Express Co.'s Agreements: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Weldon*) 77.
- Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Right of Way over St. Charles Branch: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230.
- Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1256; conc., 1449.
- Revenue and Expenditure for six months ending 1883: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.
- Rivière du Loup and Moncton, Mileage between, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 623.
- Rivière du Loup Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1344.
- Rochette, Fabien, for land: in Com. of Sup., 1345.
- Rolling Stock purchased, and built in Govt. Workshops: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.
- St. Charles Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1345.
- St. Charles Branch: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230; Ques., 260.
- Tariff between Quebec and St. Charles: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.
- INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES EXHIBITION, REPS OF COMMISSIONERS: M. for copies (*Mr. Fortin*) 80.
- INTERNATIONAL FISHERY EXHIBITION: Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2; in Com. of Sup., 1369; Outstanding Claims: in Com. of Sup., 1374.
- INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY EXHIBITION AT EDINBURGH: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.
- International Railway Co.'s B. No. 50 (*Mr. Hall*). 1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 580. (47 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- INTERIOR, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 838, 1466.
- INTERIOR DEPT.: Rep. presented, 844.
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS:
- Amt. B. No. 102 (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*). 1°\*, 504.
- Amt. B. No. 143 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1422; in Com., 1476; 1°\* of B, 1478; 2° and M. for Com., 1595; in Com., 1597; 3° m., 1636; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. McCraney*) agreed to (Y. 75, N. 62) 1636; Amt. (*Mr. Girouard*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 88) 1636; recom., 1637; 3°\*, 1640; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1656. (47 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- Commissioners under Act: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 458.
- Expenditure in putting Act into operation: in Com. of Sup., 1382; conc., 1453.
- Imports, Manufactured and Entered for Consumption, Customs and Excise Duties: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 67.
- Inspectors, Payment of: Ques. (*Mr. Irvine*) 337.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Cor. between Govt. and Local Govts.: M. for copies (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.
- Liquor Licenses and Permits in N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.
- N. W. T., Importation into: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.
- P. E. I., Certificates granted by Medical men under

INTOXICATING LIQUORS—*Continued.*

- Canada Temperance Act: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.
- Privy Council, Judicial Com., Judgment *re* Hodge against The Queen: M. for copy (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- Repeal B. No. 17 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 57.
- Repeal B. No. 25 (*Mr. Houde*). 1°\*, 71.
- Shorthand Writers' Notes: Hodge vs. Queen and Russell vs. Queen: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- Supreme Court Judgments *re* regulation of Sale: M. for copy (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- [See "Liquor and License."]
- IRON, BOUNTY TO MANUFACTURERS OF: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 70.
- IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. Co., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1496.
- ISLE-AUX-NOIX, COMPLETION OF WORKS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 966.
- JACK HEAD RIVER TIMBER LIMITS: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.
- JACQUES CARTIER UNION RY. JUNCTION AND ST. MARTIN'S JUNCTION, RY. AND BRIDGE BETWEEN, SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.
- JACQUES, JAS. H., APPOINTMENT OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.
- James' Bay and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co. B. No. 31 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 715. (47 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- James' Bay, Perth and Gananoque Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 58 (*Mr. Taylor*). 1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 603. (47 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- "JANE HURLBURT," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- "JANE MILLER," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- JEMSEG, N.B., DREDGING AT: M. for Rep. (*Mr. King*) 235.
- "JOSEPHINE KIDD," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- Judge, Puisne, for Court of Queen's Bench, Manitoba, Salary, &c. B. No. 146 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1422; 1°\* of B, 1549; 2° and in Com., 1622; recom. and 3°\*, 1627. (47 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- JUDGES, EQUALIZATION OF SALARIES OF: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 40.
- JUDGES, SUPREME AND COUNTY COURT, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 994.
- JUDICIAL SALARIES, RE-ADJUSTMENT OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Vail*) 58; Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Missisquoi*) 1387.
- JUSTICE, DEPARTMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 883.
- JUSTICE, MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 994.
- Justices of the Peace out of Session and Indictable Offences B. No. 98 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 457.
- Justices of the Peace out of Sessions, Summary Convictions, &c., B. No. 137 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1386; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1618. (47 *Vic.*, c. 43.)

- Juvenile Offenders, Reformatory at Halifax for, B. No. 141** (*Sir John A. Macdonaald*). 1°\* —; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1621. (47 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- KAZUABAZUA AND LE DESERT RY. SUBSIDY**: prop Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1499.
- KAULBACH, Mr. C. E.**: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- KEEFLEE, Mr. T. T.**: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1.
- KENT (N.B.)**: Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- KENT (ONT.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION**: Judge's Rep., 1; Election and return of Member, 198; introduced, 200.
- KEEWATIN DISTRICT, EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT IN**: in Com. of Sup., 1302.
- KIMBER, RENÉ EDOUARD**. See "Black Rod."
- KING, Mr. Justice**: Rep. on Albert Controverted Election, 1.
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B No. 68** (*Mr. Gunn*). 1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 568. (47 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO**: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY**: in Com. of Sup., 998.
- KNIGHT, Mr.**, APPOINTMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 834.
- LABOURERS, PAYMENT OF, P.E.I. RY.**: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 965.
- LABOUR TRADES COUNCIL AND FACTORY BILL**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
- LACHINE CANAL, CONTRACT FOR NEW BASINS**: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.
- LACHINE CANAL**: in Com. of Sup., 1050.
- LACHINE CANAL, JURISDICTION OF WHARFINGERS ON**: Ques. (*Mr. Auger*) 1387.
- Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 31** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 715. (47 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- LAKE ONTARIO, ISLANDS LEASED IN**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
- LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR, INSPECTION OF VESSELS ON**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 606; Deb. (*Mr. McNeill*) 607; (*Mr. Sproule*) 608; (*Mr. O'Brien*) 608; (*Messrs. Allen, Lister, McCallum and Stairs*) 609; (*Messrs. Guillet, Paint and Davies*) 610; (*Mr. McLelan*) 611; (*Messrs. Brecken and Dawson*) 613.
- LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR MAIL SUBSIDY**: in Com. of Sup., 1298; conc., 1452.
- LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR, REGION NORTH OF**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.
- LAKE SIMON AND LE DESERT RY. SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1503.
- LAND AGENT FOR ASSINIBOIA AND CALGARY**: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27.
- LAND AND TOWN RESERVES**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- Land Carriers B. No. 4** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 27.
- LAND COMPANIES**. See respective headings.
- LAND CLAIMS, SETTLEMENT OF**: in Com. of Sup., 1385.
- LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND, ONT.**: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1215.
- LAND LEASES, PASTURE, GRANTED IN 1883**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 73.
- LAND REGULATIONS**: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- LAND SALES IN THE N. W.**: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Livingstone*) 523.
- LAND SOLD IN 1883, AND PRICE PER ACRE**: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- LAND SURVEYED IN MAN. AND N. W. T. IN 1883**: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- Land Titles, Transfer of, in Territories of Canada, B. No. 16** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 43.
- LANDS ENTERED AS HOMESTEADS IN 1883**: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- Lands, Settlement of Claims to, in Manitoba, by occupancy, B. No. 150.** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1586; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1640. (47 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- LANDS, TIMBERED, SOLD IN BOW RIVER COUNTRY**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.
- LANDRY, Mr. P. A.**: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- LANSLOWNE, POST OFFICE AT**: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 336.
- LAVALLIÈRE BAY, EXPLORATIONS**: M. for Reps.\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
- LAVOIE, GEO., CLAIM OF**: Ques. (*Mr. Billy*) 797.
- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. No. 3** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 27; 2 m., 93; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Tupper*) 93; neg. (Y. 53, N. 100) 97; 2°, 97; ref. to Sel. Com. on a div., 98; M. for Com. of W., 271; in Com., 285, 669; Amt. that Com. rise (*Mr. Bossé*) agreed to, 671; M. to restore to Order Paper, 705; neg. (Y. 63, N. 87) 708.
- LAW OF EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES, B. 3**: on M. for Com., Deb. (*Mr. Tupper*) 271; (*Mr. Landry, Kent*) 274; (*Mr. Lister*) 275; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 277; (*Mr. Bossé*) 278; (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) 279; (*Mr. Blake*) 279; (*Mr. Weldon*) 280; (*Mr. Chapleau*) 281; (*Mr. Davies*) 283; (*Mr. Laurier*) 283; (*Sir John A Macdonald*) 284.
- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases further Act Amt. B. No. 96** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 457.
- LEAMINGTON, ERECTION OF P. O. AT**: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.
- LEAMINGTON HARBOUR**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 506.
- LECLERC, MOISE, CLAIM OF**: M. for copy\* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88.
- 'LE COURIER DE ST. HYACINTHE,' PAYMENTS TO, UNDER GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS**: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 67.
- LEGAL ADVISERS, PAYMENT TO**: conc., 1617.
- LEGISLATION**: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1009, 1339, 1475, 1602, 1608, 1627; conc., 1440, 1459, 1611.
- LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION**: Judge's Rep., 1.
- LETTER POSTAGE, TWO CENT**: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.

- LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION IN: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.
- LETTER POSTAGE RATES, AMT. OF EXISTING LAW: Ques. (*Mr. Thompson*) 89.
- LÉVIS: Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- LÉVIS, EMIGRANT BUILDING AND QUARANTINE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.
- Lévis Graving Dock, Further advance, B. No. 149 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1581; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1618. (47 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: Rep. of Librarian presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 3; M. for Joint Com., 31; Ms. (*Mr. Scriver*) to conc. in First Rep., 964, 1167; Second Rep., 1240; Third Rep. presented, 1443; M. to conc. in, 1476; in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1602.
- LICENSE ACT, 1883, POLICE ORGANIZATION UNDER: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 505.
- LICENSE COMMISSIONERS, QUE., FURNISHING OF BLANK FORMS, &c.: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 966.
- LICENSE LAW, REPEAL OF THE. See Bs. Nos. 17, 25, 102 and 143; also "Intoxicating Liquors."
- LICENSES, TIMBER, CANCELLATION OF, ON INDIAN RESERVES: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
- LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS' OATHS: M. for copies (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79.
- LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS OF QUEBEC, Commissions, Oaths, &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Casgrain*) 522.
- LIFE ANNUITIES, SALE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Hall*) 199.
- LIFE-BOAT AT WELLINGTON, COST OF: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 603.
- LIFE-SAVING STATION AND CREW AT PORT ROWAN: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
- LIFE-SAVING STATIONS, LIFE BOATS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Platt*) 1199; in Com. of Sup., 1229.
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE, AGENCIES, RENTS AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1232.
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1232-1234, 1369; conc., 1443.
- LIGHTHOUSE ON GOOSE ISLAND: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 655.
- LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1232.
- LIGHTHOUSES AND FOG-ALARMS, CONSTRUCTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1233; conc., 1443.
- LIGHTS, FOG-WHISTLES, BUOYS AND BEACONS, &c., MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1233, 1369.
- LIGHTS NORTH OF ISLAND OF ORLEANS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 218.
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND PROV. GOVTS.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, COMMISSIONERS UNDER: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 458.
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, EXPENDITURE IN PUTTING ACT INTO OPERATION: in Com. of Sup., 1382; conc., 1453.
- LIQUOR LICENSE INSPECTORS, PAYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Irvine*) 337.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal B. No. 17 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 57.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Repeal B. No. 25 (*Mr. Houde*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 71.
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, REPEAL: prop. Res. (*Mr. Houde*) 932; Deb. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 936; Amt., 937; (*Mr. Amyot*) 938; (*Mr. Fleming*) 940; (*Mr. Bossé*) 943; (*Mr. Laurier*) 944; (*Mr. Girouard*) 947; (*Mr. Davies*) 948; *Mr. Macmaster*) 953; (*Mr. Weldon*) 958; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) neg. on a div., 963; Amt. agreed to (Y. 117, N. 63) 963.
- Liquor License Act, 1888, Amt. B. No. 102 (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 504.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. No. 143. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1422; in Com., 1476; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1478; 2<sup>o</sup> and M. for Com., 1595; in Com., 1597; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1636; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. McCraney*) agreed to (Y. 75, N. 62) 1636; Amt. (*Mr. Girouard*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 88) 1636; recom., 1637; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1640; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1656. (47 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- LIQUOR LICENSES AND PERMITS IN THE N.W.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.
- LISLOIS, C. J., CLAIM OF, BEFORE DOMINION ARBITRATORS: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260, 965.
- Live Stock Insurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 55 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 141; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 199; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 665. (47 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- LIVERPOOL OR LONDON AND ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 1301.
- LOANS AUTHORIZED:  
Canadian Pacific Railway B. 101.  
Lévis Graving Dock B. 149.  
Manitoba Public Schools B. 156.  
Quebec Tidal Dock B. 148.  
Redemption of Small Loans B. 156.
- LOAN COMPANIES. See respective headings.
- Loan, Moneys required for the Public Service, authorization B. No. 156 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1610; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1645. (47 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- LOAN, PROPOSED CANADIAN, OF \$4,000,000, DEPARTMENTAL ORDERS AND ADVERTISEMENTS: M. for copies\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.
- LOCKPORT HARBOUR, AUTOMATIC BUOY IN: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603.
- LOGS AND LUMBER, MEASUREMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Hall*) 337.
- London Life Ins. Co. B. No. 139 (*Mr. Beatty*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1386; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1465; M. for Com., 1515; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 1516. (47 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- LONG POINT LIGHTHOUSE, REPAIRS ON: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.
- LOTBINIÈRE, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF AT: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1054.
- LOTTERY FIRM AT ST. STEPHEN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.
- Loyal Orange Association of British America Incorp. B. No. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1<sup>o</sup> on a div., 304; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 897; neg. (Y. 68, N. 105) 931. [For deb. see "Orange Association."]

- LUARD, MAJOR-GENERAL, COMPLAINTS AGAINST:** M. for copies, 621; (*Mr. Mulock*) 738; Deb. (*Mr. Wright*) 740; (*Mr. Haggart*) 743; (*Mr. Macmaster*) 745; (*Mr. Robertson, Hastings*) 748; (*Mr. Coursol*) 749; (*Mr. Guillet*) 750; (*Messrs. Massue, Landry, Montmagny, and O'Brien*) 751; (*Messrs. Williams and Caron*) 753; (*Mr. Casey*) 754; (*Messrs. Chapleau, Sir Richard Cartwright and Sir John A. Macdonald*) 757; (*Messrs. Hesson and Woodworth*) 759; (*Messrs. McNeill and Ouimet*) 760; (*Mr. Vail*) 761; reply (*Mr. Mulock*) 761.
- LUNENBURG CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judge's Rep., 1.
- MACDONALD, HON. SIR JOHN A.:** Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition *re* Lennox Electoral District, 1.
- MACDONELL & Co., ALEX., AWARD OF INTERCOL. RY. CLAIMS COMMISSIONERS:** in Com. of Sup., 1346.
- MACDONELL, J. A.:** Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 1355.
- MACLEAN, ROGER & Co., AWARD OF REFEREES:** in Com. of Sup., 1607.
- MCCALLUM, W. A., MEMORIAL OF:** M. for copy\* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.
- MCCOLLUM, E., POSTMASTER AT DUART:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 509; Complaints against appointment: M. for Pet.,\* 1201.
- MCCOURT, DANIEL, DISMISSAL OF:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 516.
- MCELHINNEY, CAPT. See "Inspection of P. E. I. Steam-boats."**
- MCLAUGHLIN, GEO. E., GRATUITY TO FAMILY OF:** In Com. of Sup., 1373.
- MOMILLAN, MR. JOHN:** Notification of Resignation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- MAGDALEN ISLAND:** in Com. of Sup., 1298.
- MAIL SERVICE IN B. C.:** Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605; Tenders, &c.\* (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1126.
- MAIL SERVICE IN THE COUNTY OF LOTBINIÈRE:** M. for Papers, &c. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.
- MAIL SERVICE NORTH OF PALMERSTON:** Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 89.
- MAIL SERVICE, SALARIES AND MISCELLANEOUS:** in Com. of Sup., 1319, 1383; conc., 1458.
- MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS:** in Com. of Sup., 1298-1301; conc., 1452, 1453.
- MANITOBA:**
- Dominion Lands Act, Examiner under, at Brandon: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland*) 1109.
  - Extension of Boundaries: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
  - Extra Militia Force for: in Com. of Sup., 1343.
  - Fairford River Improvements: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Orton*) 208.
- Felonies and Misdemeanours, Extension of Law to, B. No. 133** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1321; 2° and in Com., 1581; 3°\*, 1583. (47 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- Indians: Annuities, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 1269, 1373; conc., 1450, 1610.
- Jack Head River Timber Limits:** M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.
- MANITOBA—Continued.**
- Lands—Settlement of Claims by Occupancy, B. No. 150** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1586; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1640. (47 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 1000, 1338.
- Persons leaving and entering for year: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
- Public Schools, Aid to, B. No. 36** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 43; in Com., 68; 1°\* of B., 85; 2°\*, and in Com., 542; 3°\*, 625. (47 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- Robertson John, Claims of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 614.
- Subsidies to: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
- [See "DOMINION LANDS," "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]
- Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co. of Can. Acts Amt. B. No. 64** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 271; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- Manitoba South-Western Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 75** (*Mr. Ross*). 1°\*, 198; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 810. (47 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- "MANITOULIN," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION AND FACTORY BILL:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 82.
- MAP SHOWING LOCATION OF C. P. R.:** M. for copy. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
- Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, B. No. 140** (*Mr. McLelan*). 1°\*, 1386; 2° and in Com., 1602; 3° m., 1609; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 54, N. 100) 1609; 3° on same div. reversed, 1609. (47 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- MARINE AND FISHERIES:** Rep. presented, 260.
- MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEPT. OF:** in Com. of Sup., 842, 1467.
- MARINE:**
- Automatic Buoy in Lockport Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 604.
  - Certificates to Masters and Mates, Refusal of Board of Examiners to grant: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1444.
  - Colchester Reef Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86, 199.
  - Corbett, John, employment of: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 199.
  - Glendon, Steamer to replace: in Com. of Sup., 1227.
  - Goose Island Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 655.
  - Government Steamers. See "DOMINION."
  - Harbours and Rivers: in Com. of Sup., 1605.
  - Hudson Bay, Expedition to: in Com. of Sup., 1379, 1607; conc., 1617. See "Hudson Bay."
  - Lakes Huron and Superior, Inspection of Vessels: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 606.
  - Life-boats, Stations, Life-preservers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1229.
  - Life-saving Stations, Life-boats, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Platt*) 1199.

**MARINE—Continued.**

- Lights, Fog Whistles, Buoys and Beacons, &c., maintenance and repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1233, 1369.
- Lights north of Island of Orleans: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 218.
- Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction of: in Com. of Sup., 1233; conc., 1443.
- Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 1232, 1369; conc., 1443.
- Masters' and Mates' Certificates, Non-enforcement of Act: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 85. See "Masters and Mates."
- Meteorological Observations: in Com. of Sup., 1255.
- Navigation, School of, at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 141; M. for Com. (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.
- Observatories: in Com. of Sup., 1254.
- Pilots for and above Quebec, Acts respecting: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 655.
- Port Rowan Life-saving Station: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
- P.E.I. Steamboats, Inspection of: M. for Papers (*Mr. Davies*) 59; Ques., 460.
- Sick and Distressed Mariners' Act Amt.: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 269; Exemption of Fishing Vessels from payment to Fund: Ques. (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 199.
- Signal Stations: in Com. of Sup., 1234.
- Survey of Georgian Bay, Steamer for: in Com. of Sup., 1374.
- Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior: in Com. of Sup., 1303.
- Water and River Police: in Com. of Sup., 1232, 1369.
- Weller's Bay, Ont., Range Lights: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 336.
- Wellington, Life-boat at, Cost of: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 603.
- Marine, Ocean Mutual, Insurance Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 20** (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- Mariners, Sick and Distressed, Relief of, B. No. 129** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop. and 1°\* of B., 1126; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1360. (47 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- Maritime Bank of Dom. of Can. Capital Stock reduction B. No. 66** (*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland*). 1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 1214. (47 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- MARITIME COURT FOR CANADA**: Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 965.
- Maritime Court of Ontario (extension of jurisdiction) B. No. 70** (*Mr. Allen*). 1°\*, 162; 2° m., 461; deb. adjd., 462.
- Masters and Mates, Certificates of, Act Amt. B. No. 116** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°\* of B., 763; 2°, 1057; in Com., 1131; 3°\*, 1175. (47 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- MASTERS AND MATES, CERTIFICATES TO, NON-ENFORCEMENT OF ACT**: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 85; Certificates: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 606; Examination of: in Com. of Sup., 1229,

- MECHANICAL ARTS AND AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES, ESSAYS** ON: M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.
- MEDICAL CERTIFICATES GRANTED IN P. E. I. UNDER TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878**: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.
- MEDICINE HAT AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE**: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506.
- Medicine Hat, Ry. from, B. No. 33** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°, 84; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 736. (47 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- MEGANTIC CONTROVERTED ELECTION**: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1321.
- MELGUND, LORD**. See "Gov. Gen.'s Sec."
- MEMBERS INTRODUCED**, 1, 27, 200, 335.
- MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY**: Address, Reply to, in answer to Speech, 304. Agreement with B. C., 27. Estimates, The, for 1884-85, 145; Suppl., 1883-84, 1240; 1884-85, 1439; Further Suppl., 1884-85, 1576. Guarantee by Govt. to C. P. R., 56.
- METAPEDIAC AND PASPEBIAC RY. SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.
- METLAKATLA, B. C., INDIAN TROUBLES**: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.
- METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 1254.
- METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, ST. JOHN AND TORONTO**: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.
- Methodist Churches Union B. No. 11** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 665. (47 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- METHODIST CHURCH UNION, PETS. AGAINST**: M. to read and receive (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*) 366.
- METHOT, Mr., M. P.**: Resignation of Seat announced, 1108.
- MIALI, E., COMMISSIONER OF STANDARDS, ALLOWANCE**: in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- MICHAUD AND DUMAIS, SKIFFINGTON vs.**: M. for copies of Reps. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.
- MICHAUD, C., REP. ON EXPLORATION OF RIVER ST. FRANCIS**: M. for copy (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
- MIDDLESEX, WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION**: Judge's Rep. 1; Member introduced, 27.
- MILE BELT, WITHDRAWAL OF LANDS FROM HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION**: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
- MILITIA**:  
A, B, and C Batteries, Officers and men, &c.: M. for Ret. *Mr. (Cameron, Middlesex)* 808; in Com. of Sup., 1164.  
Ammunition and Clothing: in Com. of Sup., 1019-1022, 1343.  
Armouries, Public: in Com. of Sup., 1095, 1343, 1602.  
Artillery, Competition at Shoeburyness: in Com. of Sup., 1166.  
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1018.  
Branch and District Staff: in Com. of Sup., 1017.  
Clothing, Tenders for Manufacture of: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Vail*) 1201.  
Construction and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1343.

**MILITIA—Continued.**

- Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1343.  
 Deptl. Rep. presented, 98.  
 Dept. of : in Com. of Sup., 833, 1334 ; conc., 1440.  
 Dominion Rifle Association : in Com. of Sup., 1602.  
 Drill Instruction : in Com. of Sup., 1096.  
 Drill Pay, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1098.  
 Drill Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1160.
- Fortifications and Military Buildings B. No. 114** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 965 ; 2<sup>o</sup> 1061 ; in Com., 1063 ; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1129. (47 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- Infantry Schools : in Com. of Sup., 1366.  
 Luard, Major-General, Complaints against: M. for copies, &c. (*Mr. Mulock*) 295 ; M. withdn., 506 ; M. for copies, &c., 621, 738.  
 Manitoba, Increase of Force in : in Com. of Sup., 1343.  
 Military Properties, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1160 ; Construction and Repairs, 1162, 1602 ; conc., 1440.  
 Moccasins, Purchase of: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 624.  
 Ordnance, Rifled, Improved : in Com. of Sup., 1166.  
 Ottawa Rifle Range : in Com. of Sup., 1602.  
 Regulations and Orders, Printing: in Com. of Sup., 1343.  
 Returns, Enquiries respecting (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 1127.  
 Rifle Associations, B. C., Further aid to: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.  
 Russian Leather Permeator : in Com. of Sup., 1165.  
 School of Gunnery, &c., B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.  
 Stores : in Com. of Sup., 1022.  
 Tents, Manufacture of: Ques. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 505 ; M. for Cor.,\* 624.  
 Veterans of 1812 : in Com. of Sup., 1016.  
 Volunteers of 1837 : Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 57.
- MILLS, Hon. D.:** Return of, on Judgment of Supreme Court, 524.
- MINERAL LANDS, SALE OF, &c.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- MINING LICENSES IN THE N. W., BAKER CREEK:** Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 44.
- MINISTERIAL CHANGES:** Explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 28, 525.
- MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AS HIGH COMMISSIONER:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
- MINISTER OF RYS., APPOINTMENT OF, AS HIGH COMMISSIONER:** Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Mills*) 1039 ; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1042 ; (*Mr. Blake*) 1043 ; neg. (Y. 51, N. 95) 1046.
- MINISTER OF RYS. AND THE HIGH COMMISSIONERSHIP:** Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Blake*) 542 ; Res., 547 ; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 547 ; Amt. to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 549 ; Deb. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 549 ; (*Mr. Mills*) 558 ; (*Mr. Chapleau*) 554 ; (*Mr. Casey*) 556 ;

- MINISNER OF RYS. AND THE HIGH COMMISSIONERSHIP—Con.**  
 (*Mr. Woodworth*) 558 ; reply (*Mr. Blake*) 561 ; Amt. agreed to (Y. 122, N. 57) 566.
- MINOR REVENUES, DOMINION LANDS:** in Com. of Sup., 1318.
- MIRAMICHI VALLEY RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445 ; in Com., 1503-1507.
- MISCELLANEOUS:** in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1203, 1301-1310, 1373-1381, 1607, 1617 ; conc., 1464, 1611, 1617.
- MISCELLANEOUS JUSTICE:** in Com. of Sup., 994.
- MISCELLANEOUS WORKS, INTERCOL. RY., NOT PROVIDED FOR:** in Com. of Sup., 1050.
- MISSION SCHOOL AT FORT WILLIAM:** in Com. of Sup., 1608.
- MISSISSIPPI AND KENFREW RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444 ; in Com., 1508.
- MOBERLY, FRANK, MEMORIAL OF:** M. for copy\* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.
- MOCCASINS, PURCHASE OF, BY MILITIA DEPT.:** M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 624.
- MONEY ORDER REGULATIONS:** M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 613.
- MONEYS PAID BY DOM. TO LOCAL GOVT. OF ONT.:** M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Farrow*) 1200.
- MONTCALM CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judgment of Supreme Court, 337.
- Montreal and European Short Line Ry. Co. B. No. 89** (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 285 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 504 ; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 810. ('7 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- Montreal and Quebec Pilots Incorp. B. No. 18** (*Mr. Amyot*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 67 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 89 ; preamble not proven.
- MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO:** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445 ; in Com., 1503.
- MONTREAL CARNIVAL, ADJOURNMENT FOR:** Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 83.
- MONTREAL DRILL SHED, CONTRACT FOR REBUILDING:** Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966 ; M. for copies\*, 1201.
- MONTREAL, G. T. R. RY. CROSSING IN:** Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 1387.
- MONTREAL POST OFFICE SERVICE:** Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 797.
- MONTREAL TO ST. JOHN, HALIFAY AND SYDNEY RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444 ; in Com., 1486-1490.
- MOOSE JAW, TOWN RESERVE:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- MORPETH HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS:** Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 132 ; (*Mr. Casey*) 1054.
- MORRISTOWN, N.S., PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT:** M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 140.
- MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS, ERECTION OF:** in Com. of Sup., 1203, 1378.
- MOUNTED POLICE FOR B. C.:** Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.
- MOUNTED POLICE SUPPLIES AND TRANSPORT, TENDERS, &c.:** M. for copies\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
- MOUSSEAU, Hon. J. A., APPOINTMENT OF, TO THE BENCH:** M. (*Mr. Laurier*) 133 ; Deb. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 135 ; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 137 ; (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 137 ; (*Mr. Girouard*) 139 ; reply (*Mr. Laurier*) 139 ; neg. (Y. 47, N. 89) 140.

- MOWAT, HON. OLIVER, PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1379.
- Municipal Self Government for Indians of Canada B. No. 22.** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 67; 2° m., 538; 2° and in Com., 539; 3°, 625. (47 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- MUTUAL BENEFIT INS. SOCIETIES: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 337.
- MUTUAL MARINE INS. CO.'S. See respective headings.
- NAVAL STATION AT ESQUIMALT, B. C.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 515.
- NAVAL BRIGADE AND TORPEDO CORPS, B.C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.
- NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1502.
- NAPANEE, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for Papers and Cor. (*Mr. Allison, Lennox*) withdn., 208.
- Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s In-corp. Act Amt. Bill No. 80** (*Mr. Bell*). 1°\*, 231; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 810; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1176. (47 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- "NAPOLEON III." See "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."
- NAVIGATION COMPANIES. See respective headings.
- NAVIGATION, SCHOOL OF, AT QUEBEC: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.
- Nederlandsch-Americansche Land Maalschap-pij B. No. 30** (*Mr. Abbott*). 1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 665. (47 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- NELSON RIVER, OBSTRUCTION IN: M. for Reprs. (*Mr. Orton*) 208.
- NEW BRUNSWICK:**
- Caraquet and Shippigan Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1510.
- Carleton Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 966.
- Eastern Extension, Intercol. Ry.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 736.
- Fredericton and Miramichi River Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1503.
- Grand Southern Ry., Conveyance of Mails: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.
- Hopewell and Alma Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.
- Inland Revenue Warehouse at St. John: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1212.
- Intercol. Ry. between Rivière du Loup and Moncton, Cost of: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 623.
- Intercol. Ry. See general heading.
- Jemseg, Dredging at: M. for copies of Rep. (*Mr. King*) 295.
- Kearney and Jacques, Messrs. Appointment of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.
- Lottery Firm at St. Stephen: M. for Stmt. of Receipts of P. O. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.
- Mail Service in: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.
- Meteorological Service at St. John, Expenses, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.
- Point Escuminac Breakwater: M. for Papers (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.
- NEW BRUNSWICK—Continued.**
- "Princess Louise." See "DOMINION STEAMERS."
- St. Louis and Richibucto Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444.
- Stone for new Deptl. Building: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 736.
- Sussex and St. John Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1510.
- Swan Creek Surveys: M. for Reprs. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 605.
- U. S. Customs Duties on Hay: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Irvine*) 519.
- Vice-Admiralty Courts, Imp. Despatches respecting: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 65.
- [See "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]
- New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 54** (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*). 1°\*, 141; 2°, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 1035. (47 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- NEW MEMBERS, Return of, 1, 198, 335.
- NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS, DELAY IN TRANSMITTING: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Sproule*) 216.
- NEW HARBOUR AND INDIAN HARBOUR, N.S.: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.
- "NEWFIELD," STEAMER, COST OF WORKING: in Com. of Sup., 1227, 1318; conc., 1458.
- NEWFOUNDLAND, PROHIBITIVE DUTY: Ques. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1214.
- NEWFOUNDLAND, NEGOTIATIONS WITH: Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1653.
- NEWFOUNDLAND HERRING, INSPECTION OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.
- NIAGARA FALLS COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1203.
- Niagara Frontier Bridge Co. In-corp. B. No. 91** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 285; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 1214; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1548. (47 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- NIOOLET, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION: Resignation of Member, 1108.
- Northern and North-Western Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59** (*Mr. Small*). 1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 810. (47 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- "NORTHERN LIGHT," REPORT OF INSPECTORS, &c.: M. for Papers (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
- "NORTHERN LIGHT:" in Com. of Sup., 1227.
- "NORTHERN QUEEN," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- Northern Ry. Co. of Can. B. No. 57** (*Mr. Small*). 1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 1175; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1546. (47 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING CO., INSTRUMENT OF INCORP., &c., AND C. P. R. CLAIMS OF SHAREHOLDERS: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
- NORTH SHORE RY., ST. MARTIN'S TO QUEBEC: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 1388.
- NORTH-WEST GRIEVANCES: Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 766; Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 1138; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1147; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1152; (*Mr. Watson*) 1155; (*Mr. Mills*) 1155; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1156; neg. (Y. 57, N. 116) 1157.

**NORTH WESTERN COAL AND NAVIGATION Co.** See "Medicine Hat Ry."

**North-West Territories Act, 1880, Amt. B. No. 152** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1586; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1651. (47 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

**NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:**

Amt. to Act referred to in Speech from the Throne, 2.  
Administration of Affairs: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.

Administrator for, Appointment of: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.

Bow River Timber Limits, Sale of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.

Council, Members of: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Mills*) 1200.  
Expenses of Govt. in: in Com. of Sup., 1301; conc., 1617.

Government Herd in: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506; Sale of: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.

Gold Mining, Act relating to: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 43; M. for Ret., 512.

Land Sales in: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Livingstone*) 523.

Liquor Licenses and Permits: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.

Mining Licenses on Baker Creek: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 44.

Mounted Police: in Com. of Sup., 1294.

Registration of Deeds, &c.: prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1635.

Sales and Leases of Lands, Coal: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.

Settlers in other Provs.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 49.

Town Site Reservation at Fort MacLeod: M. for O. C., &c.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 624.

[See "DOMINION LANDS," "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

**NOVA SCOTIA:**

**Agreement, B. No. 125** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 825; M. for Com., 878; in Com., 883; conc. in and 1°\* of B., 987; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1131. (47 *Vic.*, c. 5.)

Amero, Roger, Case of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 622.

Antigonish, Public Buildings at, Expenditure on: M. Stmt.\* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 66.

Automatic Buoy in Lockport Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 603.

Bounty to Fishermen, Names, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 67; Ques., 603; Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 655.

Cheticamp Harbour, Dredging: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 967.

Coal Carried on Intercol. Ry. and by Water: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 65.

Coal Imported into the U. S. for Ocean Steamship purposes: M. for copies of Despatches (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

Customs Officials in Inverness: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 462.

**NOVA SCOTIA—Continued.**

Digby County, Fishery Overseer for: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 89.

Eastern Extension Ry.: paragraph in Speech from the Throne, 2.

Goose Island Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 655.

Great American and European Short Line Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 57.

Hearn, James, Superannuation of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Kirk*) 1110.

Ingonish Breakwater, Cor. and Engineer's Reports, &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Campbell, Victoria*) 89.

Morristown, Preventive Officer at: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 140.

**Mutual Marine Insurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 49** (*Mr. Daly*). 1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 665. (47 *Vic.*, c. 92.)

New Harbour and Indian Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.

Ogden, Alfred, Employment of: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 798, 965.

Oyster Pond Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.

Port Mulgrave as a sub-port: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 285.

Railways: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Macdonald, Cape Breton*) 65.

Scott Act in Cumberland: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 736; (*Mr. Tupper*) 1548.

Upper Wood Harbour: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 1199.

[See "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

OATH OR OATHS TAKEN BY GOV. GEN. AND LIEUT.-GOV.: M. for copies.\* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79.

**Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 2; (*pro forma*).

O'BRIEN, JOTHAM, AMOUNT PAID TO: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 623.

OBSERVATORIES: in Com. of Sup., 1254.

OBSTRUCTION, REMOVAL OF, IN NAVIGABLE RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1232.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1227-1232, 1369.

**Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 20** (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 91.)

O'CONNOR, HON. JOHN, SUMS PAID TO: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 70.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON. See Criminal Law Amts.

OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS AND SECRETARIES: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 972.

OFFICIAL INCOMES, TAXATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1054.

OGDEN, ALFRED, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 798; (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 965.

Ogilvie and Bunting, Messrs., as Security for Exchange Bank: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 261, 336.

O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 1549.

OMNIBUS Co.'s. See respective headings.

## ONTARIO :

- Accounts with the Dom. : Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72 ; (*Mr. Hesson*) 73 ; M. for Stmnts.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
- Amherstburg, Public Buildings, Land sold for : M. for Rets.\* (*Mr. Lister*) 83 ; *Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 297.
- Belle River Pier : Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.
- Boundaries between Man. and Ont. : M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
- Britton, Ephraim, Complaints against appointment : M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.
- Colchester Reef Lighthouse : Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86, 199.
- Cornwall and Rapide Plat Canals, Tenders for Enlargement : M. for copies\* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.
- Customs Employés at Windsor : M. for Cor. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.
- Dominion Grange and Farming Legislation : M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1201.
- Duart, Postmaster at : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 509 ; Ques., 1053 ; Complaints against appointment : M. for Ret.,\* 1201.
- Escheat, Queen and Mercer, Shorthand Writers' Notes : M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 74.
- Fishing in Ont. Waters, Regulations : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mulock*) 71 ; Fines under : M. for Stmnt.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 201.
- Frontier Police, South-Western Ont. : Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1054.
- Gravenhurst and Callander Ry. Subsidy : M. for copies of Cor., &c. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40 ; Ques. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 604.
- Goodwin, James, Claim of : Ques. (*Mr. Fleming*) 604 ; M. for Rep.\* (*Mr. Lister*) 1199.
- Harbour in Essex County : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 506.
- Hodge vs. The Queen, Judgment, &c., respecting : M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- Hughes, Judge, Charges against : M. for copies of Pts. (*Mr. Wilson*) 59 ; remarks, 967 ; Ques. 1109 ; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1215.
- Hunter's Island, Land or Timber Sales : Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 965 ; (*Mr. Bain*) 1054.
- Immigrants settled in, from 1879 to 1883 respectively : M. for Ret.\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
- Indian Islands in Lake Ont. : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
- Kingsville Harbour Works : Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86 ; M. for Ret., 216.
- Lake Superior, Region North of : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.
- Land Improvement Fund : Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1215.
- Lansdowne Post Office : Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 336.
- Leamington Post Office : M. for Cor. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.
- Life-saving Stations, Life-boats, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Platt*) 1199.
- Long Point Lighthouse repairs : Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 230.

## ONTARIO—Continued.

- Maritime Court (extension of jurisdiction)**  
**B. No. 70** (*Mr. Allen*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 162 ; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 461 ; deb. adjd., 462.
- Morpeth Harbour Improvements : Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 132 ; (*Mr. Casey*) 1054.
- Ottawa Gas Co., Claims of : Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
- Pajot Farm and Claim of Indian Dept. : M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.
- Palmerston, North of, Mail Service : Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 89.
- Parry Sound P. O., Postal Thefts at : Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1109.
- Pelee Island, Long Point and Rondeau Lighthouses : M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.
- Penetanguishene Indian Agent : Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 31.
- Port Rowan Life-saving Station : M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
- Port Stanley and Port Burwell as Harbours of Refuge : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 519.
- Port Stanley Harbour Revenue : M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Wilson*) 295.
- Provincial Debt to Canada : Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 199.
- Railway Bonuses given by Townships and Prov. Govts. : M. for Stmnt.\* (*Mr. Landerkin*) 1200.
- Rideau Hall, Expenditure on : M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.
- St. Lawrence Canals, Expenditure on : M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.
- St. Thomas, Public Buildings at : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 92.
- St. Vincent, Examination of Baggage at : Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 144.
- Solway, Postmaster at : M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Wells*) 1200.
- Stayner, Postmaster at : Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 1109.
- Thames and Lake Erie Canal : Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 797.
- Volunteers of 1837-38 : M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) 89.
- Waters of, Regulations under Fisheries Act, Prohibiting Fishing : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- Weller's Bay Range Lights : Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 336.
- Wellington, Life-boat at : Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 603.
- Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against : M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
- Windsor Post Office, Sale of Stamps at : Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.
- Wyandotte Indians, Distribution of Moneys to : Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 966.
- Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incomp. Act Amt. B. No. 67** (*Mr. Bergin*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 162 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 271 ; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 603. (47 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. and C. P. R. Co. Lease confirmation B. No. 32** (*Mr. Abbott*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 83 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 173 ; M. for Com., 810 ; objection (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) Ques. of Priv., 810 ; M. to substitute name of *Mr. Haggart* for promoter agreed to, 843 ; in Com., 857 ; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 859 ; Amt. (*Mr. Wallace*) 859 ; neg. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 860 ; B. passed, 886. (47 *Vic.*, c. 54.)

**Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46** (*Mr. Wells*). 1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°, 886; on M. that B. pass, Amt. (*Mr. Wilson*) to recom., 887; neg. on a div. and B. passed, 888; Sen. amts. conc. in, 1281. (47 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1507.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT. See "Parliament."

**Openings in the Ice, Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 97** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 1°\*, 457.

**Orange Association of British America Incorp. B. No. 98** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1° on a div., 304; 2° m., 897; neg. (Y. 68, N. 105) 931.

ORANGE, LOYAL, ASSOCIATION OF BRITISH AMERICA B. 93: Deb. on M. for 2° (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 897; (*Mr. Mills*) 898; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 899; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 902; (*Mr. Blake*) 904; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 919; (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 921; (*Mr. Curran*) 923; (*Mr. Farrow*) 924; (*Mr. Beaty*) 925; (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) 927; (*Mr. Foster*) 927; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 928; (*Mr. Wallace*) 928; (*Mr. Sproule*) 928; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 929.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE, QUESTIONS OF: ORDER:

*Adjournment*. Member cannot allude to a subject in an irregular manner under cover of a M. to adjn. (*Mr. Speaker*) 1545.

*Banking Facilities for Agriculturists B. 105*. On 1°, Ques. by *Mr. Blake* as to initiation of same in Com. of W.: Ans. (*Mr. Speaker*) that Member introduces B. at the risk of having its progress stopped at some subsequent stage, 524. See also "PROCEDURE."

*Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan Res.* Unparliamentary language, 342, 532; correction in deb. (*Mr. Foster*) 353; reference to Member having a seat by the grace of others, 448; flat contradictions in deb. restrained (*Mr. Speaker*) 434; personal explanation re condemnation of conduct of Liberal press (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 491; personal explanations in deb. in Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 493; mover of substantive motion has right of reply (*Mr. Speaker*) 494; allusion to Member as a criminal condemned (*Mr. Speaker*) 532. See also "PROCED."

*Central Ontario Ry. B. 73*. Reference to proceedings of Select Standing Com. objected to (*Mr. Bowell*) 1204. See also "PROCED."

*Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence B. 3*. Member can only speak once, except mover of motion, who has the right of reply (*Mr. Speaker*) 97.

*Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c., B. 6*. Stmt. reflecting on Members withdn., 813.

*Debates, Official Rep.* Accuracy of Rep. challenged (*Mr. Orton*) re quotation from *Regina Leader*: Reference to a past deb. objected to by *Mr. Blake*, 1582; in Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 1583.

*Fishing Bounty*. In Com. of Sup.: Discussion declared out of Order, no subject before Com. on which general question can arise, 1239.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

ORDER—Continued.

*Luard, Major-General, Complaints against*. Accusation of making wrong statements for purpose of deb. contradicted (*Mr. Casey*) 757; Documents read without placing same on Table, 747.

*Minister of Rys. and the High Commissionership*. Members speaking disrespectfully of each other: Rule read (*Mr. Speaker*) 561; personal explanation can be made after Member has finished his speech, 561.

*North-West Grievances*. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.: Reference to a Member not having a seat in the House checked (*Mr. Speaker*) 1152.

*Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 46*. Insinuation of Member repudiated (*Mr. Wilson*) 888.

*Orange Incorp. B. 93*. Personal allusions in deb. checked (*Mr. Speaker*) 920; unparliamentary language withdn., 923.

*Personal Allusions checked, 920, 1152.*

*Personal Explanations in Deb. in Order*: 493, 1123; can be made after Member has finished speaking, 561.

*Post Offices, Erection of*. M. for Ret.: Unparliamentary language withdn., 802; reference to former deb. checked (*Mr. Speaker*) 807.

*Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic*. Personal explanation in deb. in Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 1123.

*St. Patrick's Day*. M. to adjn. to a future period not in Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 885.

*Sick and Distressed Mariners Act*. On M. for Ret.: Member requested to confine himself to Ques. (*Mr. Speaker*) 217.

*Unparliamentary Language, 342, 532, 802, 813, 888, 922, 923.*

*Ways and Means*. Duties on packages containing crockery, in Com.: Member referring to packages containing flour in Order, 700.

PRIVILEGE:

*Contradiction of Stmt.* made by Member in another place (*Mr. Blake*) 1512.

*Denial of insinuations by Member re newspaper article* (*Mr. Blake*) 736.

*Departmental Reports*. Publication in newspapers before presentation to House: remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 141.

*Explanation of article in Toronto Globe* (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1465.

*Explanation of paragraph in Montreal Herald and other newspapers reflecting on a Member* (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1241.

*Explanations respecting reports in Toronto Mail and Montreal Gazette*: remarks (*Messrs. Ouimet, Scriver, Blake and Sir John A. Macdonald*) 457.

*L'Etendard*. Inaccurate correspondence: Explanation (*Mr. Bergeron*) 469.

*Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21*. Amts. made by Senate: remarks (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1511. See also "PROCEDURE."

## ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

## PRIVILEGE—Continued.

- Luard, Major-General*, complaints against. Personal explanations (*Mr. Caron*) 757; (*Mr. Fortin*) 808.
- Minister of Rys. and the High Commissionership*. Position in House challenged (*Mr. Blake*) 542; Res., 547.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 32*. Ques. of Privilege must conclude with a motion (*Mr. Speaker*) 811.
- Orange B. 93*, *Mr. Blake's* speech on: Accuracy of Rep. challenged (*Mr. Woodworth*) 1544.
- Regina Leader*. Misquotation: remarks (*Mr. Orton*) 1582.
- Returns*. Missing and Imperfect: remarks (*Mr. Platt* and others) 459.
- Wheat and Flour Equivalents*. Ques. misunderstood: explanation (*Mr. Bowell*) 57.

## PROCEDURE:

- Adulteration of Food and Drugs B. 114*. M. for Com. (*Mr. Costigan*) objected to by *Mr. Blake*, the B. containing money clauses should have originated in Com. of W., authorities quoted to sustain objection, 1244; ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that the money clauses should not be considered as part of the B. but should be passed over by the Chairman of the Com., authorities quoted in support of same, 1246.
- Banking Facilities for Agriculturists*. M. for Com. on Res. objected to by *Mr. Blake*, there being a B. on Order Paper for 2° on same subject: *Mr. Speaker* not prepared to give a decision in the matter, 763. See also "ORDER."
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Loan Res.* Members being called on to vote having pecuniary interest in same: Rule read (*Mr. Speaker*) 454; practice defined (*Mr. Speaker*) 458. See also "ORDER."
- Central Ontario Ry. B. Amt.* moved in Com. by *Mr. White*, of *Hastings*, objected to by *Mr. Cameron, Victoria*, no notice having been given: objection sustained by the Chairman, 1202. See also "ORDER."
- Chinese Immigration into B. C.* M. to adjn. deb. on Res. moved (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) through want of knowledge of Parliamentary Practice; Order adjng. deb. asked to be rescinded: remarks (*Mr. Speaker, Mr. Baker* and *Mr. Blake*) 977.
- Commitment of a B.* M. (*Mr. Amyot*) to dischrg. Order of the House referring B. to a Com.: Practice (*Mr. Speaker*) and Precedent (*Mr. Amyot*) quoted 131.
- Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 12*. Order for 2° being called, change of name of mover suggested (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*): ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that Member having moved introduction B. must stand in his name; no B. can be moved in name of absent Member, 80.
- Criminal Law Amt., Seduction, &c., B. 6*. Mover of B. (*Mr. Charlton*) seconding an Amt. to Main Motion objected to by *Mr. Cameron, Victoria*, 666; correction (*Mr. Speaker*) 667.

## ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

## PROCEDURE—Continued.

- Division List*. Member's name having been left out of division on B. 6, same was asked, by *Mr. Hesson*, to be rectified: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) not the practice to alter same, 709.
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21 Amt.* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) to M. that B. pass: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that no Amt. can be moved at this stage, must be obtained in the Senate, 978.
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 21*. Amts. made by the Sen.: remarks (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1511; Practice of Parliament (*Mr. Haggart*) 1512; (*Sir Charles Tupper, Messrs. Mitchell, Cameron, Victoria, and Blake*) 1513; (*Messrs. Mackenzie, McCarthy, Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1514: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that in future Amts. made by the Senate must be put on the Order Paper, 1515.
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Mr. Houde's M. to repeal*. M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for same to take precedence on a private day objected to by *Mr. Mackenzie*, no notice having been given, 824; authorities quoted by *Mr. Mackenzie* and objection sustained by *Mr. Speaker*, 825.
- Luard, Major-General*. Order for Notice of Motion called, and a Member being absent who wanted to speak on it, the same was asked to be allowed to stand: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that Notice of Motion after being called cannot stand, except at request of Government, 295. See also "ORDER."
- Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. 57*. M. (*Mr. Small*) to conc. in Amts. made by the Senate: Rule read (*Mr. Speaker*) 1547.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 32*. M. for Com. on B. objected to by *Mr. Cameron, Huron*, the mover (*Mr. Abbott*) being Solicitor of C. P. R. Co., 810: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that Member acting as such is ineligible from voting, but he is not restrained from proposing a motion or an amendment, and authorities quoted to sustain same, 811; Rule of English H. of C. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 857.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. B. 32*. M. (*Mr. Haggart*) to change name of mover objected to by *Mr. Cameron, Huron*, no notice having been given: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) no notice required after B. is introduced, 843.
- Printing of Parliament*. Sixth Rep. of Com., Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) to conc. in, except last paragraph: not usual to adopt a Rep. of a Com. in part, it is generally ref. back to the Com. (*Mr. Speaker*) 1109.
- Public Works of Canada Act Amt. B. 134*. Remarks by *Mr. Blake* on M. for 2°, as to whether B. ought not to have been initiated by Com. of W., the B. authorizing the disposal of a portion of the Public Domain, 1455: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that B. does not come under class of Bills appropriating any portion of the Public Revenue, 1586.

- ORLEANS ISLAND, LIGHTS NORTH OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 218.
- OTTAWA AND GATINEAU VALLEY RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445.
- Ottawa and St. Lawrence Ry. (Bondholders voting at Meetings) B. No. 56 (*Mr. White, Cardwell.*) 1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 271; in Com. and 3°\*, 715; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281. (47 *Vic., c.* 76.)
- OTTAWA GAS CO., CLAIM OF, FOR LEAKAGE. Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
- OTTAWA RIFLE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 1603.
- Ottawa, Roman Catholic Diocese of, B. No. 95 (*Mr. Tassé.*) 1°\*, 304; 2°\*, 504; in Com., 889; 3° on a div., 890. (47 *Vic., c.* 104.)
- Ottawa, Waddington and N. Y. Ry. and Bridge Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 40 (*Mr. Hickey.*) 1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 603. (47 *Vic., c.* 58.)
- Owen Sound Dry Dock, Shipbuilding, and Nav. Co. Incorp. B. No. 45 (*Mr. Allen.*) 1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 580. (47 *Vic., c.* 99.)
- OXFORD STATION AND SYDNEY OR LOUISBURG RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1490.
- OYSTER POND BREAKWATER, N. S.: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.
- PAGE, JOHN, PAYMENTS TO, AS ARBITRATOR: in Com. of Sup. 1351, 1608; conc., 1617.
- PAJOT FARM AND CLAIM OF INDIAN DEPT.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.
- PALMERSTON, NORTH OF, MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 89.
- Parkdale Village and G. T. R. Co., legalization of Agreement B. No. 82 (*Mr. Wallace, York.*) 1°\*, 231; 2°, 504; withdn.
- PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE: Members called on to vote (ruling) 458. See "ORDER," &c.
- PARLIAMENT, 5TH, SECOND SESSION, 1884, 47 VICTORIA: Opening, 1; Speech from the Throne, 2; Bills assented to, 664, 1654; Prorogation, 1654. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- PARRY SOUND, INDIAN AGENT AT: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 1548.
- PASSES OVER INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Montplaisir*) 1201.
- PASTURE LANDS, LEASES GRANTED IN 1883: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 73; Sale of, &c., 78.
- Patent Act, 1872, further Act Amt. B. No. 86 (*Mr. White Renfrew.*) 1°\*, 260.
- "PATENT RECORD:" in Com. of Sup., 1089.
- Patent Rights, Sale of, Prevention of Fraud in, B. No. 26 (*Mr. Mulock.*) 1°, 71; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 145; in Com. of W., 285; 3°, 460. (47 *Vic., c.* 38.)
- PAYMENTS ON SETTLERS' LANDS: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.
- PEAKE'S, STATION AT, ON P. E. I. RY.: Ques. (*Mr. McIntyre*) 261.
- PELEE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, REPAIRS ON: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.
- PENETANGUISHENE, INDIAN AGENT AT: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 31.
- PENITENTIARIES BRANCH OF DEPT. OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 833.
- PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 998-1002, 1338.
- PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1016, 1343.
- PERLEY, H. F., SERVICES ON ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc., 1460.
- Permanent Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 122 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*) 1°\*, 822; 2°, 986; in Com. and 3°\*, 1282. (47 *Vic., c.* 40.)
- PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE," &c.
- PERSONS ENTERING AND LEAVING MANITOBA FOR YEAR: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
- PERTH AND QUEBEC, EXCISE OFFICERS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 132.
- PETROLEUM IN MONTMAGNY AND ST. MAURICE: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 85.
- PICKARD, MR. JOHN: Notification of Vacancy by decease (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.
- Pictou Mutual Marine Insurance Co., Incorp. B. No. 35 (*Mr. McDougald.*) 1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic., c.* 95.)
- PICTOU CATTLE DISEASE: in Com. of Sup., 1010.
- PIERS IN P. E. I., PAYMENTS FOR REPAIRS ON: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 1054.
- PILOTS FOR AND ABOVE HARBOUR OF QUE., INCORP. ACTS RESPECTING: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 655.
- Pilots, Montreal and Quebec, Incorp. B. No. 18 (*Mr. Amyot.*) 1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 89; preamble not proven.
- PINCHER CREEK SUPPLY FARM, SALE OR LEASE: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.
- PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS, EXPORT DUTY ON: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 655.
- PLUMMER, MR., TRANSFER OF: in Com. of Sup., 841.
- POINT ESCUMINAC N. B., BREAKWATER: M. for Papers (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.
- POLICE ORGANIZATION UNDER LICENSE ACT: Ques. (*Mr. Courso*) 505.
- PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO., SUBSIDY TO: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1497.
- Pontiac, Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation Incorp. B. No. 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew.*) 1°\*, 260; 2°\*, 504; in Com., 888; 3°\*, 889. (47 *Vic., c.* 105.)
- PORPOISE FISHERY AT RIVER OUELLE: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 86.
- PORT OF LANDING FOR EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 89.
- PORT MULGRAVE, N. S., AS A SUB-PORT: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 285.
- PORT ROWAN, LIFE-SAVING STATION AND CREW AT: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
- PORT STANLEY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 519.
- PORT STANLEY HARBOUR REVENUE: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Wilson*) 295.

PORT TOWNSEND AND VICTORIA, B. C., MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.

## POST OFFICE:

Carleton, N.B., Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 966.

Duart, Postmaster at, Complaints against: M. for Pets. (*Mr. Casey*) 509, 1201.

Fort MacLeod and Medicine Hat Mail Service: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506.

Landsdowne Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 336.

Leamington Post Office, Erection of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.

Letter Postage, Reduction in: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.

Letter Rates, Amt. of existing Law: Ques. (*Mr. Thompson*) 89.

Mail Service in B. C.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.

Mail Service in Lotbinière County: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.

Mail Service in N. B.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.

Mail Service North of Palmerston: Ques. (*Mr. Lan-derkin*) 89.

Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 1298; conc., 1452.

Money Order Regulations: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 614.

Money Orders, France and Canada: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 967.

Montreal Post Office Service: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 797.

Newspaper Mail Service, Delays in Transmission: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Sproule*) 216.

Offices in operation in the Dom.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Hesson*) 90.

Parry Sound P. O., Thefts at: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1109.

Postmaster-General's Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 842, 1336, 1627.

Post Office and Finance Depts.: in Com. of Sup., 987.

St. Césaire, Postmaster at, Charges against: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.

St. Clotilde Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 1273.

St. Gilles, Daily Mail for: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 73.

St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Erection of: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.

St. Stephen, N.B., Post Office Receipts: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.

Stamps, Sale of, at Windsor: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.

Statistics: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Hesson*) 90.

Stayner, Postmaster at: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 1109.

Subsidies to C.P.R. Co.: M. for Papers (*Mr. Blake*) 79

Victoria, B.C., Postmaster at: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.

Wheatley, Postmaster at, Charges against: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.

[See "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

PRECEDENCE, MS. FOR C. P. R.: Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 198, 304; Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 107) 304; Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 108) 305; M., 468; M. for B., 524. See "INTOXICATING LIQUORS ACT, *Mr. Houde's M. TO REPEAL.*"

PRÉCIS WRITER, SUPREME COURT, STATUTORY INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 1474.

PREEMPTION ENTRIES IN 1883: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78. **Prescott and Vaudreuil Railway Co. Incorp. B. No. 23** (*Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 71; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 89; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 736. (47 Vic., c. 84.)

PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT MORRISTOWN, N.S.: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 140.

PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING AND KAMINISTIQUIA RY. CO., BONUSES TO: M. for copy of Memorial from Messrs. McCallum and Moberly to His Ex.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.

PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING TO RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1046.

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

Charlottetown Public Building: conc., 1604.

Compensation for Injuries on P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 1347.

Customs Officers: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Brecken*) 466.

Glendon, Steamer to replace: in Com. of Sup., 1227.

Harbours and Rivers: in Com. of Sup., 1220; conc., 1443, 1464.

Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1266.

Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 1234.

Officers' Salaries, &c., on P. E. I. Ry.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Davies*) 298.

Payment of Labourers on P. E. I. Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 965.

Peake's, Station at, on P. E. I. Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. McIntyre*) 261.

Piers, Payments for repairs on: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 1054; M. for copies of O. C., 1169.

Refund of Duties to Merchants: in Com. of Sup., 1312; conc., 1453.

Repairs, &c., on Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 1458.

St. Peter's Breakwater, Contract for: M. for copies\* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.

Steamboat Inspector's Rep: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 460.

Steamboats, Inspection of: M. for copies of Reps. (*Mr. Davies*) 59.

Temperance Act, 1878, Medical Certificates under: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.

Wharves and Piers, Inspection of: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 261.

[See "PUBLIC WORKS" and "SUPPLY."]

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE FISHERY AWARD: Res. (*Mr. Davies*) 1273; Deb. (*Mr. Brecken*) 1277; (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1278; (*Mr. Tupper*) 1279; (*Mr. Hackett*) 1280.

PRINCE LEOPOLD, THE LATE, RES. OF CONDOLENCE TO H. M.: Mess. from Sen., with Address, 1273; M. to conc. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1291; seconded (*Mr. Blake*) 1292.

"PRINCESS LOUISE," STEAMER, CONTRACT, &c., FOR BUILDING: M. for copies (*Mr. Weldon*) 35; Loss of: Reports of Capt. Scott on, 40; Contract for building, 623; Tenders for Steamer to replace,\* 820.

"PRINCESS OF WALES," STEAMER, REP. OF INSPECTORS, &c.: M. for Papers (*Mr. Davies*) 59.

- PRINTING, MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1009, 1373.
- PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT: M. to conc. in Sixth Rep., 408; Seventh Rep., 1321, 1359; Eighth and Ninth Reps., 1543.
- PRINTING, PRINTING PAPER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1004; conc., 1440.
- PRINTING: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
- PRINTING VOCABULARIES OF DIALECTS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1608.
- Prisoners, Transfer from one jail to another. authorization B. No. 151** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1586; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1645. (47 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- PRIVATE BILLS, HOUR FOR: Ques. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 811.
- PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
- PRIVATE BILLS, PRESENTATION OF: Ms. (*Mr. Coursol*) to extend time, 71; (*Mr. Beaty*) 162, 1240, 1359.
- PRIVATE BILLS, RECEPTION OF REPS. OF COMS.: Ms. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) to extend time, 932, 1100, 1240, 1359.
- PRIVATE BILLS, RECEIVING PRTS. FOR: Ms. (*Mr. Beaty*) to extend time, 40.
- PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30; withdr. of name from (*Mr. Tupper*) 569; First Rep. presented, 1270; M. to conc. in agreed to (Y. 107, N. 55) 1291.
- PRIVILEGE. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE," &C.
- PRIVY COUNCIL, JUDICIAL COM. OF: Judgment and Short-hand Writer's notes *re Hodge vs. The Queen*, and *Russell vs. The Queen*: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 833, 1333, 1336, 1627.
- PROCEDURE. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE," &C.
- PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC: Res. (*Mr. Foster*) 656; Sec. (*Mr. Fisher*) 980; Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) agreed to, 1113; Deb. (*Mr. Beaty*) 1114; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 1116; (*Mr. Jamieson*) 1117; (*Mr. McCraney*) 1118; (*Mr. Foster*) 1119; (*Mr. Kirk*) 1122; (*Mr. Scriver*) 1123; Amt. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 107) 1123; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1124; (*Mr. Irving*) 1125; Main Motion, as amended, agreed to (Y. 122, N. 40) 1126.
- PROHIBITIVE DUTY IN NEWFOUNDLAND (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1214.
- PROLOGATION OF PARLIAMENT: Communication from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 1652; His Ex.'s Speech, 1655.
- PROVINCIAL ACTS, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O. C., (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.
- PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL BONUSES TO RYS. SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.
- Provincial Bank of Ont. Incorp. B. No. 39** (*Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex*). 1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- PROVINCIAL DEBT, ONTARIO AND QUEBEC, TO CANADA: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 189.
- Provincial Subsidies, readjustment of, B. No. 154** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1215; M. for Com., 1583; in Com., 1584; 1°\* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1645. (47 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES UNDER CONFEDERATION ACT: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 150.
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS FOR 1883: presented, 27.
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
- PUBLIC ANALYSTS: prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1215.
- PUBLIC ARMOURIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1095, 1343, 1602.
- Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, Act Amt. B. No. 12** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 40; Order for 2° read, 80; 2° m., 292; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 294; M. for Com. of W., 813; in Com., 815; *killed in Com. of W.*, 819; M. to restore to Order Paper neg. (Y. 59, N. 96) 820.
- PUBLIC DEBT OF THE DOMINION: Ques. (*Mr. Charlton*) 736.
- PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1322; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1326; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1328; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1332; neg. (Y. 57, N. 111) 1333.
- PUBLIC HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 1012-1016.
- PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 88.
- PUBLIC LANDS SURVEYED IN MANITOBA AND N.W. T. IN 1883: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- Public Schools, Manitoba, Aid to, B. No. 36** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 43; in Com., 68; 1°\* of B., 85; 2°\* and in Com., 542; 3°\* 625. (47 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- Public Service, Moneys required for, authorization B. No. 156** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1°\* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1645. (47 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- Public Works of Canada, B. No. 134** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°\*, 1321; 2° m., 1445, 1586; 2° and in Com., 1587; recom. and 3°\*, 1609. (47 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- PUBLIC WORKS:
- Agent and Contingencies, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1318.
- Amherstburg Public Buildings: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 79; M. for Ret., 83; (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 297.
- Antigonish, Expenditure on Public Buildings: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 66.
- Bayfield Harbour, Ont., Damage to, by Storms: Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.
- Beemer, H. J., Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Fisher*) 604.
- Belle River, Essex County, Ont., Pier in: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.
- Boularderie Wharf, N. S.: conc., 1618.
- Brandon, Erection of Public Buildings: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 1110.
- Buildings, Cost of, since 1874, &C.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 41.
- Cape Tormentine Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 1603.
- Carleton, N. B., Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 966.
- Cheticamp Harbour, N. S., Dredging: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 967.
- Crane Island Wharf: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 516; Ques., 736.
- Depl. Rep. presented, 27; in Com. of Sup., 843.
- Dredges and Tug, Construction of: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*), 603.

## PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

- Dredging at Jemseg : M. for Rep. (*Mr. King*) 295.  
 Emigrant Sheds at Victoria, B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 336.  
 Esquimalt Graving Dock: in Com. of Sup., 1603.  
 Expenditure on, in different Provs., since Confederation: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.  
 Extra Clerks Charged to: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Lister*) 82.  
 Fairford River, Man., Improvements: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Orton*) 208.  
 Fortifications and Military Buildings B. No. 124 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 965; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1061. *See* B.  
 Fort MacLeod, Public Buildings: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 506.  
 Goodwin, James, Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Fleming*) 604.  
 Heating Public Buildings, Cost of: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.  
 In Com. of Sup., 1190–1198, 1218–1226, 1354–1366, 1603–1606; conc., 1443, 1458, 1464, 1616, 1618.  
 Indian Agent's Office, Toronto, closing of: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cook*) 294.  
 Ingonish Breakwater: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Campbell, Victoria*) 89.  
 Isle-aux-Noix, Completion of Works at: Ques. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 966.  
 Kingsville Harbour Works: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 86; M. for Ret., 216.  
 Lachine Canal, Contracts for new Basins: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.  
 Leamington Post Office: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.  
 Lotbinière Wharf: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1054.  
 Moncton Post Office, N. B.: conc., 1616.  
 Montreal Drill Shed, Contract for Rebuilding: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.  
 Morpeth Harbour Improvements: Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 132; (*Mr. McCraney*) 1054.  
 New Harbour and Indian Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.  
 Ottawa, Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1190.  
 Ottawa Gas Co., Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.  
 Oyster Pond Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 132.  
 Piers in P. E. I., Payments for Repairs: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 1054; M. for O. C., 1169.  
 Port Arthur Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 1603.  
 Port Stanley Harbour of Refuge: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 519.  
 Port Stanley Harbour Revenue: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Wilson*) 295.  
 Post Offices and Public Buildings, Erection of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 800.  
 Public Buildings, Cost of Heating: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.  
 Public Buildings of the Dom.: M. for Ret., 41.  
 St. Hyacinthe Post Office, Erection of: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.  
 St. Jean Port Joli Wharf: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 517.

## PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

- St. Thomas, Public Buildings at: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 92.  
 Salaries of Officers, Charged to: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Lister*) 82.  
 Stone for Deptl. Building: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 736.  
 Talbot, Achille, Employment and Salary: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 966.  
 Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1318, 1366.  
 Thames and Lake Erie Canal: Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 797.  
 Wharves and Piers in N. B.: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 458.  
 Wharves and Piers in P. E. I., Inspection of: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 261.  
 PUBLISHING DEBATES: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1389. [*See* "DEBATES."]  
 PULLMAN CAR CO.'S AGREEMENT WITH INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Weldon*) 77.  
 QUEBEC: *See* ["SUPPLY."]  
 Accounts and Dom. Government: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 73.  
 Account with Canada: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 72; M. for Stmnt.,\* 79.  
 Aylmer and Pembroke Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1497.  
 Beaumont, Expropriation of: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1200.  
 Beemer, H. J., Claim of, for work on Gates, &c.: Ques. (*Mr. Fisher*) 604.  
 Caron, Clovis, Complaints against, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1200.  
 Central Ry. Co. and Intercol. Ry. Arrangements: M. for copies (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230.  
 Central Ry. Co., Subsidy to: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1491.  
 Claims of Province against Dominion: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Coursol*) 79.  
 Crane Island Wharf: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 516; Ques., 736.  
 Culling Timber: in Com. of Sup., 1317.  
 D'Anjou, Joseph, Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Billy*) 798.  
 Dominion Subsidy to Quebec, Readjustment of; M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Laurier*) 1200.  
 Dorion and Leclerc, Messrs., Claims of: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88.  
 Elgin Road Station, L'Islet: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 199.  
 Emigrant Buildings at Lévis, Removal of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.  
 European Immigrants, Port of Landing: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 89.  
 Excise Officers at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 132.  
 Ferry or Bridge at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.  
 Floating Gas Lights on the St. Lawrence: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Valin*) 217.  
 Gosselin and Chabot, Messrs., Complaints of, against Dom. Arbitrators: M. for copies (*Mr. Amyot*) 28.  
 Government Lands in Richelieu County, Sale of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Amyot*) 1126.

## QUEBEC—Continued.

- Grand Trunk Ry. Crossing in Montreal: Ques. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1387.
- Intercolonial Ry. Office at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 86.
- Kazuabazua and Le Desert Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1499.
- Lachine Canal, Contracts for new Basin: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 1215.
- Lavallière Bay, Yamaska River, Explorations: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 820.
- Lavoie, Geo., Claim of: Ques. (*Mr. Billy*) 797.
- Lévis Emigrant Building and Quarantine: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.
- Levis Graving Dock. [See B. 149.]
- Lieut.-Gov.'s Oaths: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79; Commissions, &c.: M. for copies (*Mr. Casgrain*) 522.
- Lights North of Island of Orleans: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 218.
- Lotbinière Wharf at: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1054.
- Mail Service in Lotbinière County: M. for Papers, &c. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.
- Montreal Carnival: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 83.
- Montreal Drill Shed, Contract for rebuilding: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966; M. for copies,\* 1201.
- Mousseau, Hon. J. A., Appointment of, to the Bench: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Laurier*) 133.
- North Shore Ry., St. Martin's to Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 1388.
- Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Ry. Co. Subsidy to: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445.
- Pilots for and above Harbour: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 655.
- Porpoise Fishing at River Ouelle: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 86.
- Provincial Claim against Dom.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Coursol*) 79.
- Provincial Debt to Canada: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 199.
- Public Buildings in Com. of Sup., 1193.
- Railway Bridge at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Bossé*) 1635.
- Ry. Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 69 (*Mr. Bossé*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 162; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 271; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1035. (47 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- Ry. Subsidy to: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444.
- Sto. Anne and St. André, Surveys in: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1199.
- St. Césaire Postmaster, Charges against: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.
- St. Clotilde Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 1273.
- St. Francis River Explorations: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 820.
- St. Gilles, Daily Mail for: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 73.
- St. Hyacinthe Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.
- St. Jean Port Joli Wharf: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 517.
- St. Martin's Junction and Quebec Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1493.

## QUEBEC—Continued.

- School of Navigation: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.
- Skiffington vs. Michaud and Dumais: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.
- Subsidy to: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 883.
- Survey Contract No. 10, Transfer of: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Billy*) 1201.
- Tidal Dock, further provision B. No. 148** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1581; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1618. (47 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- Union Jacques Cartier Ry. and C. P. R.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Houde*) 41.
- Wellington Bridge, Lachine Canal: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Curran*) 798.
- Yamaska River, Explorations on: M. for copies of Rep.\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
- Quebec and Montreal Pilots Incorp. B. No. 18** (*Mr. Amyot*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 67; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 89; preamble not proven.
- QUEEN AND MERCEB, NOTES AND JUDGMENT OF PRIVY COUNCIL: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 74.
- Queen's Bench, Puisne Judge for, Man., Salary, &c., B. No. 146** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1422; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1549; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1622; recom. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1627. (47 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- RAILWAY BETWEEN FEEDER OF WELLAND CANAL AND CHIPPEWA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Railway Act, 1879, Consolidated, Amt. B. No. 52** (*Mr. Mulock*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 131; 2<sup>o</sup>, 460; withdn., 996.
- Railway Act, Consolidated, further Act Amt. B. No. 135** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1322; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1576; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1577; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1591; recom., 1594; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1595. (47 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- RAILWAY BONUSES GRANTED BY MUNICIPALITIES AND PROV. GOVT. OF ONT.: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Landerkin*) 1200.
- RAILWAYS, BONUSES TO, PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.
- RAILWAY BRIDGE AT QUEBEC: Ques. (*Mr. Bossé*) 1635.
- Railway Commissioners, Court of, for Canada B. No. 8** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 31.
- RAILWAY CROSSINGS ON ROADS AND STREETS: Ques. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1273.
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Rep. presented, 43.
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 843, 1474.
- RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
- RAILWAYS, CAPITAL: in Com. of Sup., C. P. R., 1046-1049, 1348-1350, conc., 1449, 1460; I. C. R., 1049-1050, 1344-1347, 1627-1628; P. E. I. Ry., 1347.
- Railways, Subsidies to, authorization B. No. 147** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1444; M. for Com., 1479; in Com., 1486; M. to conc. in Res., 1517; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1530; deb. adjd., 1543; rsmd., 1549; Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552; neg. (Y. 56, N. 110) 1572; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 111) 1573; Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1574; neg. (Y. 52, N. 109) 1576; Res. conc.

- in (Y. 128, N. 35) 1576; 1°\* of B., 1576; 2°\* and in Com., 1624; recom. and 3°\*, 1640. (47 *Vic.*, c. 8.) [For Deb. see "SUBSIDIES."]
- RAILWAYS, SUBSIDIES TO: M. for O. C., &c.\* (Mr. Blake) 88.
- RAILWAYS. See respective headings.
- Rancher's Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 74** (Mr. Ross). 1°\*, 198; 2°\*, 271; withdn.
- RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, TENDERS, &c.; M. for copies\* (Mr. Cockburn) 1200.
- Real Estate Loan Co. of Canada B. No. 88** (Mr. Beaty). 1°\*, 285; 2°\*, 504; in Com. and 3°\*, 1035. (47 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE CHARGEABLE TO CONSOLIDATED FUND: M. for Rets.\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28, 140, 1200.
- RECIPROCIITY: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Davies) 1176; Deb. (Mr. Hackett) 1182; (Mr. Charlton) 1184; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1186; (Mr. Mills) 1188; (Mr. Gilmor) 1188; (Messrs. Kirk, Fisher and Cameron, Inverness) 1189; neg. (Y. 60, N. 105) 1190.
- "RECORD, PATENT:" in Com. of Sup., 1089.
- Redemption of Small Loans Authorization B. No. 156** (Sir Leonard Tilley). Res. prop., 1516; in Com., 1588; 1°\* of B., 1610; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1645. (47 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- RED RIVER BRIDGE AT EMERSON: in Com. of Sup., 1348.
- RED RIVER, REMOVAL OF SAND BAR AT: M. for Reps. (Mr. Orton) 208.
- REDUCTION IN LETTER POSTAGE: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Charlton) 87.
- Reformatory at Halifax for Juvenile Offenders B. No. 141** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°\* —; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1621. (47 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- REFUND OF DUTIES TO MERCHANTS IN P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 1312; conc., 1453.
- REFUND OF SUPERANNUATION CONTRIBUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. Curran) 285.
- REFUND TO GOVT. OF N. B., I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1627
- REGINA AS CAPITAL OF THE N. W. LOCATION, &c.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 37.
- REGINA TOWN RESERVE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 75.
- REGION NORTH OF LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for Ret. (Mr. Dawson) 967.
- REGISTRATION OF DEEDS IN THE N. W.: prop. Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1635.
- REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE SALE AND MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LANDS: M. for copies (Mr. Charlton) 78.
- REID, W. G., REFUND TO: in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS: Ques. (Mr. Tassé) 965.
- REPORTS PRESENTED:
- Adulteration of Food (Mr. Costigan) 1321.
  - Agriculture (Mr. McLelan) 1055.
  - Auditor General (Sir Leonard Tilley) 27.
  - Census of Canada, Vol. 2 (Mr. McLelan) 1322.
  - Indian Affairs (Sir John A. Macdonald) 68.
  - Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan) 27.
- REPORTS PRESENTED—Continued.
- Interior (Sir John A. Macdonald) 844.
  - Library of Parliament (Mr. Speaker) 3.
  - Marine and Fisheries (Mr. McLelan) 266.
  - Public Accounts (Sir Leonard Tilley) 27.
  - Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) 27.
  - Railways and Canals (Sir Charles Tupper) 43.
  - Trade and Navigation (Mr. Bowell) 27.
  - Weights and Measures (Mr. Costigan) 1321.
- Representation, Dual, Repeal B. No. 13** (Mr. Ouimet). 1°\*, 40; M. for 2°, neg. (Y. 59, N. 102) 144.
- Representation of the Territories in the House of Commons, B. No. 110** (Mr. Cameron, Huron). 1°, 598; 2°, 1058; in Com., 1059.
- RETURNING OFFICERS, CLAIMS OF: in Com. of Sup., 1339; conc., 1459, 1611.
- RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR:
- A, B AND O BATTERIES, Officers, &c. (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) 808.
  - ACTS, PROVINCIAL, Disallowance of, &c. (Mr. Mulock) 42.
  - ACCIDENTS ON INTERCOL. RY.\* (Mr. Weldon) 79.
  - ADMINISTRATION OF AFFAIRS IN THE N. W. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 75.
  - ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE N. W. T., Appointment of (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 517.
  - AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES and Mechanical Arts, Essays on (Mr. Gigault) 33.
  - AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS, Expenses of Com. on (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury) 132.
  - AGRICULTURAL LANDS, &c.\* (Mr. Charlton) 78.
  - AMERO, ROGER, Arrest of, &c. (Mr. Woodworth) 622.
  - AMHERSTBURG CUSTOMS HOUSE and Post Office, Site for (Mr. Lister) 83; (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 297.
  - ANTIGONISH PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Expenditure on\* (Mr. McIsaac) 86.
  - ARBITRATORS. See "Dominion" and "Official."
  - AUDIT, ALPHONSE, Appointment of\* (Mr. Casey) 1201.
  - BANKS, GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28.
  - BEAUMONT, EXPROPRIATION OF\* (Mr. Amyot) 1200.
  - BOND, GRINDING IN (Mr. Blake) 53.
  - BONUSES TO RYS., Provincial and Municipal (Mr. Mulock) 616.
  - BONUSES TO RYS., by Municipalities and Provincial Govt. of Ont.\* (Mr. Lanierkin) 1200.
  - BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, Claims paid\* (Mr. Fortin) 140.
  - BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, Owners of and Tonnage of Vessels applying for same and refused\* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 67.
  - BOUNTY TO MANUFACTURERS OF IRON (Mr. Blake) 70.
  - BOUNDARIES, MAN., Extension of\* (Mr. Blake) 88.
  - BOW RIVER TIMBER LANDS, Sales of (Mr. Jackson) 90.
  - BRASSARD AND BUSHELL, MESSRS. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 598.
  - BRAZIL, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH (Mr. Blake) 57.
  - BRITISH COLUMBIA. See general heading.
  - BREAKWATER, INCONISH, Engineers Rep., &c. (Mr. Campbell, Victoria) 89.
  - BREAKWATER, POINT ESCUMINAC, N. B. (Mr. Mitchell) 514.
  - BREAKWATER, ST. PETER'S, P.E.I.\* (Mr. McIntyre) 1200.
  - BUILDINGS, PUBLIC, Cost of, &c. (Mr. Lister) 41.
  - CALGARY, SUPPLY FARM No. 20 (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 44.
  - CALLANDER AND GRAVENHURST Railway Subsidy (Mr. Cockburn) 40.
  - CANADA, G. T. R. decrying Credit of\* (Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton) 762.
  - CANADIAN EXPRESS Co., Transport of Militia Supplies\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 523.
  - CANADIAN LOAN, proposed, of \$4,000,000, Departmental Orders and Advertisements\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 40.
  - CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY. See general heading.
  - CARON, CLOVIS, Complaints against\* (Mr. Blondeau) 1200.
  - CATTLE TRADE, LIVE, with Great Britain\* (Mr. Casey) 1200.
  - CAVALRIES, &c., on the Intercol. Ry.\* (Mr. Weldon) 79.
  - CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 606.

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- CHABOT, L. and C., Copies of Petitions of, to Dominion Arbitrators\* (Mr. Amyot) 28.
- CHAPLEAU, S. E. ST. ONGE, Appointment of as Sheriff in the N. W. T. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 145.
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION (Mr. Shakespeare) 616.
- CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION FUND (Mr. Blake) 43.
- CLAIMS OF PROV. OF QUEBEC against Dominion\* (Mr. Coursol) 79.
- CLOTHING FOR THE MILITIA, Manufacture of\* (Mr. Vail) 1201.
- COAL OIL BARRELS, Seizure of, at Sandwich, &c. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 298.
- COAL ENTERED EX-WAREHOUSE, Free or for Export\* (Mr. Weldon) 67.
- COAL LANDS IN THE N. W., Sales and Leases\* (Mr. Blake) 71.
- COAL CARRIED ON INTERCOL. RY. and by Steamboat and Sailing Vessel from N. S. (Mr. Woodworth) 65.
- COLONIZATION PLANS NOS. 1 and 2, Applications under\* (Mr. Charlton) 78.
- COMMERCIAL TREATIES between Canada and Foreign Powers (Mr. Blake) 57.
- COMMISSIONER TO ENGLAND. See "High Commissioner."
- COMMISSION ON INTERCOL. RY. CLAIMS, Sittings of (Mr. McMullen) 303.
- COMMITTEE ON TARIFF and Agricultural Interests, Expenses of (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury) 132.
- CONFEDERATION, EXPENDITURE for Public Works since (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 161.
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, Receipts and Expenditure chargeable to\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28, 140, 1200.
- CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT, 1879, Railway Co.'s Returns under\* (Mr. Blake) 66.
- CORN AND CORNMEAL, Imports and Exports (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 83.
- CORNWALL CANAL, Enlargement\* (Mr. Cockburn) 1200.
- COTTON DUCK, Drawback on\* (Mr. Kirk) 624.
- COUNTY JUDGE OF ELGIN, Charges against (Mr. Wilson) 59.
- COX, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHEATLEY, Charges against (Mr. Lister) 604.
- CUBA, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH (Mr. Blake) 57.
- CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES Collected on Intoxicating Liquors imported for Consumption\* (Mr. McCraney) 87.
- CUSTOMS HOUSE and POST OFFICE at Amherstburg, Sale of Land for\* (Mr. Lister) 83.
- CUSTOMS, COLLECTOR OF, at Napanee (Mr. Allison, Lennox) withdn., 208.
- CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, Increase of, at Ports in Inverness, N.S. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 462.
- DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS IN B. U. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 414.
- DEPOSITS OF GOVT. MONEY in Banks\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28.
- DESSERTERS FROM THE U. S. ARMY arrested on Canadian Territory (Mr. Guillet) 86; (Mr. Charlton) 1200.
- DEWDNEY, LIBRT.-GOV., Absence of (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 517.
- DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS, &c. (Mr. Mulock) 42.
- DISPUTED TERRITORY\* (Mr. Blake) 88.
- DOMINION ARBITRATORS, copies of Petitions of E. Gosselin, L. Chabot, C. Chabot\* (Mr. Amyot) 28; E. Dorion\* (Mr. Belleau) 88; M. Leclerc,\* 88.
- DOMINION LANDS. See general heading.
- DOMINION SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC\* (Mr. Laurier) 1200.
- DOMINION GRANGE, Memorial of\* (Mr. Casey) 1201.
- DORION, EUSTACHE, claim of\* (Mr. Belleau) 88.
- DRAWBACKS. See general heading.
- DREDGES AND DUMPING SCOWS\* (Mr. Jackson) 1201.
- DRILL SHED, MONTREAL, Rebuilding of\* (Mr. Bernier) 1201.
- DRY DOCK in B. C.\* (Mr. Blake) 79; (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 514.
- DUART, POSTMASTER AT (Mr. Casey) 509; M. for Pet.,\* 1201.
- DUTY ON FREIGHT CHARGES (Mr. Blake) 82.
- ELGIN, COUNTY JUDGE OF, Charges against (Mr. Wilson) 59.
- ELLSWORTH, ARREST OF, by U. S. soldiers (Mr. Guillet) 86.
- EMIGRATION STATISTICS, Canada and U. S.\* (Mr. Charlton) 1199.
- EMIGRANT BUILDING and Quarantine at Lévis (Mr. Laurier) 90.
- ENGLAND, EXPENSES OF MEMBERS of the Government in\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 66.
- ESCHÉAT, MATTERS OF (Mr. Blake) 74.

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- ESQUIMAUX POINT, N. B., BREAKWATER (Mr. Mitchell) 514.
- ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, Payment on account of (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 514.
- ESQUIMALT NAVAL STATION (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 515.
- ESSAYS, &c., on Agricultural Industries (Mr. Gigault) 33.
- EXCHANGE BANK, GOVT. DEPOSITS in (Sir Richard Cartwright) 35.
- EXPENDITURE, DEPARTMENTAL, on Sessional Returns (Mr. Blake) 83.
- EXPENDITURE OF MONIES for Public Works in each of the Provinces since Confederation (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 161.
- EXPORTS, SUMMARY STATEMENT OF\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28.
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, STATEMENT OF, distinguishing products of Canada from those of other countries (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28, 1200.
- EXPRESS CO.'S AGREEMENTS with Intercol. Ry. (Mr. Weldon) 77.
- FACTORY BILL, Oor. with the Manufacturers' Association or Trades and Labour Council, &c. (Mr. Blake) 82.
- FAIRFORD RIVER, Lake Man., Improvement of (Mr. Orton) 208.
- FINANCE MINISTER'S MISSION to England (Sir Richard Cartwright) 86.
- FISH CREEK, Supply Farm No. 20 (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 44.
- FISHERIES, BOUNTY IN AID OF\* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 67.
- FISHERIES ACT, REGULATIONS UNDER, prohibiting Fishing in Ontario Waters (Mr. Blake) 71; Fines under\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 201.
- FISHERIES EXHIBITION, Reps. of Commissioners (Mr. Fortin) 80.
- FISHERIES BOUNTY, Claims paid\* (Mr. Fortin) 140.
- FISHERY CLAUSES OF WASHINGTON TREATY\* (Mr. Davies) 1200.
- FISHERY REGULATIONS, FINES UNDER\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 1201.
- Fitzgerald LOSS of the Barque (Mr. Jackson) 521.
- FLOUR AND WHEAT, Imports and Exports (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 38.
- FORT MACLEOD PUBLIC BUILDINGS (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 619.
- FORT MACLEOD TOWN SITE RESERVATION\* (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 624.
- FORT SIMPSON INDIAN TROUBLES\* (Mr. Shakespeare) 83.
- FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVES, Cancellation of Timber Licenses on (Mr. Blake) 51.
- FRANCE, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH (Mr. Blake) 57.
- FREIGHT CHARGES, DUTY ON (Mr. Blake) 82.
- FREIGHT CHARGES, INTERCOL. RY. (Mr. Innes) 808.
- GABOURY, J. E., Charges against\* (Mr. Béchard) 1199.
- GALT, SIR A. T., Claims or Allowances on account of, as High Commissioner (Mr. Blake) 66.
- GAS FLOATING LIGHTS below Quebec (Mr. Valin) 217.
- Gazette (MONTREAL) PRINTING CO., Sums paid to from 1874 to 1883 (Mr. McMullen) 303.
- GOLD MINING IN THE N. W. (Mr. Lister) 512.
- GOODWIN, JAS., Claim of\* (Mr. Lister) 1199.
- GOSSELIN, EUGENE, Petition of, to Dominion Arbitrators\* (Mr. Amyot) 28.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS, Payments under\* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 66.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S OATH\* (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 79.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S COMMISSION, &c. (Mr. Casgrain) 521.
- GOVERNMENT HERD IN THE N. W. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 618.
- GOVERNMENT MONEY on Dep. in Banks\* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28.
- GOVERNMENT DEPS. in Exchange Bank (Sir Richard Cartwright) 35.
- GOVERNMENT WORKSHOPS on Intercol. Ry., Rolling Stock built in (Mr. Weldon) 66.
- GOVERNMENT LANDS in Richelieu Co. (Mr. Amyot) 1126.
- GRAND TRUNK RY. Stockholders\* (Mr. Mitchell) 1200.
- GRAND SOUTHERN RY., Conveyance of Mails (Mr. Weldon) 78.
- GRAVING DOCK AT ESQUIMALT, Payment on account of (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 514.
- GRAVENHURST AND CALLANDER RY. SUBSIDY (Mr. Cockburn) 40.
- GRINDING IN BOND (Mr. Blake) 53.
- GRIST AND SAW MILL South of Calgary (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 507.
- GUERIN, MR., Explorations on Yamaska River\* (Mr. Vanasse) 820.
- H. M.'S SHIPS OF WAR in B. C. Waters (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 605.
- HAY, U. S. CUSTOMS DUTIES ON (Mr. Irvine) 519.
- HEALTH OFFICERS, PUBLIC (Mr. Platt) 88.
- HEARN, JAMES, SUPERANNUATION OF (Mr. Kirk) 1110.
- HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Cost of (Mr. Blake) 83.

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- HERRING, NEWFOUNDLAND, Inspection of (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.  
 HIGH COMMISSIONER. See general heading.  
 HODGE vs. THE QUEEN, Judgment of Judicial Committee of Privy Council and Shorthand Writer's Notes\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.  
 HOME FARMS, respecting (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 59.  
 HOME OR SUPPLY FARM on Pincher Creek (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.  
 HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION LANDS South of the C. P. R.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.  
 HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION LANDS withdrawn from the Mile Belt\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.  
 HOMESTEADS, Public Lands entered as\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.  
 HUDSON BAY, Navigation of\* (*Mr. Watson*) 71. See "Hudson Bay."  
 HUGHES, D. J. (County Judge of Elgin) Charges against (*Mr. Wilson*) 59.  
 HUTCHINSON, GEO., Allowance to\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.  
 INDIAN AGENT'S OFFICE, TORONTO, Closing of (*Mr. Cook*) 269.  
 INDIAN INSTRUCTION FARMS, respecting (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 59.  
 INDIAN RESERVE, FORT WILLIAM, Timber Licenses (*Mr. Blake*) 51.  
 INDIAN SUPPLIES FOR MAN. AND N. W.\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.  
 INDIANS AT METLAKATLA AND FORT SIMPSON\* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.  
 INDIANS, WYANDOTTES OF ANDERDON\* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.  
 IMMIGRATION, Report of High Commissioner on (*Mr. Blake*) 49.  
 IMMIGRATION TO MAN. AND THE N. W., Agreement between Govt. and C. P. R.\* (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 83.  
 IMMIGRATION AGENTS, Number, Names, &c. (*Mr. McMullen*) 303.  
 IMMIGRANTS, APPLICATION FOR SERVICES (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 510.  
 IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN ONTARIO in the years 1879 to 1883 respectively\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.  
 IMPORTS AND EXPORTS of Wheat, Flour, Corn and Cornmeal (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.  
 IMPORTS, SUMMARY STATEMENT OF\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.  
 INGLISH BREAKWATER, Engineer's Reps., &c. (*Mr. Campbell, Victoria*) 89.  
 INSPECTION OF NEWFOUNDLAND HERRING (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.  
 INSPECTION OF P. E. I. STEAMBOATS (*Mr. Davies*) 59.  
 INSPECTION OF VESSELS ON LAKES HURON and SUP. (*Mr. Dawson*) 606.  
 INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES EXHIBITION, Reps. of Commissioners (*Mr. Fortin*) 80.  
 INTERCOLONIAL RY. See general heading.  
 INTOXICATING LIQUORS. See general heading.  
 ISLANDS LEASED IN LAKE ONTARIO (*Mr. Platt*) 87.  
 IRON, BOUNTY TO MANUFACTURERS OF (*Mr. Blake*) 70.  
 JACK HEAD RIVER TIMBER LIMITS\* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.  
 JACQUES, JAMES H., Appointment of (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.  
 JEMSEG, N.B., DREDGING AT (*Mr. King*) 295.  
 JUDICIAL SALARIES, Readjustment of (*Mr. Vail*) 58.  
 KAMLOOPS AND SPENCER'S BRIDGE, B.C., Mail Service, Tenders, &c.\* (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1126.  
 KEARNEY, CHARLES, Appointment of (*Mr. Irvine*) 218.  
 KINGSVILLE HARBOUR WORKS (*Mr. Lister*) 216; (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.  
 LABOUR TRADES COUNCIL and Factory Bill (*Mr. Blake*) 82.  
 LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR, Region north of (*Mr. Dawson*) 967.  
 LAKE ONTARIO, Islands leased in (*Mr. Platt*) 87.  
 LAND LEASES, PASTURE, granted in 1883 (*Mr. Charlton*) 73.  
 LAND REGULATIONS\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.  
 LAND AND TOWN RESERVES (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.  
 LAND SALES AND REBATES IN THE N. W.\* (*Mr. Livingstone*) 523.  
 LANDS SURVEYED IN MAN. AND N. W. T in 1883\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 73.  
 LANDS ENTERED AS HOMESTEADS IN 1883\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 73.  
 LANDS SOLD IN 1883 and price per acre\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.  
 LANDS, TIMBERED, sold in Bow River County (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.  
 LAVALLIÈRE BAY EXPLORATIONS\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.  
 LEAMINGTON HARBOUR (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 508.  
 LEAMINGTON, ERECTION OF P. O. AT (*Mr. Lister*) 800.  
 LECLERC, MOISE, Claim of\* (*Mr. Belleau*) 88.  
 Le Courrier de St. Hyacinthe, Payments to under Gov. Gen.'s Warrants\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 67.  
 LETTER POSTAGE, Reduction in (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.  
 LÉVIS EMIGRANT BUILDING AND QUARANTINE (*Mr. Laurier*) 90.

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS' OATHS, &c. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 521.  
 LIFE-SAVING STATIONS, Life-boats, &c.\* (*Mr. Platt*) 1199.  
 LIFE-SAVING CREW at Port Rowan (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.  
 LIGHTS NORTH OF ISLAND OF ORLEANS (*Mr. Valin*) 218.  
 LICENSES, TIMBER, CANCELLATION OF, on Indian Reserves (*Mr. Blake*) 51.  
 LIQUOR LICENSES AND PERMITS IN THE N. W. (*Mr. Blake*) 73.  
 LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, Correspondence between Govt. and Provincial Govts. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 618.  
 LOAN, PROPOSED CANADIAN, of \$4,000,000. Departmental Orders and Advertisements\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 40.  
 LONG POINT LIGHTHOUSE, Repairs on\* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.  
 LOTTERY FIRM AT ST. STEPHEN, N. B. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.  
 LUARD, MAJOR-GENERAL, Complaints against (*Mr. Mulock*) 621, 738.  
 McCALLUM W. A., Memorial of\* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.  
 MCCOLLUM, E., Postmaster at Duart (*Mr. Casey*) 509.  
 McCOURT, DANIEL, Dismissal of (*Mr. Blake*) 516.  
 MAIL SERVICE AT ST. GILES, St. Patrick and St. Sylvester (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.  
 MAIL SERVICE IN B. C. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605; Tenders, &c.\* (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1126.  
 MANITOBA, SUBSIDIES TO\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.  
 MANITOBA, PERSONS entering and leaving for year\* (*Mr. Blake*) 49.  
 MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION AND FACTORY BILL (*Mr. Blake*) 82.  
 MAP SHOWING LOCATION OF C. P. R. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.  
 MASTERS AND MATES CERTIFICATES (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 606.  
 MECHANICAL ARTS and Agricultural Industries, Essays on (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.  
 MEDICAL CERTIFICATES granted in P. E. I. under Temperance Act, 1878\* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.  
 METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, St. John and Toronto\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.  
 METLAKATLA, B.C., INDIAN TROUBLES\* (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 83.  
 MICHAUD and DUMAIS, Skiffington vs. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.  
 MICHAUD, C., Rep. on Exploration of River St. Francis\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.  
 MILITIA CLOTHING, Manufacture of\* (*Mr. Vail*) 1201.  
 MILITIA. See general heading.  
 MILE BELT, Withdrawal of Lands from Homestead and Preemption\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.  
 MINERAL LANDS, Sale of, &c.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.  
 MINISTER OF RAILWAYS as High Commissioner (*Mr. Blake*) 53.  
 MOBERLY, FRANK, Memorial of\* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.  
 MOCCASINS, PURCHASE OF, by Militia Dept.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 624.  
 MONEY ORDER REGULATIONS (*Mr. Blake*) 613.  
 MONIES PAID BY DOM. to Local Govt. of Ont.\* (*Mr. Farrow*) 1200.  
 MONTREAL DRILL SHED, Rebuilding of\* (*Mr. Bernier*) 1201.  
 MOOSE JAW TOWN RESERVE (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.  
 MORRISTOWN, N.S., PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT\* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 140.  
 MOUNTED POLICE SUPPLIES and Transport\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.  
 MOUSSEAU, HON. J. A., Appointment of, as Judge (*Mr. Laurier*) 133.  
 NAPANEE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS (*Mr. Allison, Lennox*) withdn., 208.  
 NAVAL STATION AT ESQUIMALT (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 515.  
 NAVIGATION, SCHOOL OF, at Quebec (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.  
 NELSON RIVER, OBSTRUCTIONS IN (*Mr. Orton*) 208.  
 NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS, Delay in transmitting (*Mr. Sproule*) 216.  
 NEW BRUNSWICK, Mail Service in (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.  
 NEWFOUNDLAND HERRING, Inspection of (*Mr. Fortin*) 31.  
 NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING CO. and C. P. R.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 66.  
 Northern Light, Rep. of Inspectors, &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 59.  
 NORTH-WEST, ADMINISTRATION OF AFFAIRS (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.  
 NORTH-WEST COUNCIL, Members of\* (*Mr. Mills*) 1200.  
 NORTH-WEST, SALES AND LEASES OF COAL LANDS (*Mr. Blake*) 71.  
 NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES and other Provinces, Settlers in (*Mr. Blake*) 49.  
 NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES, Appointment of Administrator (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 517.

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES, Liquor Licenses and Permits (*Mr. Blake*) 73.
- NOVA SCOTIA COAL imported into the U. S. for Ocean Steamship purposes (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- NOVA SCOTIA RAILWAY\* (*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton*) 65.
- OATH OR OATHS taken by Gov. Gen. and Lieut.-Governors\* (*Mr. Landry*) 79; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 521.
- O'BRIEN JOTHAN, Amount paid to on contract (*Mr. Weldon*) 623.
- O'CONNOR, HON. JOHN, Sums paid to (*Mr. Blake*) 70.
- OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS AND SECRETARIES (*Mr. Blondeau*) 972.
- ONTARIO AND QUEBEC, Accounts with Canada\* (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
- ONTARIO, IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN SINCE 1879\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28.
- ONTARIO. See general heading.
- ONTARIO, WATERS OF, Regulations under Fisheries Act prohibiting Fishing (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- ORLEANS ISLAND, Lights north of (*Mr. Valin*) 218.
- PAJOT FARM and Claim of Indian Dept.\* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.
- PASSES OVER INTERCOLONIAL RY.\* (*Mr. Montplaisir*) 1201.
- PASTURE LAND: LEASES GRANTED IN 1883 (*Mr. Charlton*) 73; Sale of, &c., 78.
- PELEE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, Repairs on\* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.
- PINCHER CREEK SUPPLY FARM (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.
- POINT ESCUMINAC, N. B., BREAKWATER (*Mr. Mitchell*) 514.
- PORPOISE FISHERY AT RIVER OUELLE (*Mr. Blondeau*) 86.
- PORT STANLEY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE (*Mr. Wilson*) 519.
- PORT ROWAN, Life-saving Crew at (*Mr. Jackson*) 521.
- PORT TOWNSEND AND VICTORIA, B.C., Mail Service (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.
- PORT STANLEY HARBOUR REVENUE (*Mr. Wilson*) 295.
- POST OFFICES IN OPERATION in the Dominion (*Mr. Hesson*) 90.
- POST OFFICES, Erection of (*Mr. Lister*) 800.
- POSTAGE, LETTER, Reduction in (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.
- POSTAL STATISTICS (*Mr. Hesson*) 90.
- POSTAL SUBSIDIES TO C. P. R. Co. (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
- POSTMASTER AT VICTORIA, B.C. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.
- PREEMPTION ENTRIES IN 1883\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- PREVENTIVE OFFICER at Morristown, N.S.\* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 140.
- PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING and Kaministiquia Ry. Co., Bouduses to\* (*Mr. Blake*) 523.
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RY., Names of Officers, &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 298.
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND STEAMBOATS, Inspection of (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
- Princess Louise, Steamer, Contract, &c., for building (*Mr. Weldon*) 35; Loss of: Reports of Capt. Scott on, 40; Contract for building,\* 623; Tenders for Steamer to replace,\* 820.
- Princess of Wales, Steamer, Rep. of Inspector, &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 59.
- PRIVY COUNCIL, Judicial Committee of: Judgment and Shorthand Writers Notes re Hodge vs. The Queen and Russell vs. The Queen (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- PROVINCIAL ACTS, Disallowance of, &c. (*Mr. Mulock*) 42.
- PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL BONUSES to Rys. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.
- PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES under Confederation Act (*Mr. Ouimet*) 150.
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ANTIQUARIAN, Expenditure on\* (*Mr. McIsaac*) 66.
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Cost of, &c., since 1874 (*Mr. Lister*) 41.
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Cost of Heating (*Mr. Blake*) 83.
- PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS (*Mr. Platt*), 88.
- PUBLIC LANDS SURVEYED IN MAN. and N. W. T. (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- PUBLIC WORKS, Expenditure on in different Provinces, since Confederation (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 161.
- PUBLIC WORKS, SALARIES of Officers charged to (*Mr. Lister*) 82.
- PULLMAN CAR Co.'s AGREEMENT with Intercol. Ry. (*Mr. Weldon*) 77.
- QUEEN AND MERCER, Notes and Judgment of Privy Council (*Mr. Blake*) 74.
- QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. Co.\* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230.
- QUEBEC, PROV. OF, Claims against Dominion (*Mr. Coursol*) 79.
- QUEBEC, LIEUT.-GOVERNORS' OATHS\* (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 79.
- QUEBEC SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.
- QUEBEC. See general heading.
- RAILWAY BONUSES granted by Municipalities and Provincial Govt. of Ont.\* (*Mr. Landerkin*) 1200.

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- RAILWAYS, BONUSES TO, Provincial and Municipal (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.
- RAILWAYS, SUBSIDIES TO\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.
- RAPIDE PLAT CANAL Enlargement\* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE chargeable to Consolidated Fund\* (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 28, 140, 1200.
- RED RIVER, Removal of Sand Bar at (*Mr. Orton*) 208.
- REDUCTION IN LETTER POSTAGE (*Mr. Charlton*) 87.
- REGINA TOWN RESERVE (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- REGINA AS CAPITAL OF THE N. W., Location, &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 37.
- REGULATIONS CONCERNING the Sale and Management of Public Lands\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- RICHELIEU COUNTY, Govt. Lands in\* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1126.
- RIDEAU CANAL EXTENSION\* (*Mr. Taylor*) 1201.
- RIDEAU CANAL WATER SUPPLY\* (*Mr. Bell*) 1200.
- RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, Expenditure on\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.
- RIVER OUELLE PORPOISE FISHERY (*Mr. Blondeau*) 86.
- RIVERS AND STREAMS, Rental of\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 1201.
- RIVER ST. FRANCIS EXPLORATIONS\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
- RIVER THAMES SURVEYS\* (*Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex*) 1199.
- ROBERTSON, JOHN, Claims of (*Mr. Blake*) 614.
- ROLLING STOCK, Intercolonial Ry., Purchase of\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.
- RONDEAU LIGHTHOUSE, Repairs on\* (*Mr. Lister*) 230.
- RUSSELL vs. THE QUEEN, before Privy Council\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- ROYAL SOCIETY, Publication of Proceedings of\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.
- SALARIES JUDICIAL, Readjustment of (*Mr. Vaid*) 58.
- SALES AND LEASES OF COAL LANDS in the N. W.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- SANDWICH, SEIZURE of Coal Oil Barrels at (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.
- SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION at Quebec (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.
- SCOTT AND FULLER, MESSRS., Reps. of, re Claim for Fencing Parliament Grounds\* (*Mr. Lister*) 1199.
- SECTION B., Canadian Pacific Ry. (*Mr. Casey*) 77; Arbitrators' Rep.,\* 1200.
- SEIZURES AT PORTS OF ENTRY and Fines exacted (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- SENATE EXPENDITURE\* (*Mr. McMullen*) 1200.
- SESSIONAL RETURNS, Expenditure on (*Mr. Blake*) 83.
- SETTLERS IN N. W. T. and other Provinces (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
- SETTLERS' OR SQUATTERS' CLAIMS on Town Reserves along line of U. P. R. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75; within Mile Belt,\* 79.
- SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS, Drawbacks on\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
- SHORTHAND WRITERS' NOTES, re Hodge vs. The Queen and Russell vs. The Queen, before Privy Council\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS, Exemption of Fishing Vessels from payment of Duties for relief of (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 216.
- Sir James Douglas, Steamer, Expenditure on (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514; Names of Crew, &c., 514; Repairs, &c.,\* 1200.
- SINNOT, JOHN, Contract with\* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.
- SKIFFINGTON, DETECTIVE (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.
- SOLWAY, POSTMASTER AT, Appointment\* (*Mr. Wells*) 1200.
- SPAIN, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- STEM DREDGES and Dumping Scows\* (*Mr. Jackson*) 1201.
- ST. FRANCIS RIVER EXPLORATIONS\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
- ST. CÉSAIRE, POSTMASTER AT\* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH, Expropriation of Beaumont\* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1200.
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH, Intercol. Ry. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 230.
- ST. CROIX COTTON FACTORY, Importations of Machinery (*Mr. Innes*) 808.
- ST. GEORGE MAIL SERVICE (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.
- ST. GILES, ST. PATRICK and ST. SYLVESTER Mail Service (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.
- ST. JEAN PORT JOLI, Extension of Wharf at (*Mr. Casgrain*) 517.
- ST. JOHN AND MAINE RY., Conveyance of Mails on (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.
- ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, Expenditure on\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.
- ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, Rapide Plat and Cornwall, Enlargement\* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, Islands leased in (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
- St. Lawrence, Steamer, Inspector's Rep. on Condition of, &c. (*Mr. Davies*) 59.

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- ST. PETER'S HARBOUR, P.E.I., Breakwater\* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.  
 ST. STEPHEN AND WOODSTOCK MAIL SERVICE (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.  
 ST. STEPHEN'S POST OFFICE RECEIPTS (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.  
 ST. THOMAS POST OFFICE and Custom House (*Mr. Wilson*) 92.  
 STE. ANNE and ST. ANDRÉ SURVEYS\* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1199.  
 SUGAR, DRAWBACK ON\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.  
 SUBSIDIES TO MANITOBA\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.  
 SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES under Confederation Act (*Mr. Ouimet*) 150.  
 SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.  
 SUBSIDY TO THE GRAVENHURST and Callander Railway (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40.  
 SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC, Readjustment of\* (*Mr. Laurier*) 1200.  
 SUPERANNUATION FUND (*Mr. McMullen*) 85.  
 SUPERANNUATION FUND of the Civil Service\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.  
 SUPERANNUATION OF JAS. HEAAN (*Mr. Kirk*) 1110.  
 SUPPLY FARM No. 20, Fish Creek (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 44.  
 SUPPLY FARM ON PINCHER CREEK (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 617.  
 SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT *re* Sale, &c., of Intoxicating Liquors\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.  
 SURVEY CONTRACT No. 10\* (*Mr. Billy*) 1201.  
 SURVEY OF PUBLIC LANDS in Man. and N. W. T. in 1883\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.  
 SWAN CREEK AND LAKE, SURVEYS (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 605.  
 SWITZER, FRANKLIN, Arrest of, by U. S. soldiers (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.  
 TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS, Expenses, &c., of Com. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.  
 TENTS, PURCHASE OF, by Militia Dept.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 624.  
 TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878, Medical Certificates under, in P. E. I.\* (*Mr. Fco*) 1201.  
 TERRITORIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE N. W. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.  
 TERRITORY, VIOLATION of neutrality by U. S. Troops\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.  
 TIMBERED LANDS sold in Bow River Country (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.  
 TIMBER LANDS, Sale of, &c.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.  
 TIMBER LICENSES and PERMITS (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.  
 TIMBER LICENSES, Cancellation of, on Indian Reserves (*Mr. Blake*) 51.  
 TIMBER LIMITS on Jack Head River\* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.  
 TOWN RESERVES in the N. W. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.  
 TOWNSHIP, PORT, and Victoria, B. C., Mail Service (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.  
 TOWN SITES, Sale of, &c.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.  
 TRANSPORT OF WHEAT THROUGH U. S. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.  
 TRANSPORT, REQUISITIONS and Vouchers rendered by Canadian Express Co.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 523.  
 TREATIES, COMMERCIAL, between Canada and Foreign Powers (*Mr. Blake*) 57.  
 TREATISES, &c., on the Mechanical Arts (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.  
 UNION JACQUES CARTIER RAILWAY, Opening of (*Mr. Houde*) 41.  
 UPPER WOODS HARBOUR N. S., Wharf and Bridge\* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 1199.  
 UNITED STATES, Commercial Treaty with (*Mr. Blake*) 57.  
 UNITED STATES CUSTOMS Duties on Hay (*Mr. Irvine*) 519.  
 UNITED STATES CUSTOMS, Regulations respecting Transport of Wheat (*Mr. Blake*) 53.  
 UNITED STATES, N. S. Coal imported into, for Ocean Steamship purposes (*Mr. Blake*) 70.  
 UNITED STATES Soldiers in Canada (*Mr. Guillet*) 86; (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.  
 UNITED STATES, Wheat and Flour importations (*Mr. Dundas*) 66.  
 VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS, Change of Procedure in\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 63.  
 VICTORIA, B. C., City Postmastership (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.  
 VOLUNTEERS of 1837 and 1838 (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) 89.  
 WARRANTS, GOV. GEN.'S, issued to *Le Courier de St. Hyacinthe*, &c. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.  
 WASHINGTON TREATY, Termination of Fishery Clauses\* (*Mr. Davies*) 1200.  
 WATSON, O. T., Payments to, for Services\* (*Mr. Wilson*) 820.  
 WATSON, HENRY, Arrest of, by U. S. soldiers (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.  
 WELLAND CANAL, Expenditure on\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.  
 WHEAT AND FLOUR Imported from U. S. and Duty collected\* (*Mr. Dundas*) 66.

## RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &amp;c.—Continued.

- WHEAT AND FLOUR, Imports and Exports (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 38.  
 WHEATLEY, POSTMASTER AT, Charges against (*Mr. Lister*) 604.  
 WHEAT, TRANSPORT OF, through U. S. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.  
 WHITCHER, W. F., Retirement of\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.  
 WINDSOR AND WALKERVILLE, Seizure of Coal Oil Barrels at (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.  
 WOODSTOCK AND ST. STEPHEN MAIL SERVICE (*Mr. Weldon*) 78.  
 WYANDOTTE INDIANS, Claim to Pajot Farm\* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.  
 YAMASKA RIVER EXPLORATIONS\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.  
 RETURNS, IMPERFECT: remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 198, 459, 671, 1127, 1128.  
 RETURNS, MISSING, *re* P. E. COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: remarks (*Mr. Platt*) 459.  
 RETURNS, PREPARATION OF, EXTRA CLERKS SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1381.  
 RICHARDSON, H., ALLOWANCE FOR RENT: in Com. of Sup., 1379.  
 RICHEY, Mr. M. H.: notification of Resignation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.  
 RICHELIEU COUNTY, SALE OF GOVT. LANDS IN: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 1109; M. for Ret.\* 1126.  
 RIDEAU CANAL EXTENSION: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Taylor*) 1201.  
 RIDEAU CANAL, WATER SUPPLY: M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Bell*) 1200.  
 RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1200.  
 RIDEAU HALL FESTIVITIES: Adjournment for (M.) 513.  
 RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, FURTHER AID TO, B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.  
 RIFLED ORDNANCE, IMPROVED: in Com. of Sup., 1166.  
 RIGBY, Mr. JUSTICE: Rep. on Lunenburg Controverted Election, 1.  
 RIVIÈRE DU LOUP TOWN BRANCH, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1344. *See* "INTERCOL. RY."  
 RIVER OUELLE, PORPOISE FISHERY: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 86.  
 RIVER ST. FRANCIS EXPLORATIONS: M. for Rep.\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.  
 RIVERS AND STREAMS, RENTAL OF: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 1201.  
 RIVER THAMES SURVEYS: M. for Reps, &c.\* (*Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex*) 1199.  
 ROBERTSON, JOHN, CLAIMS OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 614.  
 ROCHETTE, FABIEN, FOR LAND TAKEN, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1345.  
 ROLLING STOCK, INTERCOL. RY., PURCHASE OF: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 66.  
 Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa B. No. 95 (*Mr. Tassé*). 1°\*, 304; 2°\*, 504; in Com., 889; 3° on a div., 890. (47 *Vic.*, c. 104.)  
 Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Pontiac Incorp. B. No. 84 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*). 1°\*, 260; 2°\*, 504; in Com., 888; 3°\*, 889. (47 *Vic.*, c. 105.)  
 RONDEAU LIGHTHOUSE, REPAIRS ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lister*) 230.  
 ROSS, Mr. G. W.: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1.

- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 664, 1654.
- Royal Canadian Insurance Co.'s reduction of Directorate B. No. 53** (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 199; preamble not proven.
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com of Sup., 1162.
- ROYAL SOCIETY, PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS OF: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66; in Com. of Sup., 1374.
- RULE, SUSPENSION OF: M. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 1241.
- RUSSELL vs. THE QUEEN, JUDGMENT OF AND SHORTHAND WRITER'S NOTES BEFORE PRIVY COUNCIL: M. for copies.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- RUSSIAN LEATHER PERMEATOR: in Com. of Sup., 1165.
- ST. ANDREW'S AND LACHUTE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.
- ST. CÉSAIRE POSTMASTER: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Béchard*) 1199.
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH, EXPROPRIATION OF BEAUMONT: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Amyot*) 1200. See "INTERCOLONIAL RY."
- St. Clair River Tunnel Co. Incorp. B. No. 62** (*Mr. Macmaster*). 1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 199; M. for Com., 603; in Com., and 3°\*, 665; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281. (47 *Vic.*, c. 82)
- ST. CLOTILDE POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Holton*) 1273.
- ST. CROIX COTTON FACTORY, IMPORTATION OF MACHINERY: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Innes*) 808.
- ST. FRANCIS RIVER EXPLORATIONS: M. for Rep.\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820.
- ST. GEORGE MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.
- ST. GILES, ST. PATRICK AND ST. SYLVESTER MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 296.
- ST. GILES, DAILY MAIL FOR: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 73.
- ST. HYACINTHE POST OFFICE, ERECTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Bernier*) 966.
- ST. JEAN PORT JOLI, EXTENSION OF WHARF AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 517.
- ST. JÉRÔME AND NEW GLASGOW RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.
- ST. JOHN AND MAINE RY., CONVEYANCE OF MAILS ON: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.
- ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION AT: in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1344.
- ST. JOHN RIVER, BRIDGE ACROSS: in Com. of Sup., 1627.
- St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. (Bondholders voting) B. No. 56** (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1°\*, 141; 2°\*, 271; in Com., and 3°\*, 715; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1281. (47 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201; in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- ST. LAWRENCE CANALS, RAPIDE PLAT AND CORNWALL, TENDER FOR ENLARGEMENT: M. for copies.\* (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1200.
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, ISLANDS LEASED IN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Platt*) 87.
- "ST. LAWRENCE." See "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."
- ST. LOUIS AND RICHIBUCTO RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1508.
- ST. MARTIN'S JUNCTION AND QUEBEC RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1492-1496.
- ST. MARTIN'S TO QUEBEC, NORTH SHORE RY. BETWEEN: Ques. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 1388.
- ST. PATRICK'S DAY: Adjournment for (M.) 884.
- ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1053; PERLEY, H. F., SERVICES, 1350; conc., 1460.
- ST. PETER'S HARBOUR, P. E. I., BREAKWATER: M. for copy\* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.
- ST. STEPHEN AND WOODSTOCK MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.
- ST. STEPHEN'S POST OFFICE RECEIPTS: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 614.
- ST. THOMAS POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 92; in Com of Sup., 1194.
- ST. VINCENT, CUSTOMS EXAMINATION OF BAGGAGE AT: Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1444.
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 999.
- STE. ANNE AND ST. ANDRÉ SURVEYS: M. Ret.\* (*Mr. Blondeau*) 1199.
- STE. ANNE CANAL: in Com. of Sup. 1052.
- SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES, HOUSE OF COMMONS AND SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1627.
- SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES, CANAL OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 1261.
- SALARIES OF JUDGES, EQUALIZATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 40; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Vail*) 58.
- SALE OF POSTAGE STAMPS AT WINDSOR: Ques. (*Mr. Lister*) 655.
- SALES AND LEASES OF COAL LANDS IN THE N. W.: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- SANDWICH, SEIZURE OF COAL OIL BARRELS AT: M. for Papers (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.
- San Francisco, Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 83** (*Mr. Royal*). 1°\*, 231; 2°, 505; withdn.
- SANITARY JOURNALS, SUBSIDIES TO: Ques. (*Mr. Hickey*) 1387.
- SASKATCHEWAN, DIOCESE OF. See "SYNOD."
- Saskatoon and Northern Ry. Co Incorp. B. No. 41** (*Mr. Ferguson, Welland*). 1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 897. (47 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- SAVINGS BANKS, GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 828.
- SCHOOL OF GUNNERY, FORTIFICATIONS AND MILITIA, B. C.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 285.
- SCHOOL OF NAV. AT QUEBEC: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Amyot*) 200.
- SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1254.
- SCOTT ACT IN CUMBERLAND CO.: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 736; (*Mr. Tupper*) 1548.
- SCOTT AND FULLER, MESSRS., REPORTS OF, re CLAIMS FOR FENCING PARLT. GROUNDS: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Lister*) 1199.
- Seamen's Act, 1873, Amt. B. No. 116** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°\* of B, 763; 2°, 1057; in Com., 1131; 3°\*, 1175. (47 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- SECTION B, C. P. R. ARBITRATORS OR COMMISSIONERS ON: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 1386.

- SECTION B, C. P. R., AWARD OF ARBITRATORS: in Com. of Sup., 1630; on conc. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 1645; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1646; (*Mr. Davies*) 1648; (*Mr. Allison, Hants*) 1649; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1649; (*Mr. Mills*) 1650; conc. in (Y. 82, N. 34) 1651.
- SECTION B., C. P. R., TRANSFER OF CONTRACT, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 77; Arbitrators Rep.,\* 1200.
- SECRETARY OF STATE, DEPT. OF, CHIEF CLERKS IN: Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 797; in Com. of Sup., 837, 1474.
- Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths further Act. Amt. B. No. 100** (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1° on a div., 468.
- Seduction, &c. (Criminal Law) Amt. B. No. 6** (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°\*, 28; 2° m., 141; in Com., 286; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to recom., agreed to (Y. 79, N. 70) 666; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) to recom., 666; M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to adjn. deb., 668; agreed to (Y. 96, N. 63) 669; rsmtd., 980; Amt. to Amt. 6 m. h., (*Mr. Bossé*) neg. (Y. 69, N. 74) 980; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) neg., 980; killed in Sen.
- SEIZURES AT PORTS OF ENTRY AND FINES EXACTED; M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 71.
- SELECT COMMITTEES. See "COMMITTEES."
- SENATE EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. McMullen*) 1200.
- SENATE, FRENCH REPRESENTATION IN: Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 1549.
- SERGEANT AT ARMS, SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1002.
- Saskatchewan, South, Valley Railway Co.'s In-corp. Act Amt. B. No. 10** (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 88; in Com. and 3°\*, 504. (47 Vic., c. 71.)
- SESSIONAL INDEMNITIES: in Com. of Sup., 1339, 1475, 1608.
- SESSIONAL RETURNS, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 83.
- SETTLERS IN N. W. T. AND OTHER PROVINCES DURING THE YEAR: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
- SETTLERS' LANDS PAYMENTS ON: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.
- SETTLERS' OR SQUATTERS' CLAIMS ON TOWN RESERVES ALONG LINE OF C.P.R.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- SETTLERS' OR SQUATTERS' CLAIMS WITHIN THE MILE BELT: M. for O. C.\* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 79.
- SHIPBUILDING COMPANIES. See respective headings.
- SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS, DRAWBACKS ON: M. for copies of Claims\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.
- Shipwrecks, Enquiries and Investigations into, Act. Amt. B. No. 117** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop., 763; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 764; 2° and in Com., 1131; 3° m., 1170; 3°, 1293. (47 Vic., c. 22.)
- SHORTHAND WRITERS' NOTES *re HODGE vs. THE QUEEN AND RUSSELL vs. THE QUEEN, BEFORE PRIVY COUNCIL*: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.
- SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS' ACT AMT.: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 269; reference to Notice on Order Paper, 269.
- SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS, EXEMPTION OF FISHING VESSELS FROM PAYING DUTIES TO FUND: Ques. (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 199; M. for O. C., &c., 216.
- Sick and Distressed Mariners, Relief of, B. No. 129.** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop. and 1°\* of B. 1126; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1360. (47 Vic., c. 21.)
- SIFTON & WARD, RED RIVER AND CROSS LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 1350.
- SIGNAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1234.
- "SIMCOE," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- SIMCOE, SOUTH, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 1.
- SINNOT, JOHN, CONTRACT WITH: M. for copy\* (*Mr. McIntyre*) 1200.
- "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmnts. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 514; Names, Officers and Crew, &c., 514; Repairs, &c.: M. for Cor.\* 1200.
- "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS:" in Com. of Sup., 1227.
- SKIFFINGTON, DETECTIVE: M. for copies of Reports (*Mr. Blondeau*) 621.
- SLOGGETT, Mr. See "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."
- SMITH & RIPLEY (Georgian Bay Branch C. P. R.): in Com. of Sup., 1349.
- SMITH, H. H., EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*) 261, 457.
- SMYTH, Mr. HENRY: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1; return of, 198; introduced, 200.
- SOLWAY, POSTMASTER AT, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Wells*) 1200.
- SOULANGES: Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1; Judgment of Supreme Court, 735.
- Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co.'s In-corp. Act Amt. B. No. 81.** (*Mr. Beatty*). 1°\*, 231; 2°\*, 504; in Com., and 3°\*, 979. (47 Vic., c. 72.)
- Sovereign Fire Ins. Co.'s winding-up B. No. 94** (*Mr. Mackenzie*). 1°\*, 304; 2°\*, 542; in Com. and 3°\*, 665. (47 Vic., c. 90.)
- SPAIN AND U. S., FLAG TREATY BETWEEN: ON M. for Com. of Sup., (*Mr. Val*) 1361.
- SPAIN, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH: M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, 2, 1654. [For the Address, see "Address."]
- Speedy Trials of Felonies and Misdemeanours in Ont., &c., B. No. 99** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 457.
- Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Coal and Ry. Co.'s winding-up B. No. 47** (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1°\*, 131; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 530. (47 Vic., c. 77.)
- STAIRS, Mr. J. FITZ-WILLIAM: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- STANDING ORDERS: Sel. Standing Com. on, 30.
- STATION ACCOMMODATION, C. P. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1049; conc., 1449.
- STATIONERY OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 987.
- STATISTICS, AGRICULTURAL, INDUSTRIAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1095.
- STATISTICS, CRIMINAL: in Com. of Sup., 1089.
- STATISTICS, HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 1094; conc., 1440.

## STATUTES:

- Appointment of a French Canadian: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 73.  
 Distribution of: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 797.  
 Expenses in connection with Consolidation: in Com. of Sup., 1202; conc., 1453.  
 Purchase of Type: in Com. of Sup., 1379; conc., 1464.  
 Reference to, in Speech from the Throne, 2.  
 STAYNER, POSTMASTER AT: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 1109.  
**Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. No. 121** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. prop. and in Com., 765; 1°\* of B., 766; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1058. (47 *Vic.*, c. 20.)  
 STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1255.  
 STEAMBOAT INSPECTORS' REP.: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 460.  
 STEAM DREDGE AND DUMPING SCOWS: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Jackson*) 1201.  
 STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, N.W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 994.  
 STONE FOR NEW DEPARTMENTAL BUILDING: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 736.

## SUBSIDIES:

- Applications by Ry. Co.'s, Names, &c.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 264.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 1049.  
 Grants or Payments to Rys.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 616.  
 Gravenhurst and Callander Ry.: M. for copies of Cor. &c. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 40.  
 Mail Subsidies and Subventions. See "SUPPLY."  
 Manitoba, Grants to, re Boundary, Disputed Territory, &c.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 88.  
**Provincial, Readjustment of, B. No. 154** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1215; M. for Com., 1553; in Com., 1584; 1°\* of B., 1610; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1645. (47 *Vic.*, c. 4.)  
 Provincial, under Confederation Act: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 150.  
**Rys., authorization B. No. 147** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1444; M. for Com., 1479; in Com., 1486; M. to conc. in Res., 1517; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1530; Deb. adjd., 1543; rsmd., 1549; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552; neg. (Y. 56, N. 110) 1572; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 111) 1573; Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1574; neg. (Y. 52, N. 109) 1576; Res. conc. in (Y. 128, N. 35) 1576; 1°\* of B., 1576; 2°\* and in Com., 1624; recom. and 3°\*, 1640. (47 *Vic.*, c. 8.)  
 Rys.: Prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; speech, 1479; in Com., 1486-1511; on conc., Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1517; Deb. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 1530; (*Mr. Laurier*) 1539; (*Mr. Girouard*) 1549; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Auger*) 1552; (*Mr. Houde*) 1552; correction (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1553; (*Mr. Girouard*) 1556; (*Mr. Valin*) 1556; (*Mr. Bossé*) 1557; (*Mr. Béchard*) 1558; (*Mr. Tassé*) 1559; (*Mr. Fisher*) 1563; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1564; (*Mr. Blake*) 1568; (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) 1572.

## SUBSIDIES—Continued.

- Sums paid by Can. to Ry. Co.'s under 46 *Vic.*, c. 4: M. for O. C., &c.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 88.  
 Rys. under 46 *Vic.*, c. 25: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Dupont*) 261; Deb. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 264; *Mr. Wright* 268; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 268; (*Mr. Vail*) 269; (*Mr. Stairs*) 269.  
 Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 883; Readjustment of: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Laurier*) 1200.  
 Sanitary Journals: Ques. (*Mr. Hickey*) 1387.  
 SUGAR, DRAWBACK ON: M. for copies of Memorials, &c.\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 67.  
**Summary Conviction and duties of Justices of the Peace out of Session further Act Amt. B. No. 137** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1386; 2°\*, in Com., and 3°\*, 1618. (47 *Vic.*, c. 43.)  
 "SUMMERSIDE." See "Inspection of P. E. I. Steamboats."  
**Sunday Excursions, Prevention of, B. No. 112** (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°\*, 655.  
 SUPERANNUATION CONTRIBUTIONS, REFUND OF: Ques. (*Mr. Curran*) 285.  
 SUPERANNUATION FUND OF THE CIVIL SERVICE: M. for Stmt.\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.  
 SUPERANNUATION FUND: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 65.  
 SUPPLY:  
 [Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]  
 Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Estimates for 1884-85, 145; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1883-84, 1240; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1884-85, 1439; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting further Suppl. Estimates for 1884-85, 1576.  
 Res. for Com., 28; in Com., 825, 987; Res. in Amt.: High Commissionership for Canada (*Mr. Mills*) 1039; in Com., 1046; Res. in Amt.: Immigration and Emigration (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 1063; in Com., 1088; Res. in Amt.: North-West Grievances (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 1138; in Com., 1158; Res. in Amt.: Reciprocity (*Mr. Davies*) 1176; in Com., 1190, 1218, 1254, 1294; Res. in Amt.: Public Expenditure (*Mr. Charlton*) 1322; in Com., 1333, 1361, 1404, 1423, 1466, 1602, 1626.  
 COMMITTEE:  
 Administration of Justice:  
 Duval, G., Précis Writer, Supreme Court, Statutory increase, 1474.  
 Miscellaneous Justice, 994.  
 Supreme and County Court Judges, Man., 994.  
 Supreme Court of Canada, 994.  
 Travelling Expenses, Stipendiary Magistrates, N. W. T., 994.  
 Vice-Admiralty Court, Quebec, 995.  
 Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:  
 Agricultural, Industrial, &c., Statistics, 1095.  
 Archives, Care of, &c., 1088.  
 Census, 1091.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*—Continued.

Criminal Statistics, 1089.

Dominion Exhibition, 1093.

Health Statistics, 1094; conc., 1440.

*Patent Record*, 1089.*Charges of Management*, 825–832.*Civil Government* :

Agriculture, Dept. of, 842; suppl., 1337.

Auditor-General's Office, 841.

Civil Service Board, 938; 1336; conc., 1459, 1610.

Contingencies, Departmental, 843.

High Commissioner, 987; 1336; conc., 1440.

Post Office and Finance Depts., 987.

Customs, Dept. of, 841.

Finance, Dept. of, and Treasury Board, 841.

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832.

Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 840; suppl., 1336, 1467, 1474.

Inland Revenue, Dept. of, 841; suppl., 1335.

Interior, Dept. of, 838; suppl., 1466.

Justice, Dept. of, 833.

Penitentiaries Branch, 833.

Marine and Fisheries, Dept. of, 842; suppl., 1467.

Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 833; suppl., 1334; conc., 1440.

Postmaster-Gen.'s Dept., 842; suppl., 1336, 1627.

Privy Council Office, 833; 1333, 1336, 1627.

Public Works, Dept. of, 843.

Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 843; suppl., 1335.

Secretary of State, Dept. of, 837; suppl., 1474.

Stationery Office, 987.

*Collection of Revenues* :

Adulteration of Food: Expenses under Act, 1318.

Canals—Maintenance and Repairs: Salaries and Contingencies Canal Officers, 1261.

Culling Timber: Montreal and Quebec, 1317; conc., 1457.

Customs: Salaries, &amp;c., of the several Ports, 1316; conc., 1456, 1464.

Excise: Refund to W. G. Reid, 1382; Salaries, &amp;c., of Officers and Inspectors, 1316; suppl., 1608.

Liquor License Act: Expenditure in Putting Act into operation, 1382; conc., 1453.

Minor Revenues: Dominion Lands, 1318.

Post Office: Mail Service, Salaries and Miscellaneous, 1319; conc., 1458; Additional Amount required for year, 1383.

Public Works: Agent and Contingencies, B. C., 1318; Steamer *Newfield*, Cost of working, 1318; conc., 1458; Telegraph Lines, B. C., 1318.

Railways—Repairs, &amp;c.: Intercolonial Ry., 1256; conc., 1449; Prince Edward Island Ry., 1258; Windsor Branch Ry., 1261.

Weights and Measures and Gas: Miall, E., Commissioner of Standards, allowance, 1382.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Dominion Lands—Capital* :

Surveyors' Plans and Field Notes, Examination of, 1384.

*Dominion Lands—Income* :

Settlement of Land Claims, 1385.

*Dominion Police*, 997; suppl., 1338.*Fisheries* :

Fishery Overseers and Wardens, Salaries, &amp;c., 1234.

Fishing Bounty, Distribution of, Services, 1369; conc., 1617.

International Fishery Exhibition, 1369.

*Geological Survey*, 1261; conc., 1450.*Immigration*, 1404–1422; suppl., 1602; conc., 1464.*Indians* :

Annual Grant to Supplement Fund—Ont., Que., and Maritime Provinces, 1263.

British Columbia—Indians generally, Surveys, &amp;c., 1266; suppl., 1372; conc., 1617.

Manitoba and the North-West—Annuities, &amp;c., 1269; suppl., 1373; conc., 1450, 1610.

Mission School at Fort William, 1608.

Prince Edward Island—Indians generally, 1266.

Printing Vocabularies of Dialects, B. C., 1608.

*Legislation* :

## House of Commons :

Claims of Returning Officers, 1339; conc., 1459, 1611.

Publishing Debates, 1002; suppl., 1339.

Salaries and Contingencies (Sergeant at Arms) 1002.

Sessional Indemnities, 1339; suppl., 1475, 1608.

## Senate :

Salaries and Contingencies, 1002; suppl., 1627.

## Miscellaneous :

Library, Salaries and Contingencies, 1002; suppl., 1602.

Miscellaneous Printing, 1009.

Printing, Printing Paper, &amp;c., 1004; conc., 1440.

Purchase of Works on America, 1009.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* :

Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 1232.

Buoys and Beacons, Montreal Harbour, 1369.

Lighthouse and Fog-alarms, construction of, 1233; conc., 1443.

Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &amp;c., 1232.

Lights, Fog-whistles, Buoys and Beacons, &amp;c., Maintenance and Repairs, 1233; suppl., 1369.

Signal Stations, 1234.

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* :

Canada and Antwerp, 1301.

Canada and West Indies and Brazil, 1299; conc., 1453.

France and Quebec, 1300.

Grand Manan, N.B., and Mainland, 1298.

Halifax and St. John, *vid* Yarmouth, 1298; conc., 1453.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions—Continued.*

- Halifax and St. Pierre, 1301.  
Lakes Huron and Superior, 1298; conc., 1452.  
Liverpool or London and St. John and Halifax,  
1301.  
Magdalen Islands, 1298.  
United States and Victoria, B.C., 1298.

*Militia:*

- A, B and C Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, &c., 1164.  
Ammunition, &c., 1019.  
Artillery competition at Shoeburyness (wthdn.)  
1166.  
Cavalry and Infantry Schools, 1165.  
Clothing and Great Coats, 1020; suppl., 1343.  
Contingencies, &c., Artillery and Rifle Associa-  
tions, &c., 1158.  
Dominion Rifle Association, 1159; suppl., 1602.  
Drill Instruction, Allowance for, 1096.  
Drill Pay and incidental Expenses, 1098.  
Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, 1160.  
Manitoba, Extra Militia Force for, 1343.  
Military Branch and District Staff, 1017.  
Military Stores, 1022.  
Military Properties, Maintenance, &c., 1160; Con-  
struction and Repairs, 1162; suppl., 1602;  
conc., 1440.  
Militia Regulations and Orders, Printing, &c.,  
1343.  
Ottawa Rifle Range, 1603.  
Public Armouries, &c., 1095; suppl., 1343, 1602.  
Rifled Ordnance, Improved, 1166.  
Royal Military College, 1162.  
Russian Leather Permeator, 1165.

*Miscellaneous:*

- Academy of Arts, 1608.  
Allan, W. F., Allowance in lieu of Board, &c.,  
1381.  
Barry, James, preparation of Tables of Exports and  
Imports of Fish, conc., 1464.  
B. N. A. Act., Cases decided under, Publication of,  
1378.  
Boucher de la Bruère, printing Civil Service List,  
1374.  
Boundary, Legal Expenses in connection with,  
1379.  
British Association Meeting in Montreal, 1310.  
Confederation, Historical Picture commemorating,  
1309.  
Consolidated Statutes, Cost of Type, &c., 1379;  
conc., 1464.  
Consolidated Statutes, Expenses, 1202; conc., 1453.  
Fabre, Mr., Salary and Contingencies, 1203;  
conc., 1453.  
Hudson Bay, Expedition to by water, 1379; suppl.,  
1617; conc., 1617.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Miscellaneous—Continued.*

- International Fishery Exhibition, Outstanding  
Claims, 1374.  
Keewatin District, Expenses of Govt. in, 1302.  
Legal Advisers, Payment to, conc., 1617.  
Maclean, Roger & Co., Award of Referees, 1607.  
McLaughlin, Geo. E., Gratuity to Family of, 1373.  
Mounted Police Barracks, 1203, 1378.  
Mowat, Hon. Oliver, Payment for Services, 1379.  
Niagara Falls Commission, 1203.  
N. W. T., Expenses of Government in, 1301; conc.,  
1611.  
Printing, Miscellaneous, 1373.  
Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1312;  
conc., 1453.  
Returns, Preparation of, Extra Clerks' Services, 1381.  
Richardson, H., Allowance for Rent, 1379.  
Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings, 1374.  
Survey of Georgian Bay, Steamer for, 1374.  
Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior, 1203.

*North-West Mounted Police:*

- Pay of Force, &c., 1294.

*Ocean and River Service:*

- Glendon, Steamer to replace, 1227.  
Government Steamers, Maintenance, &c., 1227.  
Life-boats, Stations, and Life-preservers, &c., 1229.  
Masters and Mates, Examination of, 1229.  
Obstructions, Removal of, in Navigable Rivers,  
1232.  
Water and River Police, 1232; suppl., 1369.

*Penitentiaries:*

- British Columbia, 1002; suppl., 1338.  
Dorchester, 1000.  
Kingston, 998.  
Manitoba, 1000; suppl., 1338.  
St. Vincent de Paul, 999.

*Pensions:*

- Compensation in lieu of Land, 1017.  
Duckett, Mrs. Edward (revote) 1343.  
Veterans of 1812, 1016.

*Public Works—Capital:*

- Public Buildings:  
Ottawa (additional buildings, Wellington St.)  
1190.  
Public Works:  
British Columbia, 1603.  
New Brunswick, 1603; conc., 1616.  
Port Arthur, 1603; conc., 1616.  
Harbours and Rivers:  
Cape Tormentine Harbour, conc., 1616.

*Public Works—Income:*

- Buildings, Public:  
British Columbia, 1198.  
Generally, 1198.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Public Works—Income—Continued.*

- Manitoba, 1198.
- New Brunswick, 1192 ; suppl., 1604.
- Nova Scotia, 1190 ; suppl., 1604 ; conc., 1616, 1618.
- North-West Territories, 1198.
- Ontario, 1193 ; suppl., 1354, 1605.
- Prince Edward Island, 1191 ; suppl., 1604.
- Quebec, 1193 ; suppl., 1354, 1604.
- Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 1198 ; suppl., 1358, 1362.

Dredging, 1225 ; suppl., 1365.

*Harbours and Rivers :*

- British Columbia, 1606.
- Manitoba (*Adelaide*, Scow) 1365 ; (*Waterhen River*) conc., 1616.
- New Brunswick, 1221.
- Nova Scotia, 1218 ; suppl., 1605 ; conc., 1442.
- N. W. T. (*Saskatchewan River*) 1606.
- Ontario, 1223 ; suppl., 1605.
- Prince Edward Island, 1220 ; suppl., 1362 ; conc., 1443, 1464.
- Quebec, 1222 ; suppl., 3165.

*Miscellaneous :*

- High Commissioner, purchase of House, 1366 ; conc., 1615.
- Monument to Joseph Brant, 1226.
- Monument to Sir Geo. E. Cartier, 1226.
- National Art Gallery, 1226.

Telegraph Lines, 1226 ; suppl., 1366.

*Quarantine :*

- Cattle Quarantine, 1010.
- Pictou Cattle Disease, 1010.
- Public Health, 1012-1016.
- Tracadie Lazaretto, 1010.

*Railways and Canals—Capital :*

- Canadian Pacific Railway :
  - British Columbia (revote) 1048.
  - Bridge over Red River at Emerson, 1348.
  - Inspecting Engineers, Salaries and Expenses, 1348.
  - Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, 1046.
  - Section B, Award of Arbitrators, 1630.
  - Sifton & Ward (Red River and Cross Lake) 1350.
  - Smith & Ripley (Georgian Bay Branch) 1349.
  - Station Accommodation, 1049 ; conc., 1449.
  - Subsidy, 1049.
  - Temple, Thomas, Patent Flanger, 1349 ; conc., 1460.

*Intercolonial Railway :*

- Bridge across St. John River, 1627.
- Claims arising out of Construction, Payment of, 1628.
- Coal Cars, additional, 1627.
- Construction Account, 1344.
- Dalhousie Branch, 1344.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Railways and Canals—Capital—Continued.*

- Expenditure on, by Govt. of N. B., 1627.
- Falconer, James, for Land damages, 1346.
- Ferguson, Wm., purchase of Land, 1347.
- Halifax Extension, 1049 ; suppl., 1344.
- Halifax Street Ry. Co. vs. The Queen, 1345.
- MacDonell & Co., Alex., Award of Commissioners, 1346.
- Miscellaneous Works not provided for, 1050.
- Rivière du Loup, Town Branch, 1344.
- Rochette, Fabien, for Land taken, 1345.
- St. Charles Branch, 1049 ; suppl., 1345.
- St. John, increased Accommodation at, 1049 ; suppl., 1344.
- Prince Edward Island Railway :
  - Compensation for Injuries, 1347.
  - Rolling Stock, 1347.

*Canals :*

- Carrillon, Dam and Approaches, 1052 ; (Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator) 1351.
- Cornwall, 1050.
- Grenville, 1053.
- Lachine, 1050.
- Murray, 1051.
- Ste. Anne, 1052.
- St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1051.
- St. Peter's, 1053 ; (Perley, H. F., services) 1350 ; conc., 1460.
- Tay, construction of Works, 1053.
- Trent River Nav., Locks, &c., 1051.
- Welland, 1051 ; construction of Raceway between Feeder and Chippewa River, 1051 ; Unpaid Labourers, 1350 ; conc., 1460 ; Page, John, Payment to, as Arbitrator, 1608 ; conc., 1617.
- Williamsburg—Lock at Rapide Plat. 1051 ; Galops Canal, 1051 ; (Clara S. Holden, Compensation to) 1352.

*Railways and Canals—Income :**Canals :*

- Beauharnois (L. W. Marchand, Professional Services) 1353 ; conc., 1463.
- Cornwall—Drain between Town and Canal, 1053.
- Miscellaneous, 1053.
- Rideau (Land damages between Brewer's Mills and Kingston) 1354.
- Welland (Schooners *St. Andrew's* and *Jennie Graham*) 1352 ; conc., 1461, 1612 ; suppl. (Waste Weir at Dunsville) 1608.

*Scientific Institutions :*

- Meteorological Observations, &c., 1254.
- Observatories, 1254.

*Steamboat Inspection :*

- Expenses in connection with, 1255.

*Unprovided Items :*

- Vide Auditor-General's Rep., 1882-83, page 44, 1383.

## SUPPLY—Continued.

## CONCURRENCE:

- Arts, Agriculture, and Statistics, 1440.  
 Barry, James, Preparation of Tables of Imports and Exports of Fish, 1464.  
 Boucher de la Bruère, Payment for Type, &c., 1464.  
 Boularderie Wharf, N. S., 1618.  
 Canada and West Indies and Brazil, Subvention, 1453.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Station Accommodation, 1449.  
 Cape Tormentine Harbour, 1616.  
 Civil Service Examiners, Board of, 1459.  
 Consolidated Statutes, Type for printing, &c., 1464.  
 Culling Timber, 1457.  
 Customs, 1456, 1464.  
 Dominion Statutes, Consolidating, Expenses, &c., 1453.  
 Excisemen, Increase of Salaries to, 1617.  
 Fabre, Mr., Salary and Contingencies, 1453.  
 Fishing Bounty, Services in connection with Distribution, 1617.  
 Geological Survey, 1450.  
 Halifax and St. John, *via* Yarmouth, Subvention, 1453.  
 Harbours and Rivers, N. S., 1442, 1616.  
 Harbours and Rivers, P. E. I., 1443, 1464.  
 High Commissioner, Contingencies, &c., 1440, 1610; House and Furniture, 1615.  
 Hudson Bay Expedition, 1617.  
 Immigration, 1464.  
 Indian Dialects, B. C., Printing of, 1617.  
 Indians, Man. and the N. W., 1450, 1610.  
 Intercolonial Ry., Collection of Revenues, 1449.  
 Intoxicating Liquors Act, Traffic in, Expenses under, 1453.  
 Lakes Huron and Superior, Mail Subsidy, 1452.  
 Legal Advisers, Payment to, 1617.  
 Legislation, Claims of Returning Officers, 1459.  
 Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, 1443.  
 Marchand, L. W., Professional Services, 1463.  
 Military Properties, Care of, 1440.  
 Militia, Dept. of, 1440.  
 Moncton Post Office, &c., 1616.  
*Newfield*, Steamer, Cost of working, 1458.  
 N. W. T., Government in, Expenses, 1611.  
 Page John, Services of, on Welland Canal Arbitration, 1617.  
 Perley, H. F., Services on St. Peter's Canal, 1460.  
 Port Arthur Harbour, 1616.  
 Post Office, 1458.  
 Printing Paper and Bookbinding, 1440.  
 Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 1453.  
 Returning Officers, Claims of, 1611.  
*St. Andrews* and *Jennie Graham*, Schooners, 1461, 1612.  
 Temple, Thos., Patent Flanger, 1460.  
 Waterhen River, Man., 1616.  
 Welland Canal, Chargeable to Income, 1461, 1612.  
 Welland Canal, Unpaid Labourers' wages on, 1460.
- Supply B. No. 155** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res., 1°\* of B., 2°\*, and 3°\*, 1651. (47 *Vic.*, c. 2.)  
 SUPPLY FARM NO. 20, FISH CREEK: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 27; M. for Ret., 44; Ques., 285.  
 SUPPLY FARM ON PINCHER CREEK, SALE OR LEASE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 200; M. for O. C., 617.  
 SUPREME AND COUNTY COURT JUDGES, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 994.  
**Supreme Court in Appeal, limitation of Jurisdiction of, B. No. 15** (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*). 1°\*, 43.  
 SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT *re* SALE, &c., OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: M. for copies\* (*Mr. Blake*) 43.  
 SUPREME COURT OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 994.  
 SURVEY CONTRACT NO. 10: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Billy*) 1201.  
 SURVEY OF GEORGIAN BAY, STEAMER FOR: in Com. of Sup., 1374.  
 SURVEY OF PUBLIC LANDS IN MAN. AND N. W. T. in 1883: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.  
 SURVEYORS' PLANS AND FIELD NOTES, EXAMINATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1384.  
 SURVEYS, LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 1203.  
 SUSSEX AND ST. JOHN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444; in Com., 1509.  
 SWAN CREEK AND LAKE, SURVEYS: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 605.  
 SWITZER, FRANKLIN, ARREST OF, BY U. S. SOLDIERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.  
**Synod of Diocese of Saskatchewan Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 61** (*Mr. Williams*) 1°\*, 162; 2°\*, 199; in Com. and 3°\*, 665. (47 *Vic.*, c. 103.)  
 TALBOT, ACHILLE, EMPLOYMENT AND SALARY OF: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 966.  
 TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS, EXPENSES, &c., OF COM.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 132.  
 TARIFF, INTERCOL. RY., BETWEEN QUEBEC AND ST. CHARLES: Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.  
**Tariff of Duties of Customs further Act Amt. B. No. 142** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1°\*, 1443; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1621. (47 *Vic.*, c. 30.)  
 TARIFF ON GRAIN, READJUSTMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Wheler*) 336.  
 TAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION OF WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1053.  
 TELEGRAPH LINES, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1318.  
 TELEPHONE Co.'s. *See* respective headings.  
**Temperance Act, Canada, Amt. B. No. 136** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1386; 2° m., 1618; 2° and in Com., 1619; 3° m., 1621; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ives*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 93) 1621; 3°\*, 1621. (47 *Vic.*, c. 31.)  
 TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878, MEDICAL CERTIFICATES IN P. E. I.: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Yeo*) 1201.  
**Temperance, Canada, and General Life Assurance Co. Incorp. B. No. 28** (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*). 1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 580. (47 *Vic.*, c. 97.)

- TEMPERANCE.** See "Intoxicating Liquors."
- TEMPLE, Mr. T., M.P., PROTEST AGAINST:** Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1110.
- TEMPLE, THOMAS, PATENT FLANGER:** in Com. of Sup., 1349; conc., 1460.
- TENTS, MILITIA, MANUFACTURE OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 505; Purchase of, by Militia Dept.: M. for Cor.,\* 624.
- TERRITORIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE N. W. T.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- Territories, Representation of the, in the House of Commons B. No. 110** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 598; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1058; in Com., 1059.
- Territory in dispute between the Dom. of Can. and Prov. of Ont. B. No. 144** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>\* —; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 1634; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c. 24.*)
- TERRITORY, VIOLATION OF NEUTRALITY BY U. S. TROOPS:** M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.
- THAMES AND LAKE ERIE CANAL:** Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 797.
- THORBURN, Dr.:** Reference to in Com. of Sup., 839.
- Tidal Dock at Quebec, further provision for, B. No. 148** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1516; in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1581; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1618. (47 *Vic., c. 9.*)
- TIMBER LAND, SALE OF, IN THE N. W.:** Ques. (*Mr. Jackson*) 73; M. for Ret., 90.
- TIMBER LANDS, SALE OF, AND PERMITS, &c.:** M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- TIMBERED LANDS SOLD IN BOW RIVER COUNTRY:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 90.
- TIMBER LICENSES, CANCELLATION OF, ON INDIAN RESERVES:** M. for copies of O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 51.
- TIMBER LIMITS ON JACK HEAD RIVER:** M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Mitchell*) 1201.
- Titles to Land, Transfer of, in Territories of Canada B. No. 16** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 43.
- Toronto Board of Trade and Toronto Corn Exchange Association amalg. B. No. 14** (*Mr. Beatty*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 43; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 88; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 504. (47 *Vic., c. 46.*)
- Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 9** (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 40; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 57; in Com., 861; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 866. (47 *Vic., c. 66.*)
- Toronto Harbour and Esplanade B. No. 60** (*Mr. Small*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 141; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 199; withdn.
- TOWNSEND, PORT, AND VICTORIA, B.C., MAIL SERVICE:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.
- TOWN RESERVES IN THE N.W.T.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 75.
- TOWN SITES, SALE OF, &c.:** M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 78.
- TRACADIE LAZARETTO:** in Com. of Sup., 1010.
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS:** presented, 27.
- Traders Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 92** (*Mr. Beatty*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 304; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 504; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 665. (47 *Vic., c. 51.*)
- TRAMWAY AND TRANSFER CO.'S** See respective headings.
- TRANSLATION OF THE OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES:** Ques. (*Mr. Lesage*) 86.
- Transfer of Prisoners from one Gaol to another authorization B. No. 151** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1586; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1645. (47 *Vic., c. 44.*)
- TRANSPORT, REQUISITIONS AND VOUCHERS RENDERED BY CANADIAN EXPRESS CO.:** M. for copies\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 523.
- TRANSPORT OF WHEAT THROUGH U. S.:** M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
- TRANSPORT.** See "Inland."
- TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF COUNTY COURT JUDGES:** Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 603.
- TRAVELLING EXPENSES, STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES, N.W.T.:** in Com. of Sup., 994.
- TRAVERSE, UNION STATION AT THE:** Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.
- TREASURY BOARD AND FINANCE DEPT.:** in Com. of Sup., 841.
- TREATIES, COMMERCIAL, BETWEEN CANADA AND FOREIGN POWERS:** M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- TREATISES, &c., ON THE MECHANICAL ARTS:** M. for copies of Pets. (*Mr. Gigault*) 33.
- TRENT RIVER NAV., LOCKS, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- TRUST CO.'S** See respective headings.
- TUNNEL CO.'S** See respective headings.
- TUPPER, SIR CHARLES.** See "High Commissioner."
- TWO CENT LETTER POSTAGE:** Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 57.
- TYRWHITT, Mr. R.:** Election sustained on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1.
- UNION JACQUES CARTIER RY., OPENING OF:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Houde*) 41.
- Union of certain Methodist Churches B. No. 11** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 40; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 89; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 665. (47 *Vic., c. 106.*)
- UNION STATION AT THE TRAVERSE:** Ques. (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) 260.
- Union Trust Corporation of Can. Incorp. B. No. 43** (*Mr. Hesson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 89; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 173; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 504. (47 *Vic., c. 100.*)
- UNITED STATES AND SPAIN, FLAG TREATY BETWEEN:** OR M. for Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Vail*) 1361.
- UNITED STATES AND VICTORIA, B. C., MAIL SUBSIDY:** in Com. of Sup., 1298.
- UNITED STATES, COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH:** M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- UNITED STATES CUSTOMS DUTIES ON HAY:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Irvine*) 519.
- UNITED STATES CUSTOMS REGULATIONS RESPECTING TRANSPORT OF WHEAT:** M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
- UNITED STATES, N. S. COAL IMPORTED INTO, FOR OCEAN STEAMSHIP PURPOSES:** M. for copies of Despatches (*Mr. Blake*) 70.
- UNITED STATES SOLDIERS IN CANADA:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86; M. for Cor.\* (*Mr. Charlton*) 1200.

- UNITED STATES WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTATIONS: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Dundas*) 66.
- UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1383.
- UNPAID LABOURERS, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1350; conc. 1460.
- UPPER WOODS HARBOUR: N.S., WHARF AND BRIDGE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 1199.
- VACANCIES IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1, 1108.
- Vancouver Island Ry. B. No. 126** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 67; M. for Com., 1023; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1039; 2°\* and in Com., 1137; 3° m., 1171; Amt. (*Mr. Gordon*) 1172; neg., 1176; Amt. 6 m. h., (*Mr. Homer*) neg. (Y. 29, N. 121) 1176; 3°\*, 1176. (47 *Vic., c. 6*.)
- "VANDERBILT," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- Vaudreuil and Prescott Railway Co. Incorp. B. No. 23** (*Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil*). 1°\*, 71; 2°\*, 89; in Com. and 3°\*, 736. (47 *Vic., c. 84*.)
- VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1016.
- VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS, CHANGE OF PROCEDURE IN: M. for copies of Imp. Despatches\* (*Mr. Weldon*) 65.
- VICE-ADMIRALTY COURT, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 995.
- VICTORIA, B.C., CITY POSTMASTERSHIP: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 605.
- VOLUNTEERS OF 1837 AND 1838: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) 89; Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 57.
- "WABUNO," LOSS OF THE. See "Lakes Huron and Superior."
- WALLACEBURGH AND SARNIA RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1445; in Com., 1507.
- WALLACE, MR. JOHN: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 1; Certificate of Election and return of, 1.
- WALLACE, TOWNSHIP OF, IMPROVEMENT FUND MONEY DUE TO: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 200.
- WARRANTS, GOV. GEN'L., ISSUED TO *Le Courier de St. Hyacinthe, &c.*: M. for Summt.\* (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 66.
- WASHINGTON TREATY, TERMINATION OF FISHERY CLAUSES: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Davies*) 1200.
- WATER AND RIVER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1232, 1369.
- WATER WORKS CO.'S See respective headings.
- WATSON, T. C., PAYMENT TO, FOR SERVICES: M. for Summt.\* (*Mr. Wilson*) 820.
- WATSON, HENRY, ARREST OF, BY U. S. SOLDIERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 86.
- WAYS AND MEANS:
- Res. for Com. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 27; The Budget Speech, 569; reply (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 584; Deb. adjd., 598; resmd. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 625; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 641; Res. 1 in Com., 653; on M. for Com. on Res. 2 (*Mr. Casey*) 672; (*Mr. Benson*) 679; (*Mr. Vail*) 679; (*Mr. Stairs*) 686; (*Mr. Armstrong*) 690; (*Mr. Taylor*) 693; (*Mr. Irvine*) 695; Res. 2 in Com., 695-704; on M. for Com. (*Mr. Charlton*) 709; (*Mr. Dundas*) 717; (*Mr. Mills*) 718; (*Mr. McLelan*) 722; (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 727; Res. 2 in Com., 723-734; Res. 3 and 4 in Com., 734, 735; on M. to conc. in Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 767; (*Mr. Tupper*) 769; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 770; (*Mr. Charlton*) 771; (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 773; (*Mr. Wigle*) 773; (*Mr. McMullen*) 773; (*Mr. Hesson*) 782 (*Mr. Armstrong*) 787; (*Mr. Watson*) 788; (*Mr. Temple*) 790; (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 790; (*Mr. Kirk*) 792; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 17, N. 39) 796; Res. conc. in, 797.
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: Rep. presented, 1321.
- Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 120** (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°\* of B., 765; 2°, 1059; in Com., 1131, 1242; Order for 3° dshgd., recom., amended, and 3°\*, 1294. (47 *Vic., c. 36*.)
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS, in Com. of Sup., 1382.
- WELLAND CANAL, EXPENDITURE ON, SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. McCraney*) 1201.
- WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1051.
- Welland Railway transfer to G. T. R. Co. authorization B. No. 44** (*Mr. Bergin*). 1°\*, 89; 2°, 271; in Com., 860; recom. and 3°, 886. (47 *Vic. c. 53*.)
- WELLER'S BAY, RANGE LIGHTS: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 336.
- WELLINGTON, LIFE-BOAT HOUSE: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 336.
- WELLINGTON, ONT., LIFE BOAT AT: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 603.
- WESTERN COUNTIES, ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1444.
- WHARFINGERS, JURISDICTION OF, ON LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (*Mr. Auger*) 1387.
- WHARVES AND PIERS IN N. B.: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 458.
- WHARVES AND PIERS IN P. E. I., INSPECTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 261.
- WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 33.
- WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTED FROM U. S. AND DUTY COLLECTED: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Dundas*) 66.
- WHEAT, TRANSPORT OF THROUGH U. S.: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 53.
- WHEATLEY, POSTMASTER AT, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Lister*) 604.
- WHITCHER, W. F., COMPLAINTS AGAINST AND RETIREMENT OF: M. for O. C., &c.\* (*Mr. Casey*) 1200.
- WILKINSON, J. A., EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Middlesex*) 966.
- WILKINSON, J. A., PROMISE OF APPOINTMENT TO: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1054; Payments to, 1055.
- WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, LOCK AT RAPIDE PLAT: in Com. of Sup., 1051.

- WINDSOR AND WALKERVILLE, SEIZURE OF COAL OIL BARRELS AT: M. for Papers (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 298.
- WINDSOR BRANCH RY., REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup. 1261.
- WINDSOR CUSTOM HOUSE, APPOINTMENTS IN: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 261.
- WITNESS, DEFENDANT, COMPETENT AS. *See* Law of Evidence.
- Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. and Steamship Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 131 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 1241; 2°, 1281; in Com. and 3°\*, 1386. (47 *Vic. c.* 70.)
- Winnipeg Bank Incorp. B. No. 29 (*Mr. Ross*). 1°\*, 83; 2°\*, 173; in Com. and 3°\*, 1035. (47 *Vic. c.* 49.)
- WOODSTOCK AND ST. STEPHEN MAIL SERVICE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 78.
- WRITS OF ELECTION: Warrants issued for, 1, 1126, 1321.
- WYANDOTTE INDIANS AND CLAIMS TO PAJOT FARM: M. for Ret.\* (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1201.
- WYANDOTTE INDIANS, DISTRIBUTION OF MONEYS TO: Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 966.
- YAMASKA RIVER EXPLORATIONS: M. for Rep.\* (*Mr. Vanasse*) 820
- YORK (N.B.): Announcement of Vacancy in Representation of (*Mr. Speaker*) 1.